

Evaluation of Written Communication Competency

California State University, Fresno
June, 2013

The WASC 2013 Handbook lists four standards of accreditation, and Standard 2 is “*achieving educational objectives through core functions*” (WASC 2013 [Handbook](#) of Accreditation Quick Reference Guide). More specifically, standard of performance is the degree of skill or proficiency with which a student demonstrates a learning outcome. WASC Standard 2, CFR 2.2a, requires baccalaureate programs to engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth, to prepare them for work, citizenship, and life-long learning. These institutions should report their students’ levels of performance at or near the time of graduation in five core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking.

Institutions that apply for accreditation in 2014 when the WASC 2013 standards are first implemented can choose *one* of the five core competency areas as its standard of performance. After careful consideration, Fresno State decided to choose Written Competency as the standard of performance to be evaluated for its accreditation in 2014-15, because Fresno State has established a campus wide policy and system in teaching writing and evaluating writing.

Students at Fresno State either take an upper division writing course (a “W” designation with a series of course requirements [outlined in APM 216](#) including 5,000 words of required student writing) or pass a writing exam (the Upper Division Writing Exam) to fulfill the requirement of writing competency before they can graduate. Many (but not all) departments offer upper division writing courses, which also qualify as major elective courses in these

departments. Academic advisors and faculty members work with students to help them decide whether they should take the exam or the writing course. Students can take the writing test twice, and those who fail both tests are required to take the course.

In Spring 2013 Fresno State conducted an evaluation of written competency among its undergraduate students.

1. Sample and data collection. Usually about one-third of all students take the writing exam, with roughly a 50% passing rate. Those who fail and those who don't attempt the exam are required to take an upper division writing course. In total, about 85% of Fresno State students meet the writing requirement by taking a writing course and 15% by passing the writing exam. The majority of the students who take a writing course do so when they are seniors (although efforts are underway on campus to develop strategies to encourage students to satisfy this requirement in their junior year).

The Core Competency Sub-Committee carefully designed its written competency evaluation project. Each year Fresno State has a senior class of approximately 3,000 students. With a proportion of juniors taking writing classes or the writing exam, there are approximately 3,500 to 4,000 students each year who can be selected for written competency evaluation.

A representative sample of 300 students was selected from the target population, of whom 250 were from writing courses and 50 from writing exams (those who passed). The division of 83.3% and 16.7% reflected the proportions of students who respectively took the course and passed the exam.

In Spring 2013, Fresno State offered a total of 80 writing course sections across five colleges and schools. The sub-committee used a *cluster sampling* scheme to draw 250 samples of

student writing from these 80 writing course sections. First, a random sample of 50 sections was drawn from the 80 sections. Second, a random sample of five students was drawn from each of the chosen 50 sections. The instructors of these chosen writing courses were asked to submit the cumulative work of five randomly selected students in their classes. An individualized instruction letter was sent to the writing course faculty (see Appendix A), and the random numbers included in the letter for selecting students are different across the courses. By the end of May 2013, a total of 235 writing course samples were collected, a 94% return rate.

The writing exam is given three times a year in the University's Testing Center, and students who take it write a guided essay within a 2-hour time period. They are only allowed to use a pen or pencil. A *simple random sampling* scheme was used to collect 50 essays that passed the exam in Spring 2013. The total sample size for the evaluation was 285.

2. Instrument and methodology of evaluation. In June 2013, a faculty panel of eight faculty members representing six departments and four colleges evaluated the student writing samples. The panel adopted a rating rubric, generated and vetted by several entities on campus in the year and a half leading up to the summer evaluation. Those involved in the creation of the rubric were the English Department's Composition Committee, the University's English Competency Subcommittee, and the *Writing Across the Curriculum* program's Advisory Committee. The rubric was also informed deeply by *The Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*, which was adopted by three of the largest writing organizations in the U.S.: the Council of Writing Program Administrators, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the National Writing Project.

The rubric (see Appendix B-1 and B-2) examines five areas of writing competency: Genre/Style Knowledge, Academic Conversation, Rhetorical Knowledge, Assessment/Judgment Capacity and Language Effectiveness. Each area is rated on a scale of 1 to 6 representing three levels: *Developing* (1-2), *Competent* (3-4) and *Accomplished* (5-6).

This evaluation rubric was fully applied to the writing course samples, but slightly adjusted for writing exam samples. For instance, one of the requirements in the rubric is to correctly reference sources researched. This was adequately reflected in writing course samples because students in writing courses typically have days or weeks to complete their cumulative work with access to literature. Students who take the writing exams are not required to cite literature nor are they allowed to have any reference materials when taking the 2-hour close-booked exam. The requirement of citing literature and developing from literature cannot be assessed for writing exam samples, and the faculty review panel decided that 5 points were the highest a writing exam sample can receive, compared to 6 for writing course samples. To keep consistency and comparability between writing course and writing exam samples, after the evaluation was completed, all writing exam scores (1 to 5) were scaled 1 to 6, so that the two portions of the student work can be compared.

Each writing sample, either from writing courses or the writing exam, was separately reviewed by two faculty members on the review panel. The two review scores were averaged to reach a final score, unless those scores were more than 2 points apart, then a third reader was used. In the case of samples needing third readers, the closest two scores were averaged.

Student demographic and family financial background, college entry academic performance (high school GPA), and college academic performance (Fresno State GPA) were

added in the rating data. About one-fifth of the students in the sample were not matched due to incorrect IDs on their writing samples, and not all those who were matched have complete background or performance records.

3. Findings. Findings of this evaluation are presented in six tables in Appendix C in six tables.

Table 1 shows ratings by school/college and by area of evaluation for writing course samples. Written competency is displayed as percentages of students scoring at each of the three levels: *Developing*, *Competent*, and *Accomplished*. Overall, 71% of the students in the sample were rated either *Competent* or *Accomplished*. Weak areas of student writing are relatively concentrated in Academic Conversation and Assessment/Judgment Capacity. In these two areas, the proportion of *Developing* is respectively 31.6% and 29.5%, vs. 15.8%, 18.4% and 19.2% in the other three areas. Conversely, the area of Language Effectiveness has the lowest percentage of *Developing* (15.8%). About 84% of the sampled students scored at least *Competent* in this area.

Table 2 is similarly formatted as Table 1, but describes writing exam ratings. The sample of 50 students represented five colleges/schools. Student writing exam samples received higher scores than writing course samples. Only 6%, or 3 out of 50 students, are placed at the *Developing* level, compared to 29.1% in the writing course samples. Language Effectiveness emerges again as the area where students are strongest, as found with writing course samples.

Table 3 shows competency by writing courses. Ninety-one of the 234 writing course samples are not matched to their courses, and among those that are matched, nine courses have a sample below 10. Table 3 is divided into two sections, with 3a showing writing courses that have

a sample size over 10 (including the No Record group), and 3b showing those with a sample below 10. The total column is the same in 3a and 3b.

Table 4 presents associations between writing competency levels and student characteristics. Some of these characteristics indicate challenges students may have faced at the time of college entry. The percentages of *Developing* by student background suggest the expected challenges: males, first-generation students, and racial minority students have higher proportions of *Developing* than females, continuing generation students, and White students. These differences, however, are not statistically significant. Students who qualified for Pell Grant, an indication of their family financial resources, have slightly lower proportions of *Developing* than those who didn't qualify for Pell, opposite as one might expect. Transfer students scored better than first-time freshmen students. For both of these two comparisons, the percentage differences are not statistically significant. High school GPA and transfer GPA are positively associated with writing competency, but only high school GPA has a significant impact. Those with an A/A- grade in high school are clearly ahead of the rest in the writing sample evaluation. Students with a below A- high school GPA show a mixed pattern: The B students have higher proportions at both ends: *Developing* and *Accomplished*. In other words, the B students in high school are not clearly better off in this writing review than those with C or lower GPAs.

Table 5 shows associations between writing competency and students' Fresno State characteristics. Seniors performed much better than juniors, and those with high Fresno State GPA are more likely to be in the competent or accomplished levels than those with low GPA. Both of these associations are statistically significant. Students with an overall A grade are 6.7

times more likely to score at the *Accomplished* level and 3.5 times less likely to be at the *Developing* level than those with an overall grade below B.

Table 6 examined associations between writing course grades and writing competency levels. The percentage differences do suggest that students who earned an A in their writing course are less likely to be *Developing* and more likely to be *Accomplished*, than those who earned a lower grade. However, none of the six Chi-square tests, each for the five areas of writing competency and the overall performance, returned a significant finding.

Besides the above analysis of the numeric ratings of student writing, the faculty review panel also offered their observations and suggestions, briefly summarized below.

Observations

- *Writing exam samples in general better are better writings than writing course samples*
- *Lack of consistency appears in w-course culminating paper requirements (e.g., the use and incorporation of sources in various w-course papers were not similar in many cases)*
- *Many courses appear neither to engage nor to ask students to engage with outside sources*
- *Many assignments asked students to fill out forms or use formulas to create writing, but this did not prove effective.*

Suggestions

- *Monitor w-course writing so that we can have some consistency*

- *Weigh w-courses heavier (4 units)*
- *Help faculty teach students how to use sources in their writing*
- *Develop rubric for all w-courses*
- *Provide faculty with rubric before semester begins*
- *Send this rubric to all w-course instructors and departments*
- *Hold meeting or workshop to orient w-course teachers to the rubric and the academic writing expectations of the university.*

4. Summary. The following highlights conclude the findings of this evaluation:

- *Seventy-one percent (71%) of the writing course samples and 94% of the writing exam samples are rated at Competent or Accomplished levels of written competency.*
- *Of the five areas of evaluation, Academic Conversation and Assessment-Judgment Capacity are relatively weak. Students performed the best in the area of Language Effectiveness in both writing course and writing exam samples.*
- *Student college entry characteristic are not significantly associated with written competency, except their high school GPA.*
- *Seniors performed better than juniors (they are 2.6 times less likely than juniors to be at the Developing level).*
- *Fresno State GPA has a strong and positive association with written competency.*
- *Writing course grades are not significantly associated with competency levels.*

The findings indicate that student demographic and financial background at the time of college entry is not statistically related to writing competency near graduation (most students in the sample are seniors), but high school GPA continues to affect how well a student writes.

Transfer GPA, however, is not significantly related to writing competency.

Student overall performance in college (GPA) is strongly correlated with performance levels in writing. In addition, those who are closer to graduation (seniors) did better than those who are one year behind them (juniors).

These findings are encouraging. The lack of significant association between student college background characteristics (gender, ethnicity, financial resources, etc.) indicates that inequality at college entry is somewhat leveled off due to education the students have received at Fresno State. Another support to this conclusion is the better performance of seniors: one more year in school is translated to better written competency.

While ascribed status is not related to written competency, high school GPA and college GPA both are. As expected, overall student academic performance is consistently intertwined with their ability to write.

Students who opt to take the writing exam are relatively better writers than those who don't. The review verified this fact. Only 6% of the passing writing exam essays received an overall *Developing* rating, compared to 29% from the writing course samples.

Fresno State serves a large proportion of under-represented minority students, and over 70% of its student population are first-generation college attendees. About half of its first-time and full-time freshmen need remedial education in English. The writing sample evaluation produced evidence of progress that students at Fresno State have received rigorous education in the area of written communication.

5. Discussion and suggestions. Evaluation of written competency is one of the well developed areas of student learning outcome assessment at Fresno State. All program SOAPs have goals and objectives in this area, and student writing is evaluated every year across

programs in SOAP activities. The university had not conducted a campus-wide written competency evaluation in the past.

Because the WASC requirement on educational quality in the five core competency areas was relatively new (released in 2013), Fresno State chose to present evidence of student written competency for its 2014-15 accreditation through a representative sample based on a standardized rubric. While this method produced evidence of student ability in writing, it is meant as a supplement to the on-going and institutionalized means of student learning outcome assessment, not to replace it.

It needs to be cautioned that although a sample of nearly 300 can be statistically sound, compartmentalization of these data into subgroups will inevitably lead to concerns of representation. Therefore, comparisons between subgroups, such as colleges/schools and writing courses, will not generate meaningful implications. These subgroup statistics in the finding tables are descriptive only, and are not supposed to represent a comparison of student groups.

It should also be cautioned that writing courses may be both a University graduation requirement for all students and a major course requirement for students in the college/school where the course is offered. Because of this latter requirement, writing courses vary significantly in their focus, delivery format, types of assignments and content styles, despite the common requirements set in the academic policy. Learning outcomes in writing courses may thus differ across academic disciplines. Different written competency content and style are required of English majors and Engineering majors. When a single rubric is used to evaluate the writing course samples, the rating differences could reflect both student writing abilities and the course content/requirement variations.

Appendix A

Instructions to collect student writing samples in your W course

Dear Professor _____ (Class title, number),

Fresno State is in the process of preparing for its 2014 WASC re-accreditation. One of our accreditation tasks is to review and evaluate our students' written communication skills.

Your W course was randomly chosen among the 84 upper division writing course sections offered in Spring 2013, to provide the WASC review committee with a writing sample from five (5) students. We would truly appreciate your cooperation in providing the required samples at the end of this semester, exactly as instructed below:

1. **Required writing sample:** The student writing sample we need is the written assignment that best represents students' cumulative work in your course. This may be the writing assignment in your course that is worth the highest percentage of your course grade (a term paper, for example), the final written assignment, or the assignment you think best represents student learning in writing in your course. If this written assignment has undergone several rounds of revisions, submit the final version.
2. **Selection procedure.** You are asked to use a *systematic random sampling* collection technique to come up with five (5) student writing samples. Please note that student grades are irrelevant in the selection. As long as a student has cumulative work turned in, he or she is eligible to be selected.
 - a. Select these five (5) students on your alphabetically sorted class roster:

#1, #5, #10, #15, and #20
 - b. **Exception.** If a student among these five does not have cumulative work, due to incompleteness or Unofficial Withdrawal, select the immediate next student on the roster. For example, if Student #20 is to be selected but he/she does not have cumulative work, Student #21 shall be chosen. If Student #21 does not have cumulative work, either, go to Student #22, etc. If you reach the bottom of your roster in this alternative selection process, go back to the top of your roster and select the first student who has cumulative work among those who have not been selected.
3. **Submission procedure.** Once you have selected the five (5) students, gather their cumulative work, and turn them in with the student IDs on the work (name is not

needed) to your College/School's Dean's office. The deadline for this submission is **5/24/2013**.

Note:

1. The five numbers of students given to you were randomly selected through a systematic random sampling technique. They are different for different W courses.
2. This data collection is solely for the purpose of WASC review and student writing competency evaluation. It is not intended and cannot be used to measure teaching effectiveness, which is strictly governed by APM procedures and department teaching evaluation policies. When you submit your student writing samples, no instructor name or course syllabus are required. We request student IDs on their work for later analysis whether student writing competency varies by student background.
3. If you have questions about this sample collection, please contact Dr. Xuanning Fu, Associate Dean of College of Social Sciences, chair of WASC Core Competency Committee, at xfu@csufresno.edu or 278-3013.

Appendix B: Writing Competency Assessment Rubric

Dimension	Ratings 1-2	Ratings 3-4	Ratings 5-6
	Developing	Competent	Accomplished
Genre & Style Knowledge	appears unaware of purposes and uses of disciplinary genres, or unaware of audiences' genre expectations, which includes a lack of control over appropriate style conventions (e.g., MLA, APA, Chicago, etc.), often misuses quoted material (or doesn't quote found material at all), or doesn't cite appropriately or consistently, and shows inconsistency in organizing and expressing ideas, which includes a lack of appropriate word choice and language use.	uses appropriate disciplinary genres for meaningful rhetorical purposes and specific audiences, which includes an emerging knowledge and proficiency with the appropriate style (e.g., MLA, APA, Chicago, etc.) and citation guidelines, particular ways of organizing and expressing ideas, language use, word choice, and sentence structures that are native to that discipline or appropriate to the discussion being attempted by the writer.	uses, often self-consciously, appropriate disciplinary genres for meaningful rhetorical purposes and specific audiences, which includes a clear knowledge and proficiency with the appropriate style (e.g., MLA, APA, Chicago, etc.) and citation guidelines, organizes and expresses ideas coherently and persuasively, and uses consciously language, word choice, and sentence structures that are appropriate, sometimes original, and native to that discipline or the discussion being attempted by the writer.
Academic Conversation	Lacks a meaningful engagement with an academic conversation on the topic at hand and that is appropriate to the writer's discipline (major) that generates informed opinions, which may appear as writing that does not incorporate any research or found academic materials, or is a clearly one-sided argument in which sources only offer one position; often important or reasonable controversial claims will not be supported, sources used may not be interrogated for their validity, appropriateness, or reliability; and there is a general lack of a developed, sustained, coherent focus/argument that answers or explores a question in a structured manner.	engages with academic conversations in the writer's discipline (major) that generates informed opinions, which includes effectively integrating outside sources in support of claims, interrogating the validity and reliability of ideas in sources, showing some awareness of the significance of sources cited (i.e., sources are not chosen haphazardly or randomly), and developing a sustained, coherent focus/argument that answers or explores a question in a structured manner.	engages self-consciously with academic conversations in the writer's discipline (major) that generates informed opinions, which includes effectively integrating outside sources in support of claims, commenting on those conversations, perhaps revealing assumptions and points of agreement and disagreement, interrogating the validity and reliability of ideas in sources, showing awareness of the significance of sources cited, and developing a sustained, coherent focus/argument that answers or explores a question in a structured manner.

Appendix B: Writing Competency Assessment Rubric

Dimension	Ratings 1-2	Ratings 3-4	Ratings 5-6
	Developing	Competent	Accomplished
Rhetorical Knowledge	does not seem to understand the rhetorical situation of texts and arguments, may not distinguish between texts and their authors, issues/questions and the ways those issues/questions are articulated by various voices/people in the field; does not take into consideration context of discussions and problems, or the authority (or lack of authority) of some voices/people when considering various positions and arguments; often does not respond in a discipline-appropriate way, or even a sophisticated manner, which includes the ability to explain the rhetorical situation in which a text (the writer's or others' texts) exists.	understands the rhetorical situation of texts and arguments and responds in a discipline-appropriate and a semi-sophisticated manner, which includes the ability to explain the rhetorical situation in which a text (the writer's or others' texts) exists.	understands the rhetorical situation of texts and arguments, either self-consciously or explicitly discussing the rhetorical aspects of texts and arguments engaged with and in, and responds in a discipline-appropriate and sophisticated manner, may even use explicitly rhetorical elements of texts and academic discussions to make sense of things.
Reflection	does not show any indications of reflection on the writer's own writing practices and drafts, or revision practices, which could show up as inconsistent editing problems but more often are revealed as inconsistent writer-choices in the text, from the use of sources (or a lack of sources) to problems with organization, to problems with the nature of the claims and ideas expressed (too simple or too oblique); the writer appears to not understand how he/she creates or revises his/her own text, or how particular writer-decisions in a text create potential reader/audience effects and reactions since many decisions create contradictory (counter-productive) reactions in readers; the act of writing and the text that is produced by the writer from that process both appear uncontrolled and not thought through or reflected upon by the writer.	reflects on occasion on the writer's own writing practices and drafts; while rarely in the text/document itself, a reader can see how the writer has thought carefully about how and why the writing decisions made are appropriate and what potential effects on audiences/readers those decisions may have.	shows clear reflection on the writer's own writing practices and drafts by conscious and careful choices in the text to create certain effects or reactions in readers that lead to purposeful audience reactions or interesting ways to argue or arrange the discussion at hand; a writer may reveal his/her thinking in meta-discourse in the text (i.e. moments in the text where the writer discusses how he/she is making meaning or understanding something, another text, or an assumption or idea, or when he/she steps outside the argument to make a comment that focuses the reader in productive ways), which also can explain how and why writing decisions are made and what potential effects on audiences/readers those decisions may have.

Appendix B: Writing Competency Assessment Rubric

Dimension	Ratings 1-2	Ratings 3-4	Ratings 5-6
	Developing	Competent	Accomplished
Assessment-Judgment Capacity	does not assess effectively a variety of texts (e.g. the writer’s own, peers’ texts, and/or published texts) for some explicit purpose that is clear in the written assessments or discussions of those texts; any discussion or assessment of any text often lacks contextual information about the argument and/or author, and may not be clear on why something is good or bad in a text; there is not much indication that the writer can articulate clear judgments based on textual and other evidence that are informed by appropriate expectations for those texts (evidence-based judgments).	assesses effectively a variety of texts (e.g. the writer’s own, peers’ texts, and published texts) for some purpose that may be clear in the written assessments or discussions of those texts, which includes demonstrating the capacity to make clear judgments based on textual and other evidence that are informed by appropriate expectations for those texts (evidence-based judgments).	assesses consciously and effectively a variety of texts (e.g. the writer’s own, peers’ texts, and published texts) for some explicit purpose that is clear in the written assessments or discussions of those texts and moves the discussion forward, often in interesting ways, which includes demonstrating the capacity to make clear judgments based on textual and other evidence that are informed by appropriate expectations for those texts (evidence-based judgments).
Language Effectiveness	does not use, or inconsistently uses, effective, clear sentences and language, which causes the writer’s ethos (i.e. credibility and authority on the subject) to be considered unreliable; the writer appears to not be able to edit drafts successfully, since the language, grammar, and syntax is not effective, clear, or powerful; sometimes the language may be relatively clean but shows no variety of sentence structures, opting for safe, short, and repetitive sentences.	uses effective, clear sentences and language that build an appropriate ethos (i.e., credibility) for the writer, even if occasionally there are errors; the writer appears to be able to edit drafts successfully, moving them toward increasing effectiveness, clarity, and power, and using a variety of sentence structures.	consistently uses effective, clear sentences and language that build a strong ethos (i.e., credibility) for the writer; there are few noticeable errors in the writing; the writer appears to be able to edit drafts successfully, moving them to an effective, clear, and powerful draft, and purposefully uses a variety of sentence structures that work toward positive effect on readers.

Rating Scale

Developing

1. Consistently inadequate, of poor quality, and/or significantly lacking
2. Consistently inadequate, of poor quality, but occasionally showing signs of demonstrating competence

Competent

3. Adequate or of acceptable quality but inconsistent, showing signs of competence mingled with some problems
4. Consistently adequate and of acceptable quality, showing competence with perhaps some minor problems

Accomplished

5. Consistently good quality, showing clear competence with few problems, and some flashes of excellent or superior work
6. Mostly or consistently excellent/superior quality, shows very few problems and several or many signs of superior work

Appendix C--Table 1 Written Competency Level by Student Major College: Writing Course Samples

		College										Total	
		CAH	CHHS	COSS	CSB	CSM	JCAST	KSOEHD	LCOE	SPE	No record		
Genre & Style Knowledge	Developing	25.0%	12.8%	4.5%	18.9%	10.5%	30.0%	12.5%	22.2%		28.0%	43	18.4%
	Competent	58.3%	66.7%	77.3%	62.2%	63.2%	60.0%	70.8%	77.8%	50.0%	62.0%	153	65.4%
	Accomplished	16.7%	20.5%	18.2%	18.9%	26.3%	10.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	10.0%	38	16.2%
Academic Conversation	Developing	33.3%	25.6%	18.2%	51.4%	5.3%	35.0%	25.0%	55.6%		36.0%	74	31.6%
	Competent	50.0%	51.3%	72.7%	37.8%	89.5%	60.0%	50.0%	44.4%	50.0%	56.0%	130	55.6%
	Accomplished	16.7%	23.1%	9.1%	10.8%	5.3%	5.0%	25.0%	0.0%	50.0%	8.0%	30	12.8%
Rhetorical Knowledge	Developing	8.3%	15.4%	9.1%	29.7%	5.3%	25.0%	4.2%	33.3%		30.0%	45	19.2%
	Competent	75.0%	71.8%	77.3%	54.1%	84.2%	65.0%	66.7%	66.7%	50.0%	64.0%	158	67.5%
	Accomplished	16.7%	12.8%	13.6%	16.2%	10.5%	10.0%	29.2%	0.0%	50.0%	6.0%	31	13.2%
Assessment-Judgment Capacity	Developing	25.0%	25.6%	13.6%	40.5%	21.1%	40.0%	12.5%	33.3%		40.0%	69	29.5%
	Competent	50.0%	56.4%	68.2%	48.6%	68.4%	55.0%	58.3%	66.7%	50.0%	54.0%	133	56.8%
	Accomplished	25.0%	17.9%	18.2%	10.8%	10.5%	5.0%	29.2%	0.0%	50.0%	6.0%	32	13.7%
Language Effectiveness	Developing	16.7%	12.8%	0.0%	29.7%	5.3%	10.0%	8.3%	11.1%		26.0%	37	15.8%
	Competent	66.7%	69.2%	86.4%	56.8%	57.9%	80.0%	66.7%	88.9%	50.0%	66.0%	160	68.4%
	Accomplished	16.7%	17.9%	13.6%	13.5%	36.8%	10.0%	25.0%	0.0%	50.0%	8.0%	37	15.8%
Overall	Developing	16.7%	23.1%	13.6%	48.6%	10.5%	30.0%	25.0%	33.3%		38.0%	68	29.1%
	Competent	66.7%	64.1%	77.3%	43.2%	78.9%	60.0%	54.2%	66.7%	50.0%	56.0%	141	60.3%
	Accomplished	16.7%	12.8%	9.1%	8.1%	10.5%	10.0%	20.8%		50.0%	6.0%	25	10.7%

of students

12 39 22 37 19 20 24 9 2 50 234

Appendix C--Table 2 Written Competency Level by Student Major College: Writing Exam Samples

		College						Total	
		CAH	CHHS	COSS	CSM	KSOEHD	No record		
Genre & Style Knowledge	Developing	40.0%	15.4%	50.0%	30.0%		33.3%	16	32.0%
	Competent	50.0%	76.9%	33.3%	60.0%	100.0%	33.3%	28	56.0%
	Accomplished	10.0%	7.7%	16.7%	10.0%		33.3%	6	12.0%
Academic Conversation	Developing	10.0%	23.1%	41.7%	30.0%		33.3%	13	26.0%
	Competent	70.0%	69.2%	41.7%	60.0%	100.0%	66.7%	31	62.0%
	Accomplished	20.0%	7.7%	16.7%	10.0%			6	12.0%
Rhetorical Knowledge	Developing	20.0%	7.7%	41.7%	20.0%		33.3%	11	22.0%
	Competent	60.0%	76.9%	41.7%	70.0%	50.0%	33.3%	30	60.0%
	Accomplished	20.0%	15.4%	16.7%	10.0%	50.0%	33.3%	9	18.0%
Assessment-Judgment Capacity	Developing	40.0%		50.0%	20.0%		33.3%	13	26.0%
	Competent	40.0%	76.9%	25.0%	70.0%	100.0%	33.3%	27	54.0%
	Accomplished	20.0%	23.1%	25.0%	10.0%		33.3%	10	20.0%
Language Effectiveness	Developing		7.7%	16.7%				3	6.0%
	Competent	70.0%	69.2%	58.3%	80.0%	100.0%	66.7%	35	70.0%
	Accomplished	30.0%	23.1%	25.0%	20.0%		33.3%	12	24.0%
Overall	Developing			16.7%			33.3%	3	6.0%
	Competent	80.0%	84.6%	58.3%	90.0%	100.0%	33.3%	38	76.0%
	Accomplished	20.0%	15.4%	25.0%	10.0%		33.3%	9	18.0%
# of students		10	13	12	10	2	3	50	

Appendix C--Table 3a Written Competency Level by Writing Course

		Writing Course					Total	
		ANTH 116W	BA 105W	ENGL 117W	IT 198W	No record	Table 3a & 3b	
Genre & Style Knowledge	Developing	33.3%	16.4%	10.0%	10.0%	18.7%	43	18.4%
	Competent	33.3%	76.4%	80.0%	65.0%	63.7%	153	65.4%
	Accomplished	33.3%	7.3%	10.0%	25.0%	17.6%	38	16.2%
Academic Conversation	Developing	40.0%	36.4%	45.0%	15.0%	28.6%	74	31.6%
	Competent	40.0%	58.2%	50.0%	75.0%	53.8%	130	55.6%
	Accomplished	20.0%	5.5%	5.0%	10.0%	17.6%	30	12.8%
Rhetorical Knowledge	Developing	40.0%	25.5%	25.0%	5.0%	11.0%	45	19.2%
	Competent	40.0%	65.5%	65.0%	90.0%	74.7%	158	67.5%
	Accomplished	20.0%	9.1%	10.0%	5.0%	14.3%	31	13.2%
Assessment-Judgment Capacity	Developing	40.0%	34.5%	35.0%	20.0%	27.5%	69	29.5%
	Competent	46.7%	54.5%	55.0%	70.0%	57.1%	133	56.8%
	Accomplished	13.3%	10.9%	10.0%	10.0%	15.4%	32	13.7%
Language Effectiveness	Developing	26.7%	14.5%	15.0%	10.0%	14.3%	37	15.8%
	Competent	46.7%	74.5%	75.0%	70.0%	70.3%	160	68.4%
	Accomplished	26.7%	10.9%	10.0%	20.0%	15.4%	37	15.8%
Overall	Developing	46.7%	29.1%	35.0%	5.0%	28.6%	68	29.1%
	Competent	40.0%	65.5%	55.0%	85.0%	60.4%	141	60.3%
	Accomplished	13.3%	5.5%	10.0%	10.0%	11.0%	25	10.7%

of students

15

55

20

20

91

234

Appendix C--Table 3b Written Competency Level by Writing Course

		Writing Course							Total Table 3a & 3b		
		LING 110W	LING 111W	PHIL 133W	PLANT 110W	SOC 130W	ANTH 105W	ENGL 115W			ENGL 160W
Genre & Style Knowledge	Developing		25.0%	33.3%	50.0%	37.5%		50.0%		43	18.4%
	Competent	100.0%	75.0%	66.7%	25.0%	25.0%	75.0%	50.0%	100.0%	153	65.4%
	Accomplished				25.0%	37.5%	25.0%			38	16.2%
Academic Conversation	Developing	100.0%	25.0%	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%	12.5%			74	31.6%
	Competent		75.0%	66.7%	25.0%	25.0%	62.5%	100.0%	100.0%	130	55.6%
	Accomplished				25.0%	25.0%	25.0%			30	12.8%
Rhetorical Knowledge	Developing		25.0%	33.3%	50.0%	37.5%	25.0%			45	19.2%
	Competent	100.0%	50.0%	66.7%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	158	67.5%
	Accomplished		25.0%		25.0%	37.5%	25.0%			31	13.2%
Assessment- Judgment Capacity	Developing		25.0%	66.7%	50.0%	37.5%	0.0%			69	29.5%
	Competent	100.0%	50.0%	33.3%	25.0%	37.5%	75.0%	100.0%	100.0%	133	56.8%
	Accomplished		25.0%		25.0%	25.0%	25.0%			32	13.7%
Language Effectiveness	Developing			33.3%	25.0%	37.5%	25.0%			37	15.8%
	Competent	100.0%	75.0%	66.7%	50.0%	25.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	160	68.4%
	Accomplished		25.0%		25.0%	37.5%	25.0%			37	15.8%
Overall	Developing		25.0%	66.7%	50.0%	37.5%	25.0%	50.0%		68	29.1%
	Competent	100.0%	75.0%	33.3%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	141	60.3%
	Accomplished				25.0%	37.5%	25.0%			25	10.7%
# of students		1	4	3	4	8	8	2	3	234	

Appendix C--Table 4 Association between Written Competency Level and Student Background and College-entry GPA

Student characteristics		Developing		Competent		Accomplished		Total		Sig.
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Gender	Female	25	19.2%	84	64.6%	21	16.2%	130	100.0%	0.183
	Male	26	25.7%	66	65.3%	9	8.9%	101	100.0%	
First generation	Yes	29	21.8%	89	66.9%	15	11.3%	133	100.0%	0.636
	No	22	22.4%	61	62.2%	15	15.3%	98	100.0%	
PELL Grant Eligibility	Yes	18	20.7%	61	70.1%	8	9.2%	87	100.0%	0.557
	No	24	21.1%	74	64.9%	16	14.0%	114	100.0%	
New student status	Freshmen	25	22.1%	76	67.3%	12	10.6%	113	100.0%	0.754
	Transfer	17	19.3%	59	67.0%	12	13.6%	88	100.0%	
Ethnicity	African American	2	20.0%	8	80.0%	0	0.0%	10	100.0%	0.231
	Asian	7	35.0%	12	60.0%	1	5.0%	20	100.0%	
	Hispanic	21	23.9%	59	67.0%	8	9.1%	88	100.0%	
	White	16	18.6%	54	62.8%	16	18.6%	86	100.0%	
	Other / No record	25	31.3%	46	57.5%	9	11.3%	80	100.0%	
High School GPA	Below B	6	18.2%	27	81.8%	0	0.0%	33	100.0%	0.025
	B and B+	16	28.6%	34	60.7%	6	10.7%	56	100.0%	
	A- and A	6	13.3%	30	66.7%	9	20.0%	45	100.0%	
Transfer GPA	Below B	8	21.1%	27	71.1%	3	7.9%	38	100.0%	0.061
	B and B+	8	25.0%	21	65.6%	3	9.4%	32	100.0%	
	A- and A	1	5.6%	11	61.1%	6	33.3%	18	100.0%	

Note: Statistical significance was tested with Chi-square.

Appendix C--Table 5 Association between Written Competency Level and Fresno State Total Course Units, Semester Course Load and Overall GPA

Student characteristics		Developing		Competent		Accomplished		Total		Sig.
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Year in school	Junior	26	39.4%	31	47.0%	9	13.6%	66	100.0%	0.000
	Senior	25	15.2%	119	72.1%	21	12.7%	165	100.0%	
Semester units load	Below 12	2	10.5%	11	57.9%	6	31.6%	19	100.0%	0.015
	12 to 16	44	25.7%	111	64.9%	16	9.4%	171	100.0%	
	17 or more	5	12.2%	28	68.3%	8	19.5%	41	100.0%	
Fresno State GPA	Below B	34	33.0%	65	63.1%	4	3.9%	103	100.0%	0.000
	B	13	15.1%	58	67.4%	15	17.4%	86	100.0%	
	A	4	9.5%	27	64.3%	11	26.2%	42	100.0%	

Note: Statistical significance was tested with Chi-square.

Appendix C--Table 6 Written Competency Level by Writing Course Grade

		Grades in Writing Course					Total	
		A	B	C	D or F	No record		
Genre & Style Knowledge	Developing	20.0%	13.6%	12.9%	25.0%	23.0%	43	18.4%
	Competent	58.7%	72.9%	71.0%	50.0%	65.6%	153	65.4%
	Accomplished	21.3%	13.6%	16.1%	25.0%	11.5%	38	16.2%
Academic Conversation	Developing	30.7%	28.8%	35.5%	50.0%	31.1%	74	31.6%
	Competent	50.7%	61.0%	48.4%	50.0%	60.7%	130	55.6%
	Accomplished	18.7%	10.2%	16.1%		8.2%	30	12.8%
Rhetorical Knowledge	Developing	14.7%	16.9%	19.4%	25.0%	26.2%	45	19.2%
	Competent	64.0%	74.6%	71.0%	62.5%	63.9%	158	67.5%
	Accomplished	21.3%	8.5%	9.7%	12.5%	9.8%	31	13.2%
Assessment-Judgment Capacity	Developing	28.0%	27.1%	29.0%	25.0%	34.4%	69	29.5%
	Competent	52.0%	62.7%	58.1%	75.0%	54.1%	133	56.8%
	Accomplished	20.0%	10.2%	12.9%		11.5%	32	13.7%
Language Effectiveness	Developing	6.7%	22.0%	12.9%	25.0%	21.3%	37	15.8%
	Competent	70.7%	64.4%	71.0%	75.0%	67.2%	160	68.4%
	Accomplished	22.7%	13.6%	16.1%		11.5%	37	15.8%
Overall	Developing	22.7%	28.8%	35.5%	37.5%	32.8%	68	29.1%
	Competent	58.7%	62.7%	58.1%	62.5%	60.7%	141	60.3%
	Accomplished	18.7%	8.5%	6.5%		6.6%	25	10.7%
# of students		75	59	31	8	61	234	

Note: No statistically significant associations are found between grades and written competency level.