Western Michigan University

Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education

Volume 2
Issue 2 *Summer/Fall 2013*

Article 6

2013

Making the Most of Existing Resources: An Online Rubric Database in University-wide Writing Program Assessment

Jennifer M. Good
Auburn University at Montgomery, jgood@aum.edu

Kevin Osborne
Rockingham Community College

Making the Most of Existing Resources: An Online Rubric Database in University-wide Writing Program Assessment

Jennifer M. Good, Spring Hill College
Kevin Osborne, Rockingham (NC) Communitiy College

"Our ideas about writing and writing assessment are shifting constantly and never enjoy complete consensus" (Gallagher 34). This statement is particularly true for me as director of a writing across a curriculum (WAC) program at a university where I'm responsible for assessing our entire writing program for our institution while also teaching a writing-intensive class that makes me sympathetic to the classroom-based assessment needs of faculty. At the classroom level, writing assessment should provide a road map for improved instruction and student growth; at the institutional or school level, assessment should inform programmatic change and improvement. Nonetheless, these simple purposes seem in conflict with the inherent complexities of writing assessment. As a former secondary teacher, I realize this complexity is not unique to higher education; secondary school personnel feel this struggle as well. Secondary teachers and administrators seek ways to make their classroom writing assessment blend with high-stakes national testing on the writing achievement of their students.

To classroom teachers and university administrators alike, writing assessment is all of the following: "politics and pedagogy, burden and opportunity, threat and promise, weapon and tool" (Gallagher 30). Recognizing the challenges of writing assessment, I was determined to balance the intricacies of user-friendly and accessible writing assessment for our faculty at the classroom level with complex outcomes, analysis, and statistical reporting for senior staff at the institution. Because of my experience in the secondary schools, I recognize that this WAC program assessment, built upon writing assignments coming from multiple classes with ratings entered into affordable and ubiquitous software programs, could translate into most any educational setting, whether K-12 or university.

Although writing educators stress the importance of embedding evaluation of students' authentic writing samples—and a variety of samples—into overall assessment plans, often district and university administrators yield to easy, less expensive, and less intensive methods of evaluating writing. At my university, I am frequently asked by administrators to provide writing data that is quantitative and capable of comparing students at our institution with students at comparator institutions; this is a limiting perspective on writing assessment, particularly if I collect quantitative data that fails to align with assessments used by faculty teaching writing-intensive courses. Ochsner and Fowler believe that many universities do not evaluate program effectiveness based on the effectiveness of student writing, choosing instead to assess programs by frequency of writing and assignment length and type because of the ease of counting and tallying such measures. Condon contends that administrators often choose to evaluate writing programs through standardized testing only--without ever exploring growth through writing samples produced during instruction.

With the influx of accountability demands placed upon K-12 schools, the problem is exacerbated in that particular setting when compared to higher education. Creating a writing assessment system that will support both classroom instructors and administrators, whether in a K-12 setting or university, is a daunting task. I wanted to develop an assessment system that uses authentic student writing samples produced in writing-intensive classes, giving ownership of the classroom assessment to instructors, while also providing comparative data for the university administration, and I wanted to be sure that the internal and external data

supported and informed the system's ongoing development and reform, particularly in the area of validity. The complexity of skills necessary to produce good writing, combined with writing's developmental nature, make it difficult to create an assessment system that measures all nuances of growth (e.g., Yancey and Huot).

Recognizing that rubrics often have the potential to balance standardization with authentic performance assessment in the classroom, I decided to develop a rubric to support our assessment efforts for our entire university. Because rubrics "capture the essence of performance at various levels" (Spandel 19), they provide an assessment that informs instruction and individual writing growth within the classroom; simultaneously, they also can be analyzed numerically in aggregate to provide insight at the institutional or school level—across student grade or university classification, program area or subject, or course level. Rubrics offer a means of standardization that provides quantification of the success of achieving large-scale instructional writing objectives by using written samples produced by students in the classroom.

In spite of their benefits, however, assessment experts warn against the lack of technical merit that is yielded with this measurement tool. Wiggins argues that rubrics often ignore rhetorical purpose or audience in the evaluation of written products; instead, due to broad generalizations about definitions of good writing, he argued that rubrics limit the multi-contexts of authentic writing, suggesting that the validity of rubrics may be lacking. Similarly, McLeod, Brown, McDaniels, and Sledge caution that analytic rubrics used to evaluate writing should have the flexibility to accurately assess varying rhetorical modes, noting that definitions and criteria of effective writing may change depending on the purpose, focus, and context of the work. Realizing these weaknesses, I was determined to demonstrate that our rubric had sound psychometric properties, particularly validity, or the rubric's ability to measure accurately the writing skill or dimension of performance it claims to measure. In order to do that, I realized I needed multiple forms of assessment that could help validate our rubric.

In addition to questions about validity of rubrics, the actual data collection methods for collecting and evaluating writing can be cumbersome. Electronic portfolios can be used to support course content management in online environments, but more powerfully they "radically transform portfolios from a 'thing' to a process or processes" (Fitch et al. 38). E-portfolios are often touted as the best method for collecting numerous writing samples, assessable through the use of rubrics, yet even the advocates of e-portfolios recognize the abundance of obstacles that make their adoption difficult at the school or institutional level (e.g., Schaffhauser; Sicar et al.). Students and faculty note communication issues, training needs, and technology and interfacing mishaps with e-portfolios, while administrators feel the weight of system cost and training at the institutional level. Even the advertised purpose of e-portfolios varies. Unfortunately, based on the review of systems we completed at our institution, a "one size fits all" e-portfolio system doesn't exist. When considering this in tandem with the notion presented in a position paper on writing assessment presented by a special committee of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) emphasizing the importance of human raters, we realized that we needed to create an electronic method to collect quantitative data derived from our writing rubric, which allows for course-level faculty as the human raters who are aware of the writing assignments' purposes and the individual students' learning to enter ratings for later and deeper analysis.

Over two decades ago, Wansor supported the use of multiple measures in writing assessment. Currently, writing experts continue to emphasize the importance of rich assessment options; in a statement regarding best practices in writing evaluation, administrators from NCTE note that "assessment must include multiple measures and must be manageable." Our assessment system includes two unique types of measures: (a) final rubric ratings collected per each individual student, based on a semester of essays rated by course instructors and collected, akin to a portfolio, throughout instruction in the writing-intensive course; and (b) standardized tests, which provide data to rank our students against national norms for reporting at the institutional level, but more importantly, provide additional writing achievement data to help validate our rubric. Like universities, school systems are also often required to complete standardized testing. In our particular state, our secondary

students are required by our State Department of Education to complete ACT testing, which includes multiple choice writing skills and writing samples subtests. Although the rubric is the heart of our assessment system, the external standardized tests can be used to strengthen and validate the rubric. Making assessment manageable for classroom instructors and teachers while simultaneously providing university or system-wide administrators the information they require for accountability reporting remains complicated. Our model, which draws upon standardized and internal measures of writing achievement and collects the internal rubric data through common and existing technology that is affordable for schools and universities alike, is offered as a viable option for consideration.

Developing the WAC Rubric

Prior to the launching of our WAC program, I worked with the director of composition to make sure that any university-wide assessment measure of writing was in alignment with assessment tools used among her composition faculty. The director of composition had already developed a 5-point writing checklist for use in the first two courses of the composition series. Her checklist requires instructors to rate each individual piece of student writing per separate writing components of Focus, Content, Organization, Style, Conventions, and Writing Process on a scale of 1 (*Needs Work*) to 5 (*Far Exceed Expectations*). To begin exploring reliability of her checklist after a semester of using it in the composition program, she did the following: (a) gathered a group of faculty from various disciplines and academic programs; (b) selected a sample of student portfolios from both courses in the two-part composition series; (c) removed student identification from the samples; (d) mixed samples by student and semester of instruction and coded accordingly; and (e) asked faculty to rate using the composition checklist. Following this exercise, she asked faculty to respond to a survey that asked about clarity and ease of using the checklist.

Alignment of measurement tools is important. Thus, based on her findings (Woodworth et al.), I expanded her checklist into an analytic rubric for use in our content-area writing-intensive courses (See Appendix). While developing the rubric, I also pulled research and rubric samples from various books, authors, venues, and agencies, including but not limited to the following: (a) the Written Communication Value Rubric, developed by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU); the 6 + 1 Writing Traits Rubric (Education Northwest), used in many K-12 schools throughout the country; and (c) a variety of rubric samples provided by John Bean. The resulting product was an analytic rubric (aligning with the skills defined in our composition program's checklist) that has cell-based descriptors and indicators per each analytic dimension of writing, similar to AACU's rubric or the 6 + 1 Traits rubric. Unlike the AACU rubric, which uses a 4-point scale, or the 6 + 1 Traits rubric, which most often uses a 6-point scale, I decided to remain consistent with the 5-point scale that had been developed within our composition program. In addition, members of our WAC committee reviewed the rubric from a discipline-specific objective to assess the rubric's overall content validity, or their perspectives of how accurately the rubric reflected and measured all of our learning goals articulated in our writing program.

As we considered each analytic dimension of writing that would measure our program's goals and objectives, we recognized that writing assessments should provide the flexibility to be revised locally in order to align with specific purposes of the writing assignment (CCCC). For this reason, unlike the composition checklist, the specific indicators that define the first four writing dimensions (Focus, Content, Organization, and Syle), shaded in gray on the WAC rubric presented in the Appendix, have the flexibility to vary per discipline based on the nature of the written assignments. Although indicators may vary within cells, the five writing components being measured by our analytic rubric remain consistent across all of our writing and writing-intensive courses.

I encourage all writing and writing-intensive content instructors to use the WAC rubric to assess individual student writing samples during the semester of writing-intensive instruction. At the end of the semester, the instructors are able to consider all of the students' rubric scores from each writing sample in order

to determine and evaluate a *writer's* overall writing skills and ability. These data are entered online at the end of each academic semester of instruction per each writing dimension on the analytic rubric for every individual student in their courses. We did not adopt an e-Portfolio system within our assessment plan. Instead, if faculty from a given program or school choose to use an e-Portfolio platform that has already been selected or required by their administration, they can continue to use the system without having to duplicate work. Ultimately, with this model, individual writing is assessed by human raters, or course instructors, with final summative ratings per student per course entered quickly and easily into an online database.

To provide a means to explore the technical merit often lacking in rubrics as well as large-scale assessment while also satisfying the administration's need for quantitative data for benchmarking purposes for comparisons of writing skills of the students in this program against other students across the nation, we selected two writing subtests of the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP), published by American College Testing (ACT). The Writing Skills subtest, given at the completion of the two-course composition series, is a 72-item multiple-choice test measuring students' understanding of the conventions of standard written English. Subscores are provided for Usage/Mechanics and Rhetorical Skills. The CAAP Writing Skills subtest can be used to address criterion-related validity of our WAC rubric. The CAAP Writing Essay subtest, given at the completion of upper level content-area courses, is designed to demonstrate a student's level of proficiency in the writing dimensions commonly taught in college-level writing courses and required in upper-division college work. This particular standardized measure asks students to create two actual written products, as opposed to responding to multiple-choice questions regarding mechanics, usage, and rhetoric. External scorers contracted by ACT use a 6-point rubric to evaluate the writing samples. We recently gave the writing essay subtest to our students, and in an effort to consider the validity of our rubric on some of the higher order dimensions of writing (Focus, Content, and Organization), we are now at the beginning stages of an analysis that compares ACT's 6-point ratings with our 5-point ratings generated by using our WAC rubric. Using CAAP writing skills or writing sample subtests, the rubric ratings per student are validated bi-annually, and concurrent validity, or our rubric's ability to measure writing dimensions against another test taken at the same time, is established.

Capitalizing on Technology: Providing Flexibility Online

As noted earlier, many e-portfolio systems are often costly to either the students or the university or school when determining a large-scale data collection method. Two of the academic schools at our university, Education and Business, already used different online assessment portfolio systems. As WAC director, I didn't want to alienate one dean or school faculty by selecting one e-portfolio system over another; however, I knew that, in order to collect the data for analysis, we would need a home-grown system that was easy to use across the university and inexpensive. I also sought a system that would track all of our students over time and maintain all rubric data in a database for regular short-term analysis, such as annual reports presented to our department heads and senior staff, as well as more intensive longitudinal analysis and comparisons to other writing measures, presented to accrediting and state agencies when requested. For this reason, I teamed up with Kevin Osborne in the university's Office of Institutional Research (OIR), turning to him for his expertise in technology. Specifically, I asked him if data could be captured electronically and provided for all students taking writing-intensive courses, both composition and content-area, each semester, and based on the technology, if all data entered on a particular student could continue to build a student record of writing-intensive instruction and achievement over time, with the course and semester of the instruction designated per set of ratings. Kevin created an online database for data collection, using Microsoft products, which are used on most K-12 and university campuses, to collect ratings at the end of each course.

Kevin was highly aware of my need to manage the assessment data while also allowing faculty to easily access the system. For this reason, he began his creation of the technology to support our data collection with

a dynamic website using an ASP.NET web application framework. The .NET web pages were created using Microsoft Visual Studio, and the data are captured regularly within a Microsoft Access database. At this point in our program, the database has generated over 3300 rows of student data, enabling us to track course-to-course growth on hundreds of students through at least three of the 5-course series in the WAC program, and the Access software provided by MicroSoft has been robust enough to maintain all rubric data collected.

Each semester the database is updated using an Access Macro. The Access Macro runs two queries that populate the database for the current semester. The first query retrieves all writing-intensive courses, appropriate instructors teaching the courses, and student enrollment rosters from Banner, which is the student and course database system used by the university; these data are inserted into a *Courses* table. The writing-intensive courses are selected through the query by looking in Banner, our student database system, for all English 1010 and 1020 courses and all courses with a WI in the course section field. Using the *Courses* table, a user list is created for the current semester. This user list table is used to authorize which faculty members have access to the online rubric database during a specific term. Although the technology seems overwhelming from my standpoint and areas of expertise, Kevin assured me that the software programs he used are common technology that any member of an information technology (IT) office, whether at the university or K-12 system level, would be able to understand and recreate. Since first designing this online data collection system, he has been asked by other 2- and 4-year college writing program administrators to talk to their IT offices to discuss programming and compatibility.

Each semester, I run a user list from the Access database that Kevin created to email all faculty members who are teaching composition or writing-intensive courses for the semester. In the email, sent approximately one month before the end of the semester, I provide a specific log-in and password and ask writing-intensive instructors to complete an assessment for each student on their course roster. As noted earlier, the assessment is based on the student's overall skills, with individual written products and evaluations collected throughout the semester used as support of the final overall assessment, much like final grades for a portfolio. Once logged in, the web page displays a list of the current writing-intensive course the instructor is teaching. The faculty member selects a course, and a list of the enrolled students is displayed. A hyperlink, which reads *Assess*, is placed beside each student's name. The faculty member clicks the hyperlink, which redirects the instructor to a new webpage. On the new page, the instructor completes the rubric for each student on the roster. The rubric rating on the website provides the writing element and each of the single-word ratings (*Inadequate* to *Excellent*). I asked Kevin to not include the detailed descriptors per each cell of the rubric, as they are often modified to meet the discipline's needs or writing assignment purpose; however, a link to the WAC rubric template (displayed in the Appendix) is provided to allow the instructors access to the detailed definitions per writing element with one click of the mouse.

Once the rubric rating is completed, the instructor hits a *Submit* button, and the data are inserted into the *Data* table, the second table in the system. The system then queries the *Data* table to determine if a record already exists for the student. Although the WAC program is comprised of five total courses, each student has six available course section fields of data allocated in the database, on the chance that a student simply takes additional writing-intensive courses out of academic interest. If a student record already exists, then the newly-submitted data go into the next available fields. If not, then a new record is created for the student who has not had any prior data entries in the database. When writing this particular element of the query, a simple "If Then" statement was used.

Although I go into the database each semester to update the *Course* table changes, based on the query that is run, the *Data* table continues to grow from semester to semester. At any given time, I can pull up the existing database and check by name and student ID which writing-intensive courses have been completed by a student. In addition, this database allows me to analyze data by term, by instructor, by course sequence, by

student major, and by the department that houses the course. Like an online course grading system, both the courses that qualify as writing-intensive as well as the rosters of students within each course are automatically provided to the instructor, making it a simple method for instructors to navigate that requires little training on actual methods for data entry. In fact, the brief training necessary is provided in text through email. Other than an occasional moment of confusion about user id, no issues have been noted by faculty with the online system.

By using this web-based application and queries that are interfacing with the university's student database system, I am able to provide an analysis of internal data collected through courses for our writing initiative's assessment. By disaggregating data, which can also be done at the school level at the university or grade level in secondary schools, I have now started providing annual reports with tables of student achievement data to some of our schools for their own discipline-based accreditation requirements regularly. After an adequate number of years of program implementation, I can provide a longitudinal analysis that specifically tracks an individual student's progress through the entire WAC program course sequence can occur, and a group comparison of means, matched at the student level. The data belongs to our institution. We did not outsource this system to an external data collection or e-portfolio system. Rather, we maintained ownership of the system and data, allowing us to determine and select what data we want to analyze with this ever-growing database of rich information.

Validity: The First Semester of Data Collected Online

At the end of a spring semester of instruction, based upon multiple rubric ratings collected per each student during the semester and generated through individual writing sample evaluation, each writing and writing-intensive instructor entered a 1 (*Inadequate*) to 5 (*Excellent*) into the online database, rating each of the five writing components per student to assess the *student's overall ability* as a writer. The ratings of each of the five writing components were analyzed at the course sequence level, anticipating that students in the first course will yield lower mean ratings than their counterparts completing second, third, or fourth courses in the sequence. Although this isn't an exact measure of predictive validity, which truly pairs students' current performance with the same students' future performance, this provided a good indication that the rubric was sensitive to developmental growth. In other words, we would expect freshman in early classes to earn lower mean ratings in their first introductory composition course when compared to their counterparts completing the second course in the series. The data we collected and analyzed yielded exactly the expected results. Table 1 provides mean ratings per each of the writing components on the rubric for students in both the first and second course of the composition series as well as *F* values and significance levels, yielded when comparing means at the course sequence level per writing component. Students in the first of the two composition courses, English 1010, earned significantly lower mean ratings overall in every component of the WAC Rubric relative to the students in the second of the courses, English 1020.

Table 1: *Spring 2010 English 1010 and 1020 Writing Component Means*

Course	Focus	Content	Organization	Style	Language Conventions
ENGL 1010 (*n*=197)	3.13	3.16	3.23	3.12	3.12
ENGL 1020 (*n*=449)	3.55	3.53	3.55	3.49	3.53
F	15.17	11.96	9.13	11.84	13.85
p	.000	.001	.003	.001	.000

In order to consider concurrent validity, we expected that a correlation should exist between the Language Conventions component of the WAC rubric and the CAAP Writing Skills subtest, which measures writing skills in usage and mechanics as well as rhetoric; in other words, we were looking to see if a relationship existed between the same students' scores on the rubric and their CAAP scores, as an external benchmark test, during the same time period of instruction. The CAAP Writing Skills subtest was given to students in English 1020 toward the end of the semester of instruction--at approximately the same time the instructors were entering data into the WAC rubric online system. Because we claim to measure grammar, mechanics, and punctuation (language conventions) on the rubric and ACT also claims to measure the exact same elements on their CAAP writing skills subtest, we wouldn't expect to see a significant correlation for areas of focus, content, or organization. Five separate Pearson product-moment correlations were run between each of the writing components of the rubric and the composite scaled CAAP writing skills scores. Table 2 provides the correlations and the significance levels for these five bivariate Pearson correlations.

Table 2: *Correlations and Significance Levels for CAAP Writing Skills Subtests by Rubric Writing Component*

	Focus	Content	Organization	Style	Conventions
R	.105	.069	.103	.110	.139
P	.051	.202	.055	.041	.009

As noted in Table 2, the CAAP Writing Skills subtest scores correlated positively with all five of the components of the writing rubric; however, only the Language Conventions component correlated significantly with the CAAP Writing Skills subtest at the .01 alpha level, and the Style component correlated significantly with the CAAP Writing Skills subtest at the .05 alpha level. The correlation between the CAAP Writing Skills subtest scores and the WAC rubric scores for language conventions supports the concurrent validity of the WAC rubric on those specific analytic dimensions of style and conventions, yet at first glance the correlation with the style component is somewhat surprising. When considering, however, that the CAAP Writing Skills subtest measures not only mechanics but also usage and rhetoric, it would be understandable that a relationship between the style component and the CAAP Writing Skills subtest exists. In English 1020 students learn writing elements that are considered important to achieving effective style, such as an awareness of style guidelines as noted in MLA, use of active voice, and sentence combining strategies. These skills would be measured through both the style component of the WAC rubric as well as the Rhetoric subscore of the CAAP Writing Skills subtest. When considering that growth of skills should occur in students in their second semester of instruction and the skills measured by an external test correlate with those measured in the rubric, the WAC rubric scores generated during the first semester of data collection appear to be valid.

Future Considerations

We were determined to use technology to collect data generated through the use of our internal rubric per each writing or writing-intensive course that was easy and accessible to faculty while also meaningful and manageable for analysis. Creating an overall assessment system, drawing form standardized and internal rubric data, that tracks students' academic achievement in writing and considers multiple pieces of authentic writing within the appropriate context, while also meeting external accountability demands and remaining sound in terms of measurement theory, is difficult. Only through ongoing data collection can we truly consider the longitudinal impact of the data on enhancing writing skills and instruction. This program model, which makes the most of existing and available technology, attempts to meet these needs.

Writing is complex, as is writing assessment. Taking the technical complexities out of the assessment

by providing a user-friendly system through environments with which instructors have already interacted becomes imperative. If the data were not so easily available, the follow-up studies of concurrent validity, based on students' ACT CAAP scores, could not happen. The database of internal scores allows me to easily merge writing data with the external standardized test scores, providing opportunities for sophisticated analysis and tests of psychometric properties.

As noted, the online WAC rubric will continue to develop. For instance, as discipline-based writing-intensive instructors revise the specific definitions of the writing components of the WAC rubric (shaded in gray), the content-specific rubrics will be published to assist students and faculty in elevating their understanding of writing in their field. Each of these unique rubrics will need to be tested for bias, validity, and reliability over time. In addition, as the database grows each semester—potentially, at exponential rates during WAC program implementation and roll out—more comprehensive analysis can occur, offering authentic opportunities to engage in the cycle of continuous improvement at the student level, the course level, the program level and the institutional or school level. Considering these cyclical challenges presented by writing assessment theory has opened opportunities for further exploration and research. Making the methods of collecting the data to inform this research flexible, feasible, and affordable for a university community or school system has made this exploration a reality.

Works Cited

ACT. "Assessing Academic Growth for College and Career Readiness." Web. 20 Sep. 2012.

ACT. "Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency" Web. 28 Oct. 2010.

Association of American Colleges and Universities "Written Communication Value Rubric." Web. 20 Sep. 2012

Bean, John C. *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2001. Print.

Condon, William. "Accommodating Complexity: WAC Program Evaluation in the Age of Accountability." *WAC for the New Millennium: Strategies for Continuing Writing Across the Curriculum Programs* Eds. Miraglia, Eric, Margot Soven, Christopher Thaiss, and Susan McLeod. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 2001. 1-27. Print.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. "Writing Assessment: A Position Statement. Nov. 2006 Web. 14 Oct. 2010.

Education Northwest "6+1 Trait Rubrics (aka Scoring Guides)." Web. 20 Sep. 2012.

Fitch, Dale, Melissa Peet, Beth Glover Reed and Richard Tolman. (2008). "The Use of ePortfolios in Evaluating the Curriculum and Student learning." *Journal of Social Work Education* 2008: 37-54. Print.

Gallagher, Chris W. "What Do WPA's Need to Know about Writing Assessment? An Immodest Proposal." *Writing Program Administration: Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administration* 2009: 29-45. Print.

McLeod, Stephen G., Gavin C. Brown, Preselfanie W McDaniels, and Lawrence Sledge. "Improving Writing with a PAL: Harnessing the Power of Peer Assisted Learning with the Reader's Assessment Rubrics." *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* 2009: 488-502. Print.

National Council of Teachers of English Executive Committee "Framing Statements on Assessment." Nov. 2004. Web. 14 Oct. 2012.

Ochsner, Robert, and Judy Fowler. "Playing Devil's Advocate: Evaluating the literature of the WAC/WID Movement." *Review of Education Research* Summer 2004: 117-141. Print.

Schaffhauser, Dian. "Hurdling toward Campuswide e-Portfolios." *Campus Technology* 2010: 32-38. Print.

Sicar, Sumit, Ronald C. Fetzer, James Patterson, and Heidi McKee. "An Assessment of Electronic Portfolios across the Curriculum." *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching* 2009: 121-148. Print.

Spandel, Vicki A. "In Defense of Rubrics." *English Journal* 2006:19-22. Print.

Wansor, Collin T. "Assessing Writing Ability: What are the Issues?" Approaches? *NASSP Bulletin* 1986: 67-73. Print.

Wiggins, Grant P. "Real-world Writing: Making Audience and Purpose Matter." *English Journal* 2009: 29-37. Print.

Woodworth, Elizabeth, Kelly Birchfield, Susan Barganier, and Jennifer Good. "Launching Writing Across the Curriculum Program Evaluation through Rubric Development in Composition Courses." Mid-South Educational Researcher Association Paper Presentation. Baton Rouge, LA. Nov. 2009. Print.

Yancey, Kathleen, and Brian Huot. eds. (1997). *WAC Program Assessment*. Norwood: Ablex, 1997. Print.

About the Authors

Jennifer Good currently serves as the Associate Provost at Spring Hill College in Mobile, Alabama. Prior to that position, she also served as a faculty member in the School of Education and Director of Writing Across the Curriculum and Institutional Effectiveness at Auburn University at Montgomery. She has also held administrative positions at Auburn University, where she received a Ph.D.in Educational Psychology with a cognate in literacy studies, and the Citadel in Charleston, South Carolina. Before working in higher education, she taught high school English for eight years in schools in Chandler, Arizona and Virginia Beach, Virgina. ***Kevin Osborne*** currently serves as the Director of Institutional Research and Planning at Rockingham Community College in North Carolina. Kevin received his B.S. from the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and his M.B.A. at Auburn University at Montgomery (AUM). After completing his degree at AUM, Kevin served in various positions for the university, including Director of Institutional Research and Senior Database Analyst in Institutional Effectiveness. Kevin continues to hone his interests and skills in accreditation and assessment, and he is beginning the pursuit of his doctoral degree.

Student-Teachers' Comments' Type on Children's Writing: Practices and Perceptions of their Role as Writing Facilitators

Esther Sayag- Cohen, Merav Asaf, and Nurit Nathan
Kaye Academic College of Education (Israel)

Introduction

Literacy programs in teacher education play a dual role: improving students' academic literacy level, and preparing them for their role as writing facilitators. Several courses and activities aim at improving the level of academic writing (language courses, academic writing courses and reading and writing assignments). However, little is done to prepare the student-teachers in non-language programs for their role as future writing facilitators (Dempsey, PytlikZillig & Bruning, 2009; Hill, Bronwen, Gilmore & Smith, 2010). Although, students continuously engage in writing activities, most do not engage in comprehensive processes of teaching writing with children (Moore, 2000). Consequently, Bainbridge & Macy (2008) find that many student-teachers are deeply concerned about their ability to assess literacy learning, even though they were exposed to several assessment tools throughout their studies. In addition, many teacher educators do not provide a positive role model for writing teachers since they are busy struggling balancing time and content limitations with the demands of providing effective and ongoing feedback to multiple students (Dempsey, PytlikZillig & Bruning, 2009). We are therefore interested in examining how student-teachers write and perceive the provision of feedback on school-students compositions in the final stages of their learning.

Writing Feedback

Writing Feedback on school-students compositions is the main activity use by non- language teachers to improve writing. This activity is based on student-teachers' experiences as writers and their perceptions about their role and about writing processes (Lee, 2009). Writing feedback relates to different aspects of the composition: syntax, lexical variety, register, text structure and ideas. It is commonly provided in the form of comments differed in their rhetorical style: pose questions, request clarifications, correct or suggest corrections (Auten, 1991; Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener, & Knoch, 2009). Comments can be local (relating to the specific words, sentences, and suggesting specific corrections), or conclusive, serving as summative or global comments. The purpose of feedback is to improve writing but even more so, its aim is to motivate writers to express their ideas through extended writing processes (Lam & Law 2007). Teachers' feedback on their students' written products reflect their perception regarding the writing process (Auten, 1991; Connors & Lunsford, 1993) and their choice of feedback type tunes their students' writing process and their motivation towards writing (Biggs, 1988; Connors & Lunsford, 1993; Hounsell, 1997).

Three major types of teachers' feedback practices are reported in the literature: editing (direct–corrective), formative (indirect-corrective) and dialogical which characterized by different comment types but moreover are a manifestation of the teachers' perspectives of the writing processes:

Editing Direct-Corrective Feedback. This feedback is characterized by taking control of the text and revising various aspects, correcting spelling mistakes, rephrasing sentences, adding informational details or ideas, etc. Teachers frequently adopt this technique by using imperative sentences (Sugita, 2006), presenting critical attitudes towards lexical decisions, syntax, structure and ideas (Kasanga, 2004). Direct comments imply that teachers perceive writing as a short-term activity, which seeks to correct a specific text rather than develop writing strategies (Lee, 2003). Nevertheless, studies find that college students prefer this directive, explicit