Learning Outcomes Assessment in Fundamental Studies Writing Courses

Dr. Scott Wible

Associate Professor, Department of English

Director, Professional Writing Program

swible@umd.edu

Fundamental Studies Requirements

"Fundamental Studies courses ensure that students have the basic skills in written and oral communication, in mathematical analysis, and in critical thinking that are important to their success across the curriculum and in their professional lives."

A. Mathematics
B. Analytic Reasoning
C. Oral Communication
D. Academic Writing
E. Professional Writing

A Guiding Metaphor for Academic Writing: "The Unending Conversation"

"Imagine that you enter a parlor. You come late. When you arrive, others have long preceded you, and they are engaged in a heated discussion, a discussion too heated for them to pause and tell you exactly what it is about. In fact, the discussion had already begun long before any of them got there, so that no one present is qualified to retrace for you all the steps that had gone before. You listen for a while, until you decide that you have caught the tenor of the argument; then you put in your oar. Someone answers; you answer him; another comes to your defense; another aligns himself against you, to either the embarrassment or gratification of your opponent, depending upon the quality of your ally's assistance. However, the discussion is interminable. The hour grows late, you must depart. And you do depart, with the discussion still vigorously in progress."

Kenneth Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Form*, 1941

Fundamental Studies Academic Writing

Prepares students with a foundational understanding of the writing skills needed for success in further studies at Maryland and beyond.

On completion of an Academic Writing course, students will be able to:

A.   Demonstrate understanding of writing as a series of tasks, including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing appropriate sources, and as a process that involves composing, editing, and revising.

B.   Demonstrate critical reading and analytical skills, including understanding an argument's major assertions and assumptions and how to evaluate its supporting evidence.

C.   Demonstrate facility with the fundamentals of persuasion as these are adapted to a variety of special situations and audiences in academic writing.

D.   Demonstrate research skills, integrate their own ideas with those of others, and apply the conventions of attribution and citation correctly.

E.   Use Standard Written English and edit and revise their own writing for appropriateness. Students should take responsibility for such features as format, syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

F.   Demonstrate an understanding of the connection between writing and thinking and use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating in an academic setting.

Typical Sequence of FSAW Writing Projects

1. Academic Summary
2. Annotated Bibliography
3. Inquiry Essay
4. Rhetorical Analysis
5. Digital Forum
6. Position Paper
7. Revision and Reflection

A Guiding Principle for Professional Writing: Genre as Social Action

"A rhetorically sound definition of genre must be centered not on the substance or the form of discourse but on the action it is used to accomplish. . . . We understand genres as typified rhetorical actions based in recurrent situations. . . ."

"We cannot just learn a pattern of forms or even a method of achieving our own ends, but rather we must learn the variety of possible ends, an understanding of the situation, potentials for failures and successes. . . . [F]or the student, genres serve as keys to understanding how to participate in the actions of a community."

Carolyn R. Miller, "Genre as Social Action," 1984

Fundamental Studies Professional Writing

Science Writing (ENGL 390)

Argumentation/Advanced Composition (ENGL 391)

Legal Writing (ENGL 392)

Technical Writing (ENGL 393)

Business Writing (ENGL 394)

Writing for the Health Professions (ENGL 395)

Special Topics in Professional Writing (ENGL 398)

    Writing about the Arts (ENGL 398A)

    Writing for Social Entrepreneurship (ENGL 398B)

    Writing Case Studies and Investigative Reports (ENGL 398C)

    Writing about Economics (ENGL 398E)

    Scholarly Writing in the Humanities (ENGL 398L)

    Writing for Nonprofits (ENGL 398N)

    Nonfiction Narrative Writing and Editing (ENGL 398R)

    Writing about the Environment (ENGL 398V)

Fundamental Studies Professional Writing

Strengthens writing skills and prepares students for the range of writing expected of them after graduation.

On completion of a Professional Writing course, students will be able to:

A.   Analyze a variety of professional rhetorical situations and produce appropriate texts in response.

B.   Understand the stages required to produce competent, professional writing through planning, drafting, revising, and editing.

C.   Identify and implement the appropriate research methods for each writing task.

D.   Practice the ethical use of sources and the conventions of citation appropriate to each genre.

E.   Write for the intended readers of a text, and design or adapt texts to audiences who may differ in their familiarity with the subject matter.

F.   Demonstrate competence in Standard Written English, including grammar, sentence and paragraph structure, coherence, and document design (including the use of the visual) and be able to use this knowledge to revise texts.

G.   Produce cogent arguments that identify arguable issues, reflect the degree of available evidence, and take account of counter arguments.

Typical Sequence of Linked FSPW Assignments

Project #1: Situation analysis

Project #2: Causal analysis

Project #3: Evaluation paper

Project #4: Proposal: Print

Project #5: Proposal: Oral

Project #1: Topic Proposal

Project #2: Stakeholder & client analysis

Project #3: Inquiry Project
(Feasibility Study, Recommendation Report, Report for Decision Making)

Project #4: Proposal: Print

Project #5: Proposal: Oral

GENERAL EDUCATION @UMD

ABOUT | REQUIREMENTS | I-SERIES | FOR STUDENTS | FOR ADVISORS | FOR FACULTY | POLICIES

FOR FACULTY

Proposing/Reviewing a General Education or I-Series Course

Assessment Rubrics

Learning Outcomes

Faculty Board Members

Gen Ed Workshops

Role of Faculty Boards

Faculty and the General Education Program

University of Maryland faculty members created and will continue to own the General Education program, which was launched in fall 2012. Faculty members teach the courses, propose and develop new courses, revise old courses, serve on department and college Programs, Courses, and Curricula committees, and, as members of the General Education Faculty Boards, take overall responsibility for the quality of General Education. They also serve on the Senate General Education Committee.

Faculty Boards are appointed by the Dean for Undergraduate Studies in consultation with the college deans. Faculty Board membership is primarily but not exclusively tenured/tenure-track faculty members. All colleges with undergraduate students are represented on these boards. Deans regularly review their College representation.

Faculty Boards evaluate proposals for new and existing courses for suitability in the General

Academic Writing

This rubric is designed as a tool to assess activities aimed at student gains in the follow learning outcome(s) for the Academic Writing General Education Category:

At the completion of this course, students will be able to:

- *Demonstrate facility with the fundamentals of persuasion, especially as they are adapted to a variety of special situations and audiences in academic writing.*

Criterion for review of student work	Descriptions of levels of student performance			
	Advanced	**Proficient**	**Beginning**	**Unacceptable**
Thesis	Writer composes specific and ambitious thesis that articulates a complex argument, sets out the purpose of the essay, and has the potential to contribute to a scholarly conversation.	Writer composes a clear and specific thesis that articulates a viable argument and indicates the purpose of the essay. The thesis engages a scholarly conversation.	Writer composes a thesis, but the thesis may be weak in terms of specificity and clarity of argument, articulation of purpose, or viability. While the thesis may identify a scholarly conversation, it does not successfully engage or contribute to the intended conversation.	Writer's thesis is difficult to discern, posits a very basic or unarguable claim, and/or does not engage a scholarly conversation.
Exigence	Writer clearly establishes the value and urgency of the issue and explains why readers should attend to the issue by showing awareness and building upon an existing conversation. Writer also establishes the exigence and importance of his/her argument.	Writer supplies reasons for exigence of issue and argument, but these reasons may not be wholly persuasive. The writer demonstrates why the exigence of the issue matters for the identified conversation.	Writer gestures at the exigence of the issue and his/her argument, but reasons for exigence for argument and issue are flawed or not fully developed. The writer may not connect the exigence to the conversation, or the connections may be faulty.	There is little to no articulation of exigence for issue or argument.

Criterion for review of student work	Descriptions of levels of student performance			
	Advanced	**Proficient**	**Beginning**	**Unacceptable**
Supporting Arguments	Writer systematically, logically, and thoroughly advances the thesis through effective and appropriate lines of reasoning. All supporting claims are valid and arranged in a logical manner. The writer responds to counterarguments thoughtfully and effectively.	Writer provides sufficient, well-reasoned support for his/her thesis. Most of the supporting claims are valid and logically arranged. The writer addresses and/or responds to counterarguments.	Writer attempts to support thesis. The arrangement strategy may be confusing to the reader or the writer may not successfully connect ideas in a logical manner. Writer may provide oversimplified or "straw man" representations of counterarguments.	Writer's supporting arguments are off topic, illogical, and/or do not offer support to the thesis of the essay. Writer may not articulate or respond to counterarguments or may provide unfair representations of counterarguments. Writer's arrangement strategy may be critically flawed.
Audience	Writer consistently and persuasively tailors the argument to the expectations of an academic audience through tone and prose style, arguments and supporting claims, as well as logical, ethical, and emotional appeals.	For the majority of the essay, the writer tailors argument to the expectations of an academic audience through tone and prose style, arguments and supporting claims, as well as logical, ethical, and emotional appeals.	Writer attempts to meet the expectations of an academic audience through prose style, appeals, or stylistic concerns, but this attempt is not wholly successful due to appropriateness of execution.	Writer does not meet the expectations of an academic audience. The essay's tone, prose style, and/or rhetorical appeals may be ineffective or inappropriate for the intended audience.

Criterion for review of student work	Descriptions of levels of student performance			
	Advanced	**Proficient**	**Beginning**	**Unacceptable**
Source Quality	The writer consistently integrates a rich variety of high quality and scholarly research relevant to his/her argument. The writer exceeds the audience's expectations for relevant sources.	Writer employs research that is credible and relevant to his/her argument. The writer meets the audience's expectations for appropriate sources.	Writer draws on sources that are not consistently relevant or credible. Few of these sources are scholarly. The writer may misunderstand the audience's expectations for research, drawing on inappropriate sources or ignoring important sources.	Writer rarely integrates research into his/her essay, and/or when the writer does integrate sources, they are not relevant, credible, or scholarly. The writer fails to meet the audience's expectations for relevant and appropriate sources.
Source Use	Writer effectively and expertly integrates research into the argument by means of attribution, summarizing, quoting, or paraphrasing. Writer thoroughly analyzes research and offers meaningful and persuasive explanations of how it relates to his/her argument.	The writer judiciously integrates research into the argument by means of attribution, summarizing, quoting, or paraphrasing. Writer analyzes research and explains how it relates to his/her argument.	The writer integrates research into his or her essay but his/her attempts at attribution, summarizing, quoting, or paraphrasing are sometimes flawed. Writer may include quotations with no framing language when integrating source material. The connections between the research and the writer's argument may be missing or tenuous.	The writer's attempts at summarizing, quoting, or paraphrasing are frequently flawed. Writer may not attribute sources or frame quotations. The writer may not make connections between the research and his/her argument.
Citation	The writer expertly cites sources, both citing them correctly within the text and using correct conventions throughout the works cited list.	The writer cites sources in text and throughout the works cited list. There may be minor errors in MLA citation.	The writer attempts to cite all sources in text and throughout the works cited list, but there may be major errors in MLA citation.	The writer makes no attempt to cite sources, or the writer may attempt to cite sources, but there is no evident pattern or style for citations.

Academic Writing – Inquiry

At the completion of this course, students will be able to:

Demonstrate an understanding of the connection between writing and thinking and use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating in an academic setting.

Criterion for review of student work	Descriptions of levels of student performance			
	Advanced	**Proficient**	**Beginning**	**Unacceptable**
Guiding Question/ Statement of Inquiry	The writer crafts an insightful, complex, and open-ended question that guides an inquiry and opens a field of scholarly conversation. The question can be explicit or implicit.	The writer crafts an open-ended question that initiates a scholarly conversation and leads to related inquiry. The question can be explicit or implicit.	The writer crafts a question that may be easily answered or may not lead to productive inquiry. The question can be explicit or implicit.	There is no question, either explicit or implicit.
Exigence	The writer effectively and persuasively establishes the urgency and importance of the topic and inquiry in the opening paragraphs. The writer employs multiple strategies to cultivate exigence throughout the entire essay.	The writer establishes the urgency and importance of the topic and inquiry in the opening paragraphs. The writer cultivates exigence at one or two other points in the essay.	The writer gestures at the exigence of the issue but the reasons for the issue's exigence are insufficient or unpersuasive.	There is little to no articulation of exigence for the topic or the line of inquiry.

Criterion for review of student work	Descriptions of levels of student performance			
	Advanced	Proficient	Beginning	Unacceptable
Inquisitive Stance	The writer pursues the guiding question throughout the essay by resisting argument and closure, thoughtfully deepening the chosen audience's understanding of the issue. The writer engages in the process of inquiry through nuanced, accurate, and unbiased portrayals of varied aspects of the issue.	The writer pursues the guiding question through resisting argument and closure. The writer offers accurate and unbiased portrayals of varied aspects of the issue for most of the essay.	The writer attempts to address the guiding question throughout the essay but is not entirely successful. The writer might slip into argument or offer somewhat biased or shallow portrayals of the issue.	The writer does not address the guiding question throughout the essay. The writer takes a position or exhibits either strong bias or an inaccurate portrayal of the perspectives within the issue.
Using Research to Forward Inquiry	The writer effectively and expertly synthesizes convincing evidence pulled from a rich variety of scholarly and popular sources relating to the topic. The writer effectively connects sources in order to identify or create a conversation that engages the guiding question and propels the inquiry forward in interesting and original ways.	The writer synthesizes evidence pulled from a number of scholarly and popular sources relating to the topic. The writer connects sources in order to identify or create a conversation that engages the guiding question and propels the inquiry forward.	The writer includes several sources. However, the sources used may offer similar or one-sided perspectives relating to the topic, or the engagement with sources may be shallow. The writer attempts to connect sources to a conversation or to the guiding question.	The writer may consult sources that are problematic because of bias, a lack of evidentiary proof, or outdated data. The writer does not engage the research in an open-ended way.

Professional Writing

Each General Education category is grounded in a set of learning outcomes. For the full set of learning outcomes for Professional Writing courses see: www.gened.umd.edu

This rubric is designed as a tool to assess activities aimed at student gains in the follow learning outcome(s) for the Professional Writing General Education Category:

At the completion of this course, students will be able to:
- *Write for the intended readers of a text, and design or adapt texts to audiences who may differ in their familiarity with the subject matter.*
- *Produce cogent arguments that identify arguable issues, reflect the degree of available evidence, and take account of counterarguments.*

Criterion for review of student work	Descriptions of levels of student performance			
	Advanced	**Proficient**	**Beginning**	**Unacceptable**
PURPOSE Articulates the purpose of the document, one that is appropriate for the rhetorical situation (i.e., relationship between the writer; topic; audience; genre; and broader social, academic, or professional context).	The writer clearly articulates the purpose of the document. The writer persuasively establishes the reasons for writing for this purpose, about this specific topic, for this specific audience, and at this specific time and place.	The writer explains the purpose of the document, although perhaps not as clearly as possible. The writer presents several good—but perhaps not the most compelling—reasons for writing for this specific purpose, about this specific topic, for this specific audience, and at this specific time and place.	The writer attempts to explain the purpose of the document, but that purpose is difficult to determine. The writer provides reasons, but not the most logical or persuasive reasons, for writing about this topic, for this audience, and at this time and place.	The writer makes little or no attempt to explain the purpose of the document. The writer provides few, if any, persuasive reasons for writing about this topic, for this audience, and at this time and place.
AUDIENCE Identifies an appropriate audience for the topic and the document. Anticipates and responds to the values, needs, and expectations of the audience.	The writer targets an appropriate audience for the document, given both the writer's and the audience's standing in relation to the topic and to one another. The writer also identifies logical secondary audiences. The writer effectively adapts the content, structure, and language of the document to these intended audiences.	The writer targets an appropriate audience for the document. The writer adapts most elements of the document to the primary audience but does not include a key supporting reason; provide an explanation; or use types of language the audience would value, need, or expect. The writer makes some effort to address a secondary audience.	The writer targets an audience for the document but demonstrates a limited understanding or awareness of the audience's values, needs, and expectations. The writer attempts to anticipate and respond to these perceived values, needs and expectations of the audience but does not succeed in several different ways. The writer may identify a secondary audience but does not work to address it.	The writer targets an audience for the document that is inappropriate, given the writer's and the audience's standing in relation to the topic and/or to one another. The writer targets no secondary audience. The content, arrangement, and style of the document reflect the interests of the writer, not the audience.

Criterion for review of student work	Descriptions of levels of student performance			
	Advanced	**Proficient**	**Beginning**	**Unacceptable**
GENRE Uses conventions of the genre, such as **content** (e.g., general or discipline-specific types of evidence and reasoning); **arrangement** (e.g., format, structure, document design); and **style** (e.g., voice, tone, sentence complexity) to meet the demands of the rhetorical situation.	The writer adapts the conventions of the genre to meet the demands of a specific rhetorical situation. Every part of the document works toward the end of achieving the writer's purpose.	The writer meets the audience expectations for the conventions of the genre, but the writer misses potential opportunities to adapt the genre conventions to meet the unique demands of the rhetorical situation. Most, but not all, rhetorical elements of the genre work toward the writer's purpose for the document.	The writer follows standard conventions for the genre but does not attempt to adapt the genre conventions for the unique demands of the rhetorical situation. Several elements of the document do not work in support of the writer's purpose for the document.	The writer fails to use standard conventions of the genre and does not attempt to write for a specific rhetorical situation. Most elements of the document undermine the writer's expressed or apparent purpose for the document.
ARGUMENT Identifies an arguable issue or problem. Presents a clear, logical, persuasive argument in response to the issue or problem.	The writer clearly and persuasively articulates the major argument of document. The argument presents a substantive, original response to the unique rhetorical situation. The writer presents logical, persuasive reasons to support this argument.	The writer clearly articulates the major argument of the document. The argument represents a substantive response to the arguable issue, although the argument does not directly respond to every aspect of the unique rhetorical situation. The writer presents logical reasons to support this argument.	The writer attempts to present the major argument of the document, but the specific argument is difficult to determine. The argument presents a predictable response to the rhetorical situation. The writer presents supporting reasons for the argument, but they are neither persuasive reasons nor clearly explained and fully developed.	The writer attempts to make an argument in the document, but the writer presents few, if any, supporting claims and makes little or no attempt to persuade the audience.

Criterion for review of student work	Descriptions of levels of student performance			
	Advanced	**Proficient**	**Beginning**	**Unacceptable**
EVIDENCE Supports the argument using concrete, relevant, accurate, and sufficient evidence. Analyzes the evidence and explains its relevance to the major argument and supporting reasons.	The writer clearly supports the argument with accurate evidence that the audience would consider credible. The writer provides sufficient details to support the main points of the argument. The writer uses a variety of appropriate sources, both primary and/or secondary.	The writer provides many details to support the argument but does not fully elaborate on each one or make each one sufficiently specific. The writer provides some evidence that the audience will not find relevant for the argument.	The writer provides some supporting evidence but does not fully explain the evidence. Some evidence is not relevant to the argument, or the audience will not find it credible or convincing. The writer does not include important content that the audience would have expected the writer to address.	The writer provides little or no data or logical reasoning to support the main ideas of the argument. Much of the writer's data is inaccurate, outdated, or irrelevant.
COUNTERARGUMENTS Anticipates and responds to arguments that various stakeholders would likely make about the writer's major argument, supporting reasons, and evidence.	The writer anticipates questions or objections about the argument that stakeholders would likely want to or need to see addressed. The writer addresses those counterarguments in a clear, convincing way through logical reasoning, presentation and analysis of additional evidence, or qualification of the argument.	The writer anticipates the most important questions or objections that stakeholders would likely pose to the writer, although some additional related concerns might not be addressed. The writer attempts to address these counterarguments in a clear, convincing way, succeeding in most but not all of these attempts.	The writer mentions counterarguments but does not explain them in a clear, even-handed way. The writer makes superficial attempts to address these counterarguments.	The writer makes no attempt to anticipate or engage counterarguments.

Professional Writing - Planning

OFFICE OF
UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

Each General Education category is grounded in a set of learning outcomes. For the full set of learning outcomes for Professional Writing courses see: www.gened.umd.edu

This rubric is designed as a tool to assess activities aimed at student gains in the follow learning outcome(s) for the Professional Writing General Education Category:

At the completion of this course, students will be able to:
- *Understand the stages required to produce competent, professional writing through planning, drafting, revising, and editing.*

Criterion for review of student work	Descriptions of levels of student performance			
	Advanced	**Proficient**	**Beginning**	**Unacceptable**
PLANNING Analyzes the topic and rhetorical situation. Composes a plan for developing the document. Demonstrates knowledge of necessary steps to complete assignment.	Addresses key issues (such as audience, genre, and research plan) that relate to the rhetorical situation in a substantive way. Develops an effective plan that builds on the analysis of the topic and rhetorical situation.	Addresses most key issues in a substantive way. Develops a plan that builds on the analysis of the topic and rhetorical situation. Sufficiently develops ideas for initial draft that fit stated purpose of document.	Addresses most if not all of the key issues, but not in any depth. Seems unaware of some key steps necessary for the project. Generates some ideas for initial draft, but these ideas may be only loosely connected to the rhetorical situation.	Does not address all key issues. Does not develop a plan that demonstrates sufficient knowledge of steps necessary to complete document. Fails to generate ideas to create draft or generates ideas that aren't relevant to document.
DRAFTING Completes steps noted in initial plan. Produces a full draft that responds to the analysis. Completes the draft on schedule.	Draft is fully developed. The plan is addressed in full and adapted as needed. All aspects of the plan, as well as outstanding concerns, are addressed in a substantive way.	Produces a complete draft. Draft is fully developed in most parts. Most aspects of the plan are addressed in a substantive way.	Produces a partial draft, with some key pieces or sections undeveloped. Certain aspects of the plan are unaddressed.	Draft is not created or is poorly executed. Draft demonstrates little if any connection to the plan or assignment.
REVISING Builds on and responds to both outside feedback and writer's own analysis to make effective changes to the document.	Document is revised in a sophisticated manner that responds to feedback on the draft in complex, original ways and effectively addresses any deficiencies in draft.	Document responds to feedback, but not all changes are as effective as possible. Responds to peer, instructor, or own feedback in a substantive way.	Document demonstrates attempts to respond to feedback but not in ways that work toward the goals of the document or that is based on substantive reflection on the outside feedback or one's own review of the text.	Document changed in superficial manner that fails to make changes necessary for it to effectively achieve its purpose. Ignores feedback. Does not appear to recognize the deficiencies of the initial draft.

January 9, 18

Criterion for review of student work	Descriptions of levels of student performance			
	Advanced	**Proficient**	**Beginning**	**Unacceptable**
EDITING Revisits the document as necessary to create sentences that are clear, correct, and at the appropriate level of complexity for the audience. Makes effective adjustments to visuals and document design, if necessary.	Document has been polished. Sentences are correct, appropriately complex, and clear for the audience. Consistent voices throughout. Any necessary changes have been made to create an effective document design.	Document has been revisited. Sentences have been changed to clarify and adjust to the appropriate level of complexity. Some language errors remain. Document design is mostly effective.	Many sentences could be made more clear for the audience. The level of sentence complexity was not adjusted for the audience. Many language errors remain. Problems in document design were not adjusted.	Leaves many sentences unclear and unnecessarily complicated or simplistic. The voice is left inconsistent throughout the text. Significant language errors remain. Document design is ineffective throughout the text.
REFLECTING Describes and analyzes the key decisions made during the planning, drafting, revising, and editing process. Analyzes the strengths and weaknesses of the text and the process used to develop the text. Identifies writing skills developed or enhanced.	The reflective writing is clearly connected to the revisions; offers detail and thoughtful analysis of writer's progress through the process; provides reasons for key decisions that are grounded in the developing analysis of the topic and the rhetorical situation; discusses specific writing skills developed.	Reflection is connected to the revision. Talks about most major decisions in detail and how those decisions relate to the writer's goals. Much of the analysis is in depth, but may lack sufficient detail on a couple of key points. May note some development of writing skills, but does not discuss in depth.	Attempts to discuss revisions but may focus on small sentence-level issues or fails to adequately connect to the actual revisions. May note some overall writing goals or skills but fails to clearly connect those to this writing process.	Does not discuss major decisions made during the drafting and revising process. Makes little to no reference to the text. Does not discuss overall writing goals or skills in relation to this assignment.

Using Writing within Learning Outcomes Assessment

1. Expand and refine learning outcomes into a teachable, measurable definition.

UMD Professional Writing Rubric

This rubric will be used to assess activities aimed at student gains in the following learning outcome for the General Education Fundamental Studies Professional Writing requirement.

At the completion of this course, students will be able to
- Understand the stages required to produce competent, professional writing through planning, drafting, revising, and editing.

CRITERION	ADVANCED	PROFICIENT	BEGINNING	UNACCEPTABLE
Planning Analyzes the topic and rhetorical situation. Composes a plan for developing the document. Demonstrates knowledge of necessary steps to complete assignment	Addresses key issues (such as audience, genre, and research plan) that relate to the rhetorical situation in a substantive way. Develops an effective plan that builds on the analysis of the topic and rhetorical situation.	Addresses most key issues in a substantive way. Develops a-plan that builds on the analysis of the topic and rhetorical situation Sufficiently develops ideas for initial draft that fit stated purpose of document.	Addresses most if not all of the key issues, but not in any depth. Seems unaware of some key steps necessary for the project. Generates some ideas for initial draft, but these ideas may be only loosely connected to the rhetorical situation.	Does not address all key issues. Does not develop a plan that demonstrates sufficient knowledge of steps necessary to complete document. Fails to generate ideas to create draft or generates ideas that aren't relevant to document.
Drafting Completes steps noted in initial plan. Produces a full draft that responds to the analysis. Completes the draft on schedule	Draft is fully developed The plan is addressed in full and adapted as needed. All aspects of the plan, as well as outstanding concerns, are addressed in a substantive way.	Produces a complete draft. Draft is fully developed in most parts Most aspects of the plan are addressed in a substantive way.	Produces a partial draft, with some key pieces or sections undeveloped. Certain aspects of the plan are unaddressed.	Draft is not created or is poorly executed. Draft demonstrates little if any connection to the plan or assignment.

Revising Builds on and responds to both outside feedback and writer's own analysis to make effective changes to the document.	Document is revised in a sophisticated manner that responds to feedback on the draft in complex, original ways and effectively addresses any deficiencies in draft.	Document responds to feedback, but not all changes are as effective as possible. Responds to peer, instructor, or own feedback in a substantive way.	Document demonstrates attempts to respond to feedback but not in ways that work toward the goals of the document or that is based on substantive reflection on the outside feedback or one's own review of the text.	Document changed in superficial manner that fails to make changes necessary for it to effectively achieve its purpose. Ignores feedback. Does not appear to recognize the deficiencies of the initial draft.
Editing Revisits the document as necessary to create sentences that are clear, correct, and at the appropriate level of complexity for the audience. Makes effective adjustments to visuals and document design, if necessary.	Document has been polished. Sentences are correct, appropriately complex, and clear for the audience. Consistent voices throughout. Any necessary changes have been made to create an effective document design.	Document has been revisited. Sentences have been been changed to clarify and adjust to the appropriate level of complexity. Some language errors remain. Document design is mostly effective.	Many sentences could be made more clear for the audience. The level of sentence complexity was not adjusted for the audience. Many language errors remain. Problems in document design were not adjusted.	Leaves many sentences unclear and unnecessarily complicated or simplistic. The voice is left inconsistent throughout the text. Significant language errors remain. Document design is ineffective throughout the text.
Reflecting Describes and analyzes the key decisions made during the planning, drafting, revising, and editing process. Analyzes the strengths and weaknesses of the text and the process used to develop the text. Identifies writing skills developed or enhanced.	The reflective writing is clearly connected to the revisions; offers detail and thoughtful analysis of writer's progress through the process; provides reasons for key decisions that are grounded in the developing analysis of the topic and the rhetorical situation; discusses specific writing skills developed.	Reflection is connected to the revision. Talks about most major decisions in detail and how those decisions relate to the writer's goals. Much of the analysis is in depth, but may lack sufficient detail on a couple of key points. May note some development of writing skills, but does not discuss in depth.	Attempts to discuss revisions but may focus on small sentence-level issues or fails to adequately connect to the actual revisions. May note some overall writing goals or skills but fails to clearly connect those to this writing process.	Does not discuss major decisions made during the drafting and revising process. Makes little to no reference to the text. Does not discuss overall writing goals or skills in relation to this assignment.

Using Writing within Learning Outcomes Assessment

3. Identify data (i.e., type of student performance) appropriate for assessing the outcome.

4. Determine logistical procedures for collecting and assessing data.
   - Specific data to be collected (which papers or presentations are to be collected from which classes)
   - When the data will be collected
   - Sampling technique used

Using Writing within Learning Outcomes Assessment

5. Generate an assessment rubric (set of criteria) based on the outcome to be assessed.

6. Pilot rubric with appropriate evaluators in order to identify any problems with it, and revise accordingly.

7. Apply rubric in real assessment of student performance, including, where appropriate, proper training for evaluators.

8. Ask evaluators to discuss the results of the assessment and come to a collective judgement as to the degree to which the program in enables students to achieve the outcome, then write and submit the assessment report.

UMD Professional Writing Rubric

This rubric will be used to assess activities aimed at student gains in the following learning outcome for the General Education Fundamental Studies Professional Writing requirement.

At the completion of this course, students will be able to

- Understand the stages required to produce competent, professional writing through planning, drafting, revising, and editing.

CRITERION	ADVANCED	PROFICIENT	BEGINNING	UNACCEPTABLE
Planning Analyzes the topic and rhetorical situation. Composes a plan for developing the document. Demonstrates knowledge of necessary steps to complete assignment	Addresses key issues (such as audience, genre, and research plan) that relate to the rhetorical situation in a substantive way. Develops an effective plan that builds on the analysis of the topic and rhetorical situation.	Addresses most key issues in a substantive way. Develops a plan that builds on the analysis of the topic and rhetorical situation Sufficiently develops ideas for initial draft that fit stated purpose of document.	Addresses most if not all of the key issues, but not in any depth. Seems unaware of some key steps necessary for the project. Generates some ideas for initial draft, but these ideas may be only loosely connected to the rhetorical situation.	Does not address all key issues. Does not develop a plan that demonstrates sufficient knowledge of steps necessary to complete document. Fails to generate ideas to create draft or generates ideas that aren't relevant to document.
Drafting Completes steps noted in initial plan. Produces a full draft that responds to the analysis. Completes the draft on schedule	Draft is fully developed The plan is addressed in full and adapted as needed. All aspects of the plan, as well as outstanding concerns, are addressed in a substantive way.	Produces a complete draft. Draft is fully developed in most parts Most aspects of the plan are addressed in a substantive way.	Produces a partial draft, with some key pieces or sections undeveloped. Certain aspects of the plan are unaddressed.	Draft is not created or is poorly executed. Draft demonstrates little if any connection to the plan or assignment.

Revising Builds on and responds to both outside feedback and writer's own analysis to make effective changes to the document.	Document is revised in a sophisticated manner that responds to feedback on the draft in complex, original ways and effectively addresses any deficiencies in draft.	Document responds to feedback, but not all changes are as effective as possible. Responds to peer, instructor, or own feedback in a substantive way.	Document demonstrates attempts to respond to feedback but not in ways that work toward the goals of the document or that is based on substantive reflection on the outside feedback or one's own review of the text.	Document changed in superficial manner that fails to make changes necessary for it to effectively achieve its purpose. Ignores feedback. Does not appear to recognize the deficiencies of the initial draft.
Editing Revisits the document as necessary to create sentences that are clear, correct, and at the appropriate level of complexity for the audience. Makes effective adjustments to visuals and document design, if necessary.	Document has been polished. Sentences are correct, appropriately complex, and clear for the audience. Consistent voices throughout. Any necessary changes have been made to create an effective document design.	Document has been revisited. Sentences have been been changed to clarify and adjust to the appropriate level of complexity. Some language errors remain. Document design is mostly effective.	Many sentences could be made more clear for the audience. The level of sentence complexity was not adjusted for the audience. Many language errors remain. Problems in document design were not adjusted.	Leaves many sentences unclear and unnecessarily complicated or simplistic. The voice is left inconsistent throughout the text. Significant language errors remain. Document design is ineffective throughout the text.
Reflecting Describes and analyzes the key decisions made during the planning, drafting, revising, and editing process. Analyzes the strengths and weaknesses of the text and the process used to develop the text. Identifies writing skills developed or enhanced.	The reflective writing is clearly connected to the revisions; offers detail and thoughtful analysis of writer's progress through the process; provides reasons for key decisions that are grounded in the developing analysis of the topic and the rhetorical situation; discusses specific writing skills developed.	Reflection is connected to the revision. Talks about most major decisions in detail and how those decisions relate to the writer's goals. Much of the analysis is in depth, but may lack sufficient detail on a couple of key points. May note some development of writing skills, but does not discuss in depth.	Attempts to discuss revisions but may focus on small sentence-level issues or fails to adequately connect to the actual revisions. May note some overall writing goals or skills but fails to clearly connect those to this writing process.	Does not discuss major decisions made during the drafting and revising process. Makes little to no reference to the text. Does not discuss overall writing goals or skills in relation to this assignment.

Morning Reflective Writing Questions (11:45am—12:00pm)

Since you have just finished reading and assessing student work, please spend the next 15 minutes writing in response to these questions about our assessment process. You can either write your responses on the handout and submit them to the PWP Main Office or compose them in our online SurveyMonkey form: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/J23LFPN

1. Describe the type of assignment/project you were reading, and comment on how well this particular type of assignment allows you to assess student achievement of this learning outcome?

2. Comment on the student materials that you read this morning.

   a. What types of materials (prewriting, drafts, peer feedback, teacher feedback, final drafts, reflective memos) were most useful for you in assessing student achievement of this learning outcome, and why?

   b. What types of materials were less useful, and why?

3. Comment on the rubric itself. What aspects of the criteria and/or the descriptive language seem to be particularly useful in assessing student achievement of this learning outcome? What revisions, if any, would you recommend for the rubric criteria and/or descriptive language?

Composite Assessment Results

Criterion	Total Scores	Average Score (out of 3)	Advanced (Score: 3)	Proficient (Score: 2)	Beginning (Score: 1)	Unacceptable (Score: 0)
Planning	111	1.78	19% 21 students	47% 52 students	26% 31 students	7% 7 students
Drafting	114	2.01	23% 26 students	56% 66 students	20% 21 students	1% 1 student
Revising	112	1.78	20% 22 students	47% 54 students	26% 28 students	8% 8 students
Editing	113	1.82	17% 20 students	52% 58 students	28% 32 students	3% 3 students
Reflecting	112	1.77	24% 27 students	37% 43 students	31% 34 students	8% 8 students

Afternoon Discussion Section, Part 1

Freewriting (1:00pm—1:15pm)

Please spend the first 10-15 minutes reflecting on and analyzing the assessment results. You can write either on the back of the handout or online: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/JJZJZ6P

A. What surprises you? Why is it surprising?

B. What doesn't surprise you, and why isn't it surprising?

C. What do these results help you to understand about student achievement of these learning outcomes? What do these results prompt you to reflect on about student work and student learning in PWP courses?

Afternoon Discussion Section, Part 2

Large-Group Discussion (1:15pm—1:45pm)

    A.   What do you think might account for these results (both the surprising and unsurprising results)?

    B.   What do our students do well, and how can we build on that?

    C.   What do our students struggle with (in terms of this learning outcome)? What aspects of our courses / our projects / student activity in completing those projects do we need to think about improving?

Afternoon Discussion Section, Part 3

Small-Group Discussion of Pedagogical Implications (1:45pm—2:30pm)

NOTE: Each small group should have 1 notetaker who sends her or his materials to Scott Wible (swible@umd.edu or dropped off in PWP main office).

    A.   What aspects of teaching toward this learning outcome might we need to think about implementing program-wide?

    B.   What aspects of teaching toward this learning outcome should be open to instructor variation and/or to course/discipline variation?

    C.   In short, what should the PWP approach to teaching this learning outcome look like?

Afternoon Discussion Section, Part 4

Large-Group Discussion of Pedagogical Implications (2:30pm—3:00pm)

    A.   What aspects of teaching toward this learning outcome might we need to think about implementing program-wide?

    B.   What aspects of teaching toward this learning outcome should be open to instructor variation and/or to course/discipline variation?

    C.   In short, what should the PWP approach to teaching this learning outcome look like?

Using Writing Projects For Programmatic Learning Outcomes Assessment

Disciplines are not simply a specific body of knowledge

    (Michael Carter: "knowing that")

Disciplines are active ways of knowing-–the habits of mind and the recurring activities of the disciplinary community

    (Michael Carter: "knowing how")

" Typified responses to recurrent rhetorical situations" (Carolyn Miller)

"Ways of knowing and doing in the disciplines" (Michael Carter)

Problem Solving Disciplines

Disciplinary Ways of Knowing	Examples of Disciplines	Typical Writing Genres
identify, define, and analyze problems	accounting	business plan
	agricultural economics	feasibility report
find and evaluate necessary information	animal and avian science	management plan
apply basic disciplinary theories to design solutions	business management	marketing plan
	engineering	report to management
evaluate solutions	nutrition and food science	project report
	forestry management	project proposal
create arguments to support best solutions	mathematics	technical memoranda
		technical report

A. James Clark School of Engineering

Department of Aerospace Engineering

Bachelor's - Aerospace Engineering

a. Ability to apply knowledge of mathematics

b. Ability to apply knowledge of basic science (chemistry, physics)

c. Ability to apply knowledge of engineering principles

d. Ability to use computers to solve engineering problems

e. Ability to identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems

f. Ability to design and conduct experiments

g. Ability to analyze and interpret data

h. Ability to design a component, system, or process to meet desired needs under realistic constraints

i. Ability to use the techniques, skills, and tools of modern engineering practice

j. Ability to write effectively

k. Ability to speak effectively

l. Ability to function effectively as part of a multidisciplinary team

m. Understanding of professional and ethical responsibility

n. Knowledge of contemporary issues in engineering

o. Understanding of the impact of engineering solutions in a global, societal, environmental, and economic context

p. Awareness of the need to continually upgrade one's technical knowledge base and skills, and the ability to do so

Robert H. Smith School of Business

Bachelor's - Operations Management

a. Students will be able to demonstrate a clear understanding of important concepts and methodologies in the core business disciplines and in the specific fields of Operation Management.

b. **Students will demonstrate critical reasoning and written communication skills through the individual analysis and write-up of a business case.**

c. Students will demonstrate their oral communication skills by presenting an analysis of a business case to their class.

d. Students will demonstrate their leadership skills by leading a class discussion or a group project on a business case.

e. Students will demonstrate their abilities to work effectively with other members of a team in the preparation of a group project.

Empirical Inquiry-Based Disciplines

Disciplinary Ways of Knowing	Examples of Disciplines	Typical Writing Genres
identify important research questions	anthropology	laboratory reports
	biology	poster
identify relevant existing theories	chemistry	poster presentation
create hypotheses	geology	research proposal
test hypotheses using appropriate methods to gather, analyze, and explain empirical data	microbiology	research report
	political science	scientific article
	psychology	scientific presentation
	public policy	
	sociology	

Department of Psychology

Bachelor's - Psychology

- **Research Methods: Understand and apply basic research methods in psychology, including research design, data analysis, and interpretation. Formulate testable hypotheses. Select and apply appropriate methods. Collect, analyze, interpret, and report data using appropriate statistical strategies. Recognize limitations in applicability of results.** Demonstrate technological competency and information literacy related to research methods.

- Critical Thinking: Use creative and critical thinking to solve problems related to the behavior and mental processes. Use critical thinking effectively. Engage in critical thinking. **Use reasoning to recognize, develop, defend, and criticize arguments and other persuasive appeals.**

- Communication: **Communicate effectively in a variety of formats. Demonstrate effective writing skills.** Demonstrate effective oral communication skills, if applicable. Demonstrate interpersonal skills.

- Content: Demonstrate familiarity with the questions that gave rise to content knowledge, a sampling of the major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends in psychology.

Disciplines that Research
Primary and Secondary Sources

Disciplinary Ways of Knowing	Examples of Disciplines	Typical Writing Genres
compose significant research question	history	historical narrative from sources
locate relevant primary and secondary sources	literature	literary criticism
	philosophy	research paper
evaluate and analyze sources	religious studies	research project
use sources to compose an argument that answers the research question	women's and gender studies	

College of Arts and Humanities

Department of History

Bachelor's - History

a. Students will be able to distinguish among a variety of genres of primary and secondary historical texts (e.g. documents, monographs, letters, novels, film, political cartoons, essays) and use them appropriately and effectively in academic work.

b. Students will demonstrate the ability to conduct research using primary and secondary sources including archival, print and non-print, and web-based texts.

c. **Students will demonstrate the ability to define and defend a historical thesis.**

College of Arts and Humanities

Department of Art History and Archaeology

Bachelor's - Art History and Archaeology

a. Students demonstrate knowledge of a large set of artistic monuments, objects, and performances in the history of art and in specific periods and/or cultures and place the visual arts in cultural historical, political, and/or social contexts

b. **Students communicate effectively about art in writing, applying complex forms of analysis in essay-length papers using clear and concise prose**

c. Students employ the appropriate technologies for conducting research in the history of art, including print sources and/or electronic information

d. Students communicate effectively in oral presentations using visual media (i.e., PowerPoint presentation)

e. Students recognize the methods and theories used to ask and address significant questions about works of art, and understand the values informing them

f. Students demonstrate skills in visual analysis by identifying specific formal elements and understanding the interaction of these elements

g. Students demonstrate critical analysis skills and sensitivity to diversity in comparing works of art across time, geography, and/or culture

Performance-Oriented Disciplines

Disciplinary Ways of Knowing	Examples of Disciplines	Typical Writing Genres

learning critical issues and standards that guide performance
 	
learning to perform in ways that reflect an understanding of these issues and standards
	architecture
	
	art and design
	
	graphic design
	
	industrial design
	
	landscape architecture
	
	music, dance, and theater
	
	language, writing, & rhetoric
	
	journalism
		portfolio of artifacts
		
		    Artifacts take on added importance:
		    Drawings
		    Sculptures
		    Paintings
		    Multimedia
		    Written texts in journalism or rhetoric
		
		artist's statement
		
		the critique

College of Arts and Humanities

School of Theatre, Dance and Performance Studies

Bachelor's - Dance

Students will:

a. Perform dance movement with clarity, expressivity, and a sense of personal style.

b. **Speak and write from the perspective of dance participant, observer, and creator, with depth and perspective.**

c. Demonstrate choreographic invention and innovative vision, and utilize a variety of forms of choreography.

Using Writing within Learning Outcomes Assessment

Disciplines are active ways of knowing-–the habits of mind and the recurring activities of the disciplinary community

  (Michael Carter: "knowing how")

1. Identify writing-related learning outcomes as well as outcomes where students demonstrate "active ways of knowing" through writing.

  B.S. in Aerospace Engineering

   • Ability to design and conduct experiments
   • Ability to analyze and interpret data

Using Writing within Learning Outcomes Assessment

2. Expand and refine those learning outcomes into a teachable, measurable definition:

To demonstrate that graduates have an ability to design and conduct experiments as well as analyze and interpret data, they should be able to:

- Take an experimental problem and develop a hypothesis, define the pertinent dependent and independent variables, and establish a sound experimental method that will allow them to measure the variables and test the hypothesis;

- Conduct an experimental procedure, use laboratory materials properly and safely, carefully note observations in a laboratory notebook, and describe the procedure clearly for others;

- Measure and record raw experimental data and analyze those data for the purposes of understanding and explaining the data. Graduates should be able to represent data in both verbal and visual forms (equations, tables, graphs, figures, etc.) in a way that is both an accurate and an honest reflection of the data.

- Render the data meaningful by discussing the data in the context of the hypothesis and appropriate theories and principles and by stating, clearly and concisely, conclusions that can be drawn from the experiment.

Using Writing within Learning Outcomes Assessment

3. Identify data (i.e., type of student performance) appropriate for assessing the outcome.

4. Determine logistical procedures for collecting and assessing data.
  - Specific data to be collected (which papers or presentations are to be collected from which classes)
  - When the data will be collected
  - Sampling technique used

Using Writing within Learning Outcomes Assessment

5. Generate an assessment rubric (set of criteria) based on the outcome to be assessed.

6. Pilot rubric with appropriate evaluators in order to identify any problems with it, and revise accordingly.

7. Apply rubric in real assessment of student performance, including, where appropriate, proper training for evaluators.

8. Ask evaluators to discuss the results of the assessment and come to a collective judgement as to the degree to which the program in enables students to achieve the outcome, then write and submit the assessment report.

Clarifying Questions?

Emerging Connections?

Challenging Situations?

Learning Outcomes Assessment in Fundamental Studies Writing Courses

Dr. Scott Wible

Associate Professor, Department of English

Director, Professional Writing Program

swible@umd.edu