Summary WAC Assessment

The Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program is designed to convert all state recognized Gordon Rule (GR) classes to a more rigorous set of university-supported guidelines. This conversion process began in the summer of 2004 and piqued in 2007 when the program was officially instituted. About 6 new courses have been certified each year following the initial push except for 2011-12 (7 in 2009-2910 and 6in 2010-2011. Course conversions spiked in 2011-2012 When the Honors College converted the remainder of their Gordon Rule courses (25) to comply with the WAC program.

In 2006, the Faculty Senate voted to require all faculty who taught WAC courses to receive training. Training peaked in 2007 with 80 faculty (the year that the program was officially implemented), and has plateaued over the past three years to about 23 a year (24 in 2010, 22 in 2011, and 17 in 2012: Note that the WAC Director was on sabbatical in Fall 2011, was on sick leave for the summer of 2012, and has not yet led the fall workshops, which accounts for lower numbers in 2012). Detailed data is available on the WAC website at [www.fau.edu/wad](http://www.fau.edu/wad) under WAC Assessment.

The number of WAC courses taught each term has remained relatively consistent since the official start of the WAC program, growing to match the growth in student enrollments. A summary chart is provided below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **School Year** | **Fall** | **Spring** | **Summer** | **Total** |  |
|  | **2009 - 2010** | 268 | 239 | 70 | **577** |  |
|  | **2010 - 2011** | 274 | 258 | 74 | **606** |  |
|  | **2011 - 2012** | 317 | 296 | 70 | **683** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Since 2007 when faculty workshops were offered fall, spring, and summer, fewer additional workshops and presentations have been provided. Each year presentations are also made during the History and English TA training seminars. Presentations are also offered to campus tour guide training seminars and the athletic support center staff most years. Fall 2010 one bag lunch discussion was held. There were none in 2011 and three in Spring 2012

The WAC Committee meets about seven times a school year. All minutes are available on the WAC website.

Each year two or three WAC Departmental Curriculum Development grants are awarded to faculty teams from specific departments: 2 were awarded in 2010, 3 in 2011, and 2 in 2012. All grants are available on the WAC website.

WAC syllabi are recertified on a three year rotating cycle. English 2010; history and philosophy 2011, and all other WAC courses will be recertified 2012.Faculty are asked to submit syllabi for each unique WAC course they teach, not for every section. On average about a third of the syllabi reviewed need additional information based on our published WAC guidelines for 1000 level courses and 2000-4000 level course.

Every year since 2008, a random stratified sample of WAC classes have been selected in which students have been asked to complete surveys and submit samples of their work for the WAC assessment process. A twelve trait analytical rubric using a four point scale is used to norm and rate the collected papers. The data from 2008-2010 was processed during our first full WAC norming and rating process. Because of interface glitches, norming mistakes, and missing data, this first full year of the assessment did not provide reliable data. We do not have interrater reliability for that year either. Therefore, we did not analyze that data. About 325 papers were rated in 2010-2011. The only statistically significant results from 2010-2011 were that papers from upper division courses outperformed papers from the lower division. First year writing first term scores were not statistically distinct from second semester College Writing once the data was adjusted for the effects of course grade. .Students with higher grades get higher trait scores regardless of whether they are in 1101 or 1102. Correlation between the course grade and the trait scores on the rubric range from a high of .284 for trait 10 (mechanics) to a low of .13 for traits 2 and 3.  Correlations are uniformly low, as we would expect with the restricted range of the rubric scores. Differences between ENC 1101 and 1102 were tested on each individual trait score (not shown).  The differences washed out on most of the trait scores when taking into account SAT scores, high school GPA and course grade.  Only trait 7 (“Academic Tone”) still showed a statistically significant difference between the two courses in the presence of other predictors. Tthe same kind of analysis comparing ENC 1101, ENC 1102, were performed on LIT courses, NUR courses, SOW 3302, COM 1930 and PHI 2010.  Nursing had the highest total trait scores on the rubric before adjusting for other student characteristics. Adjusting for course grade, number of credit hours earned, overall GPA, and whether the student began as an FTIC or transfer student predict over half of the variance in total trait scores.  The only significant predictors were the course itself, and the grade in the course.  The pairwise comparisons confirmed that nursing and social work produce the highest overall trait scores. Differences on individual trait scores (not shown on the output) were tested. Differences among courses were found still to exist except for trait 6 (“Implications and consequences”), where the students’ overall GPA was the sole predictor. Finally, interrater reliability was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for each rater and then for papers where there was agreement. Most paper rating systems use two raters and a third when there is disagreement. The outlying scores are removed so that only two scores are ever reported for interrater reliability. We have three raters rate each paper. Understandably, agreement is substantially lower with three raters across 12 traits on a four point scale. Adjusting for modes (two same scores and one outlier) and averages (when three scores are all different but adjacent 2,3,4 or 1,2,3) reveals much higher rates of reliability. Furthermore, most writing assessment scores are considered reliable even if they are one point away (e.g. 2/3, 3/4). All charts described above are available on the WAC website. We are still waiting for final results from the 2012 WAC assessment process.