Introduction and Follow-up on Last Year’s Assessment

The Developmental English SAC is in the midst of comprehensive changes to its sequence, curriculum, and pedagogy. These changes began several years ago when the SAC attempted to convert all DE courses from three to four credits. Though the four-credit conversion was successful only for RD 115, the SAC continued to work to address problems in the sequence by linking existing courses and piloting experimental courses. In response to the 2012 Program Review, the administration convened a DE Task Force in 2013 to study national DE program models and make recommendations for DE program redesign at PCC.

Finding an appropriate approach to program assessment has been challenging during this period when DE has been working toward sweeping changes to the course sequence. In general, the Assessment Committee has aimed for assessments that can inform the redesign process while also yielding valuable information about current practices and providing professional development opportunities to faculty. During our previous assessment of Communication and Critical Thinking and Problem Solving in WR 90, we developed a process for assessing writing. While our results supported the general direction of the DE program redesign (integration of reading and writing) and provided a basis for discussion of thesis and use of outside texts in developmental writing, substantive response to assessment results will necessarily be postponed until a new sequence of DE classes is developed. We hope that some assessment findings and the assessments themselves will play a role in the development of the redesigned DE program.

Because this year the Deans of Instruction tasked our group with working on alignment in cooperation with the Composition and Literature Assessment Committee, we are reporting outside of the regular LAC reporting structure. However, we believe this year’s assessment could be useful for future Core Outcomes Assessments.

Project Overview and Goals

This was an exploratory year in which we aimed to build a shared vision of RD 115 and lay the groundwork for future assessment of course outcomes and Core Outcomes in this class. Our project had two parts, the Collection of Significant Assignments (COSA, See Appendix 1) and the Course Embedded Reading Assessment (CERA, See Appendix 2). The COSA component was developed in cooperation with the Composition and Literature Assessment Committee, and it allowed us to collect a broad range of assignments given in RD 115. Since the Comp-Lit Assessment Committee was collecting its own set of COSAs for WR 115, using the COSA in this
year’s assessment gave us an opportunity to identify potential points of alignment (and misalignment) between RD and WR 115.

The CERA, an assessment developed by Reading Apprenticeship, allowed us to pilot a potential approach to assessing reading, an approach that aligns especially well with the Self Reflection Core Outcome. Though the SAC has undertaken piecemeal work on reading instruction in the past, we have not had a chance to develop a coherent and shared philosophy of reading instruction. The CERA was undertaken to open an ongoing discussion of reading instruction by investigating a potential reading assessment tool.

Perhaps most importantly, both parts of this year’s project helped us identify our current practices in reading assessment, articulate our current values when it comes to reading instruction, and uncover questions central to the effective instruction of successful reading practice. With a firmer sense of what constitutes reading instruction and assessment—a sense that is based on student work rather than our guesses and intuitions—the assessment committee can help guide the SAC toward a common understanding of reading instruction, from which authentic assessments can emerge.

Procedure

Collection

For the COSA, we randomly identified four sections of RD 115 on each campus and asked instructors to assemble their significant assignments from the class along with three pieces of student work (of high, low, and medium quality. For each COSA, instructors were asked to indicate which Course Outcomes were being assessed, and they were given space to explain what they thought was valuable about the assignment.

There were 29 face-to-face sections of RD 115 taught during Winter 2015; however, because any instructor might teach multiple sections, we actually requested COSAs from 16 out of 21 instructors teaching face-to-face classes. Twelve of the sixteen instructors submitted COSAs: four from Southeast, four from Sylvania, two from Rock Creek, and two from Cascade. In some cases, instructors declined to submit COSAS, while in other cases instructors did not follow through.

For the CERA, we invited all reading instructors to administer the assessment at the beginning and at the end of their reading courses (see instructions, Appendix 2B). Participation was voluntary. We collected CERAs from 16 sections of RD 115 and 6 sections of RD 90. A full accounting of the Collected CERAs is available in Appendix 2C. CERAs arrived from across the district from full-time and part-time instructors. In the future, if we were using the CERA as a Core Outcomes assessment, we would take steps to achieve a random and representative
sample, but since our main purpose this year was piloting the assessment, a random and representative sample was not our primary concern.

**Processing**

**COSA**

After the committee reviewed the COSAs, we assembled reading instructors from across the district for Reading 115 Day. Small groups read COSAs and used a modified version of the Critical Friends “Making Meaning” protocol (see Appendix 1B) to discuss what they observed in each COSA, what questions each COSA raised, and the emerging implications of each COSA. During this protocol, a facilitator took notes, and the notes were later collated into a list of course-relevant observations and questions.

In order to discuss the RD 115 COSAs alongside the WR 115 COSAs, a committee member counted assignment types present in the both RD and WR 115 COSAs and generated a Venn diagram from these rough counts in order to show potential areas of overlap and significant disconnects between the courses. The DE and Comp-Lit assessment committees then met to discuss alignment and potential recommendations for the integrated sections.

**CERA**

On Reading 115 Day, we spent the morning norming, using, and discussing the CERA and its rubric. With 12 participants, we normed by scoring two CERA artifacts and coming to near-consensus on both. We then used the rubric to score 14 CERA artifacts, with each artifact being scored by two raters. Scores in each of the rubric’s 17 categories were entered into a Google form. We then reassembled as a large group and generated a list of questions and comments about the CERA. Using the CERA data collected in the Google form, we later calculated inter-rater reliability for each of the rubric categories, including the overall category.

**Inclusion**

This year’s project included full-time and part-time instructors from across the district at each phase of the project. In the planning phase, six full-time and four part-time instructors from all four campuses met regularly throughout the academic year to conceive and execute this year’s project. On Reading 115 Day (May 8, 2015), 11 full-time and 10 part-time instructors from all four campuses assembled to read and discuss COSAs and pilot and discuss CERAs.
Findings

**COSA**

What did we as a committee notice about the COSAs after quickly reading through all of them?

- Most included an information literacy assignment
- Lots of summary, summary-response, and evaluation
- Varying approaches to vocabulary (in context and out of context)
- Varying expectations of attribution (some require MLA, others require informal attribution)

What did we observe in the COSAs as a larger group using the Critical Friends “Making Meaning” Protocol?

- Scaffolding/de-mystifying reading: breaking up a large assignment into steps or stages; clarity of rationale for each stage and how it relates to a larger task; clear and transparent grading criteria; “step-by-step-ness.”
- Requirement of various kinds of work in service of a larger inquiry (e.g., discussion, paper, lexicon, journal, creative response); “many types of intelligences have the chance to succeed.”
- Thematic readings that encourage students to explore multiple perspectives on a relevant topic.
- Requirement of writing: grading criteria may be writing criteria.
- Requirement of metacognitive work: students’ awareness of learning as a process, research as a process, reading as a process; students use of literacy concepts and vocabulary to describe their own reading; students’ awareness of reading purposes; students’ “recursive self-reflection” throughout the term.
- Requirement of student ownership/direction: student-selected texts, student-directed research.
- Many of our assignments are already integrating reading and writing.
- More guidance is needed for people teaching this course (e.g., there should be a central repository of assignments/texts/shared D2L shell for F-2-F classes).
- There’s a broad spectrum of student investment in RD 115.

What are some course-relevant questions that we generated as a larger group using the Critical Friends “Making Meaning” Protocol?
What should be the expectations for citation in RD 115?
What is the role of literature/literary study in RD 115?
Should RD 115 be aligned with FYC? Or areas outside the writing sequence? If we see RD 115 as a “kitchen sink” to prepare students for the reading tasks they will encounter in a variety of settings, how do we reverse-design the course?
Should the focus of RD 115 be critical reading and thinking (as it seems to be now)? What’s the role of pleasure reading? Can this be taught?
To what extent is the essay an appropriate tool to assess reading?
What assignments are we already doing that lend themselves to integration of RD-WR?
Is RD 115 over-focused on the research process at the expense of critical, close reading?
How and why should we be assessing students’ participation in the course?
What is a sustainable amount of work (for students and instructors) in RD 115?

What did we learn in conversation with Comp-Lit about potential alignment and disconnect between Reading and Writing 115?

(For an expanded version of this diagram, definitions, and data tables, see Appendix 1C)
• “Metacognition”: We see a consistent emphasis in both SACs on students’ meta-awareness of reading and writing as a process and as socially constructed activities. In terms of integrated courses, this could mean infusing genre-awareness throughout both Reading and Writing curricula.

• “Response”: Responding to a text is a significant area of overlap. Summary, however, is more common on the RD 115 side, even though many WR 115 instructors assign “Summary-Response” papers. Clarifying how we teach summary and response, or representation and interpretation, seems essential in an integrated curriculum.

• “Information Literacy”: Treatment of information literacy appears to be a significant gap. All RD 115 courses are expected to involve an Information Literacy Project. However, WR 115 is ambiguous in terms of the expectations for Information Literacy. Clarifying the parameters and expectations of a “115 Research Paper” will help the integrated pilots. Aligning these expectations with the “121 Research Paper” seems essential in order to effectively “reverse design” what we do in 115 and below.

What did we learn in conversation with Comp-Lit about potential recommendations for integrated sections?

Integrated sections might include

• Process-based approaches to reading and writing.
• Genre awareness as an important concept in reading and writing.
• Inquiry-based writing curricula at the 115 level (e.g., Bruce Ballenger-type approaches).
• Engagement with Reading Apprenticeship as a framework for metacognitive conversations about reading process.
• If not common assignments, then at least a common element—like identifying the targeted course outcome(s) of an assignment—on all assignment sheets.

**CERA**

The CERA generated important questions from those who participated in Reading 115 day, questions that suggest changes we might make to the rubric, text selection, and/or instructions if we were to use the CERA for future assessment:

**CERA Questions—Inspired by RD 115 Day**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERA Administration Process &amp; Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Are results skewed by how we each present instructions (e.g. Do we tell students to write on the text?)  
| • How we score may also depend on what we know of the student.  
| • Context of when this was taken (early/late in term, etc.) impacts evaluation.  
| • If CERA is the tool we use to pre & post, we need to be explicit that we’re assessing annotation. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How the CERA Informs Reading Instruction/ Supports DE SAC Aligning Reading Pedagogy (Suggests direction for on-going PD in the service of integrated RD/WR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • What do we think effective reading looks like/ consists of and how would we/ are we assessing it?  
| • Not seeing anything at all = useful info as a teacher (re: Teacher gathers useful info.)  
| • Might need to have a conversation with a student – tells me “I need to ask more questions of student”  
| • If student sees their CERA “scores” – what use could they make of it?  
| • Why do we annotate? What do we each teach is purpose of it? When does a reader do it and why?  
| • Want to see how other colleges use CERA to show student growth and growth in what? Process or comprehension?  
| • CERA would be useful to be on the same page/develop common language  
|  
| o As an optional tool, but needs revision/ clarity - make a pre & post version.  
| • RA would need to be more widely used/ learned or offer |
more variation in rubric.

- As we head to integration...
  - What’s the artifact we want to assess?
  - What’s the relationship between RD & WR
  - What’s the role of annotation in trying to get at what we’re “doing: in an integ. Course.

- Annotations maybe are like their brainstorming before writing?
- Maybe do an annotation conference with students?
  - Then students could use simpler rubric to assess each other’s annotation.
  - As a means to help them improve annotations
  - What if for 1\textsuperscript{st} or 2\textsuperscript{nd} conference, student brings in a reading with their annotations & spends time discussing what they’ve done in annotations, why...

- Small group/pair feedback about partners’ response to a text.
  - Is annotation the artifact or just a process? YES
    - Topic to discuss with SAC
    - What are different ways for students to find their own ways into text...?
  - How important is annotation to us as instructors to assess as an outcome of effective reading?
  - Comes down to learning style and maybe also our own (instructors’) experience...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERA Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Overview should come at the end. Almost consensus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The “overview” should be 2 parts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If student has no annotations, but “spot on” CERA responses, hard to choose level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The varying format of CERA questions impacts responses and the level of score – (the more detailed instructions and headings, give guidance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rubric doesn’t include an option: “student doesn’t understand what a summary is”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rubric language assumes students are “off track”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**What did we learn about inter-rater reliability for this assessment?**

Despite our norming process, the “Overall” category had 57% inter-rater reliability, suggesting that this category could be an area to focus on if we revise the rubric and train raters more thoroughly than we were able to on RD 115 day. Other areas to focus on include categories C4 (Cognitive Strategies – Summary) and C5 (Cognitive Strategies – Process), since inter-rater reliability in these areas was low (36% and 50%, respectively.) These are areas where the rubric could perhaps be more concrete to help raters make consistent decisions.

Our complete inter-rater reliability findings are below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERA RUBRIC CATEGORY</th>
<th>INTER-RATER RELIABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Overview: Annotations + Responses</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1. Evidence of Metacognitive Conversation</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Using Cognitive Strategies - Strategic Use of Text</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. Using Cognitive Strategies-Multiple Strategies</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4. Using Cognitive Strategies - Purpose of Comments</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5. Building Knowledge - Word Learning Strategies</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6. Building Knowledge - Reading Beyond Word Level</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1. Metacognitive Conversation – Summary</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Metacognitive Conversation – Process</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. Metacognitive Conversation - Overall Response</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6. Use of Cognitive Strategies - Overall Response</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**C7. Building Knowledge - Background Knowledge**  
$.86$

**C8. Building Knowledge – Summary**  
$.64$

**C9. Knowledge Building - Word Learning**  
$.79$

**C10. Building Knowledge – Process**  
$.57$

### Recommendations

As an immediate next step, anonymized COSAs will be shared with the SAC on our Spaces page. This will enable all instructors to get a broad overview of RD 115 instruction across the district and could function as an assignment bank for RD 115.

We will also make the CERA assessment, rubric, and “anchor” reading samples available to SAC members for potential use in reading classes. Two examples of strong CERAs are available in Appendix 2D.

Based on this year’s work, the assessment committee will also be able to make recommendations to future DE assessment committees, to the DE SAC, and for the integrated 80, 90, and 115 pilots being taught on all four campuses in 2015-16.

After this year’s trial, we recommend that the CERA be considered as a potential assessment of reading, particularly after changes to the rubric that respond to problems with inter-rater reliability and questions raised by CERA users on RD 115 Day. Although we went through a norming process to bring the Overall category into alignment, we wound up with 57% inter-rater reliability in this category, so this may be a place for future assessment committees to focus on clarifying rubric language.

To the instructors developing integrated Reading and Writing 115 courses, we recommend considering

- Process-based approaches to reading and writing.
- Genre awareness as an important concept in reading and writing.
• Inquiry-based writing curricula at the 115 level (e.g., Bruce Ballenger-type approaches).

• Engagement with Reading Apprenticeship as a framework for metacognitive conversations about reading process.

• If not common assignments, then at least a common element—like identifying the targeted course outcome(s) of an assignment—on all assignment sheets.

In order to further develop a shared vision of reading as a discipline, we recommend that the SAC take up a broad discussion of what constitutes effective reading. What is the role of reading in successful literacy? How can we better understand the role reading plays in both writing and overall capacity to navigate key concepts in different disciplines, the work place, and citizenry? How does reading shape the development of critical thinking and creative problem solving? How can effective reading be shown? We hope SAC members’ diverse instructional approaches and sources of expertise in reading instruction can be brought into conversation and, eventually, alignment.

The 2015-16 DE Assessment Committee

Jessica Johnson – Chair
Valeria Ambrose
Adon Arnett
Corrinne Crawford
Danica Fierman
Blake Hausman
Sherri Kurcewski
Theresa Love
Lisa Rosenthal
Appendix 1 – COSA

1A - Instructions and Cover Sheet

The request below is a modified version of an email composed by Nick Hegen-Fox and sent by the Comp-Lit Assessment Committee when they collected their WR 115 COSAs.

Dear colleague,

You have been randomly selected to submit student work from your RD115 section as part of this year’s annual DE Program assessment project. As you may know, assessment is required by the college for accreditation. The DE assessment committee also strives to make assessment a valuable learning experience for those who participate. We can’t stress enough that (1) you, as an individual instructor, are not being evaluated in this process and (2) we can’t do this important work without your help.

We’ve made a change to our assessment process this year. In the past, we have assessed single pieces of student work. This year, we are trying to get a snapshot of the work students do in Reading 115 and over the course of a term. In other words, instead of simply submitting one single paper/essay/composition for a student, we want to take a look at what you consider to be a collection of significant assignments (COSA) from your course—i.e., those that best demonstrate your students’ learning. We leave it to you to decide what constitutes the "significant" assignments in your class.

Here’s what that means to you:

1. Think a little about what you deem the “significant” assignments for the term. There is no upper or lower limit on the number you submit.

2. Make copies of the instructions and grading criteria for each significant assignment.

3. For each assignment, fill out and include the attached COSA cover sheet.

4. For each assignment, identify and copy a higher quality piece of student work, a medium quality piece of student work, and a lower quality piece of student work. Ideally these will be submitted without comments,
but you should label them High, Medium, and Low. Please remove information that would identify the student.

3. At the end of the term, for each assignment, submit the following items in the following order:

- Cover sheet (top)
- Instructions for the assignment
- Grading criteria for the assignment
- High quality piece of student work
- Medium quality piece of student work
- Low quality piece of student work (bottom)

Collect this work however best suits you: A manila folder. A digital folder. We'll take it. Ideally, please send this off to me (Jessica Johnson at Southeast Campus, Scott 106) no later than the end of Finals week in March. If your significant assignments are in before that, hand it off sooner.

We imagine you might have some questions, so we're including a brief FAQ as well. If that doesn't answer your question, feel free to email me for clarification. We appreciate your participation and look forward to reading our students' work this term!

FAQ

Why was I selected?
- We numbered all RD115 sections for this quarter and used a randomizing tool. Lucky you.

This seems like extra work. Do I have to do it?
- We can't make you do it. But doing quality self-assessment every year is how PCC maintains its accreditation. It can also be meaningful for your teaching.

This seems like extra work and I'm a part-time instructor. Do I have to do it?
- We've received a guarantee from the DOIs that PT instructors who were randomly selected will receive 3 hours of Special Projects Rate pay ($27.91/hr) for your work.

What are you going to do with the items I submit?
- First, the AssComm will read the collections and use them to report on what’s going on in RD 115 across the district. For example, how are instructors assessing students’ reading? Is there a type of assignment
that most instructors are giving and consider to be significant? Next, all participating instructors will be invited to discuss the assignments and student work they submitted. The goals of this discussion will include sharing our instructional expertise and identifying the kinds and qualities of student work that constitute successful completion of RD 115. This event will take place during spring quarter.

What if I give instructions in person and don’t have a prompt?
• Please just add a note to the folder with a quick description of the instructions you do give verbally.

What if I don’t have written grading criteria?
• Please just add a note to the folder with a quick description of what you’re looking for when you grade the assignment.

Do you want drafts of papers and assignments?
• If you think of the drafts as Major, then yes. If you don’t, then no.

What if I don’t have a high quality or low quality example of student work for a particular assignment?
• Give us what you’ve got and please include a brief note to that effect in the folder.

You ask for papers from my RD115 course, but I have two sections. Which one?
• It’s up to you; pick one section and submit the papers from it.
Assignment Title: ____________________________________________________________

During which week in the quarter do you assign and collect this assignment:

Assign: _______________ Collect: _______________

CCOG Outcomes Addressed by this Assignment:

_____ 1. Proficiently use stages of reading: previewing, reading, review-and reading strategies in order to improve comprehension, control concentration, and increase persistence and retention in a variety of academic and non-academic reading tasks. Refine connections between text, the student’s life, student’s knowledge of the world, and other texts. Examine interactions between relationship, richness, structure, style, vocabulary, and purpose within complex texts. Increase reading frequency. Adjust reading rate to the nature of the material.

_____ 2. Advance and broaden use of vocabulary development strategies to learn and use new words including discipline-specific vocabulary in listening, speaking and writing. Advance word parts study.

_____ 3. Refine written evaluation, analysis, and reflection in response to various texts.

_____ 4. Analyze texts in order to identify and articulate explicit and implied main idea and major details, distinguish fact from opinion, determine the author’s and reader’s purpose and bias, and distinguish between literal and figurative meaning in a variety of increasingly complex academic and non-academic reading materials. Make accurate inferences and rely on information provided in text to substantiate thinking. Identify and evaluate complex points of view in different texts. Cultivate flexibility and skepticism about authors and readers perspectives.

_____ 5. Use library resources to formulate a research query and select appropriate sources of information. Use critical thinking to evaluate increasingly complex and diverse information and sources for academic and lifelong learning. Identify and make use of steps in the research process.

_____ 6. Exhibit habits and contribute to academic success, including engagement and intellectual curiosity. Employ active learning and study strategies for academic success. Use campus support services and other learning resources to help meet academic goals. Participate in a classroom learning community in a respective and responsive manner.

What do you like about this assignment? What do you think students get from it? (optional):

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
On Reading 115 Day:

1) Divide into triads.
2) Assign facilitators who will take notes throughout the protocol.
3) Explain norms: “Group members provide answers without making judgments about the quality of the text or their personal preferences.”
4) Start the protocol:
   Participants read the text in silence, making brief notes about aspects of it that they particularly notice.

**Describing the Text**
The facilitator asks the group, “What do you see?” Group members provide answers without making judgments about the quality of the text or their personal preferences. If an interpretation or judgment emerges, the facilitator asks for the evidence on which it is based.

**Asking Questions About the Text**
The facilitator asks the group, “What questions does this text raise for you? Group members state any questions they have about the text.

**Speculating about the Meaning/Significance of the Text**
The facilitator asks the group, “What is significant about this text?” Participants, based on their reading of the text, construct meaning about the insights, problems or issues that the text seems focused on.

**Discussing Implications for Teaching Practice**
The facilitator invites everyone to share any thoughts they have about ways this particular text might influence their work as teachers and educators.

**Repeat for next text.**
1C – COSA Counts

Data tables and definitions

**RD 115**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modes</th>
<th>Number of COSAS containing</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>research*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attribution skills**</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>note-taking***</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocabulary in context**</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(personal) response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehension questions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thesis-driven essay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocabulary out of context***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading rate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modes-based essay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes generating questions, locating sources, evaluating credibility, reflecting on research process, and summarizing sources.

**includes paraphrase and citation

***includes annotation

X this does not count evaluation of researched sources

XX in the context reading

XXX words to be memorized

**WR 115**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modes-based paper</th>
<th>Number of COSAS containing</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compare-contrast</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause-effect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis-based academic essay</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal narrative/essay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal entries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Portfolio (3 short essays)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I recently saw an old friend for the first time in many years. We had been Ph.D. students at the same time, both studying science, although in different areas. She later dropped out of graduate school, went to Harvard Law School and is now a senior lawyer for a major environmental organization. At some point, the conversation turned to why she had left graduate school. To my utter astonishment, she said it was because it made her feel stupid. After a couple of years of feeling stupid every day, she was ready to do something else.

I had thought of her as one of the brightest people I knew and her subsequent career supports that view. What she said bothered me. I kept thinking about it; sometime the next day, it hit me. Science makes me feel stupid too. It’s just that I’ve gotten used to it. So used to it, in fact, that I actively seek out new opportunities to feel stupid. I wouldn’t know what to do without that feeling. I even think it’s supposed to be this way. Let me explain.

For almost all of us, one of the reasons that we liked science in high school and college is that we were good at it. That can’t be the only reason – fascination with understanding the physical world and an emotional need to discover new things has to enter into it too. But high-school and college science means taking courses, and doing well is courses means getting the right answers on tests. If you know those answers, you do well and get to feel smart.

A Ph.D., in which you have to do a research project, is a whole different thing. For me, it was a daunting task. How could I possibly frame the questions that would lead to significant discoveries; design and interpret an experiment so that the conclusions were absolutely convincing; foresee difficulties and see ways around them, or, failing that, solve them when they occurred? My Ph.D. project was somewhat interdisciplinary and, for a while, whenever I ran into a problem, I pestered the faculty in my department who were experts in the various disciplines that I needed. I remember the day when Henry Taube (who won the Nobel Prize two years later) told me he didn’t know how to solve the problem I was having in his area. I was a third-year graduate student and I figured that Taube knew about 1000 times more than I did (conservative estimate). If he didn’t have the answer, nobody did.

That’s when it hit me: nobody did. That’s why it was a research problem. And being my research problem, it was up to me to solve. Once I faced that fact, I solved the problem in a couple of days. (It wasn’t really very hard; I just had to try a few things.) The crucial lesson was that the scope of things I didn’t know wasn’t merely vast; it was, for all practical purposes, infinite. That
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Curriculum-Embedded Reading Assessment (CERA) Individual Writing Prompts

Please respond to the following questions (in pen).

PART I. SUMMARY
1. In your own words, write a short (1-2 sentence) summary of this piece.

PART II. READING PROCESS
2. What kinds of things were happening in your mind as you read this?

3. What did you do that helped you to understand the reading?

4. What questions or problems do you still have with this piece?

PART III. SELF-ASSESSMENT
5. How easy or difficult was this piece for you? (circle one)
   pretty easy    not too hard    pretty hard    too hard

6. How well would you say you understood this piece?

## Curriculum Embedded Reading Assessment (CERA) Rubric

### A. Overview: Annotations + Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of student’s overall control of reading processes.</th>
<th>Noticing Reading</th>
<th>Focusing on Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher gains little insight into student’s reading process, what is confusing, or how to support the student.</td>
<td>Few or no marks on the page along with vague responses to process questions and confused answers to comprehension questions.</td>
<td>Marks on the page and responses to questions give insight into student’s reading process and comprehension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Annotations on the Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B1.</th>
<th>Focusing on Reading</th>
<th>Taking Control of Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Few or no marks to give evidence of strategic or thoughtful reader interaction with the text; for example:</td>
<td>Marking indicates some reader interaction with the text; for example:</td>
<td>Marking indicates substantial reader-text interactions focused on problem solving and building understanding; for example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sparse underlining with no written comments.</td>
<td>- Some limited strategic marks focused on one or more strategies, such as making connections, asking questions.</td>
<td>- A variety of marks for varying purposes, such as highlights, circles, underlines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Whole paragraphs highlighted with no indication of important ideas or questions.</td>
<td>- Comments in margins are generalized responses, like “boring,” “cool,” or “me too.”</td>
<td>- Strategic marking of main ideas, text signals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Marks limited to a single type of interaction, such as underlining unfamiliar words.</td>
<td>- Comments and marks identify specific problems, such as “What?” connected to a highlighted section.</td>
<td>- Purposeful comments that clarify, ask and answer questions, make connection, summarize.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B2. Strategic use of text...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B2.</th>
<th>Focusing on Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Few or no marks give evidence of strategic interaction with the text.</td>
<td>Specific areas of the text are marked and commented on as roadblocks or confusions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B3. Multiple strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B3.</th>
<th>Focusing on Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marks, if any, indicate a single strategy, such as underlining only key words or highlighting everything indiscriminately.</td>
<td>Marks indicate the use of one or more literacy strategies but may not lead to solutions. Marks may appear “practiced.” For example, many questions are asked but not all seem purposeful, and few are answered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B4. Purpose of comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B4.</th>
<th>Focusing on Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments, if any, indicate general confusion or reactions — such as “Huh?” or “Why am I reading this?” — and don’t draw attention to specific problems.</td>
<td>Comments focus on the text and reader response, but not on identifying roadblocks and problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Knowledge – Student mobilizes, builds, &amp; revises schema about: Content and the world, Texts, Language, Disciplinary discourse and practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5. Word learning strategies</td>
<td>Marks indicate little or no attention to developing word knowledge; for example, student highlights all long words, or words—such as proper nouns—that do not interfere with comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6. Reading beyond word level</td>
<td>No indication that student is reading beyond word level to attend to sentence and context clues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Responses to CERA Questions

**Metacognitive Conversation --In annotations, student writes about reading process to monitor comprehension and get back on track.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1. Summary</th>
<th>Summary misses the main idea or indicates confusions, yet student indicates text was “easy” and he or she understood it “well.”</th>
<th>Summary indicates identification of the main ideas.</th>
<th>Summary indicates understanding of the main ideas and may connect to larger themes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2. Process</td>
<td>Process responses offer little evidence of strategic reading; for example, the response is vague, no problems or confusions are identified, strategies are vague—“I just read it.”</td>
<td>Process responses indicate some evidence of what is seen in the marking and annotating; for example, student thought about what a key term meant.</td>
<td>Process responses use literacy vocabulary to specifically describe reading processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. Overall response</td>
<td>Taken together, responses suggest student is unaware of reading difficulty.</td>
<td>Taken together, responses indicate an awareness of roadblocks and processes. Student identifies at least one comprehension problem either solved or unsolved.</td>
<td>Taken together, responses demonstrate student is aware of confusions and able to apply strategies to get back on track.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Using Cognitive Strategies --Student uses strategies to focus on reading and to take control: Setting a purpose, Previewing, Identifying roadblocks, Tolerating ambiguity, Clarifying, Using context, Making connections, Chunking, Visualizing, Questioning, Predicting, Paraphrasing, Getting the gist, Summarizing, Using evidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C4. Summary</th>
<th>Summary does not clearly demonstrate comprehension.</th>
<th>Summary identifies main ideas.</th>
<th>Summary clearly states main ideas, which may also be marked in the text.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C5. Process</td>
<td>Process responses do not identify roadblocks or problems to solve.</td>
<td>Process responses relate to marks and annotations on the text and describe at least one strategy used or problem solved.</td>
<td>Process responses relate to marks and annotations on the text and demonstrate the use of multiple strategies to solve problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6. Overall response</td>
<td>Taken together, responses indicate student is unable to use strategies to get back on track.</td>
<td>Self-assessment demonstrates understanding of challenges and how to get back on track.</td>
<td>Self-assessment demonstrates understanding of main ideas and awareness of how reading problems were solved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. Responses to CERA Questions (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Knowledge</th>
<th>Noticing Reading</th>
<th>Focusing on Reading</th>
<th>Taking Control of Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C7. Background Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Responses indicate student is not connecting to background knowledge to understand the author’s ideas or themes.</td>
<td>Responses indicate some relevant background knowledge to understand the author’s ideas or themes.</td>
<td>Responses indicate ample background knowledge to understand the author’s ideas or themes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>C8. Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary reflects limited schema about the author’s ideas or theme; for example, “This was about reading and how he hated it.”</td>
<td>Summary reflects general understanding and unelaborated referencing of the author’s ideas; for example, “This is about how going to jail made him want to learn how to read.”</td>
<td>Summary reflects strong understanding and references the author’s ideas and themes; for example, “Learning to read may have been the most important turning point in his life.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C9. Word learning</strong></td>
<td>Either responses indicate no attention to word learning and language, or responses to language are generalized; for example, “It had lots of hard words.”</td>
<td>Student may describe clarifying a difficult word or phrase.</td>
<td>Process responses indicate ways that student learned new words or solved complex syntax problems. Student may use new vocabulary from the text in his or her summary in ways that reflect understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>C10. Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process responses do not reference text structures or signals as guides to reading.</td>
<td>Process responses indicate awareness of text structures or signals; for example, student references the introduction.</td>
<td>Process responses indicate use of text structures and signals to solve problems and build understanding of the text; for example, “I figured out that it had two different parts when she said ‘All that changed when...’”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PCC DE Assessment Committee – CERA Reporting Form

Student Work

Sample Number: ____________________  Faculty Rater: ____________________

Instructions: Working from the CERA rubric, mark an X in the column that fits your assessment of the student’s work in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Noticing Reading</th>
<th>Focusing on Reading</th>
<th>Taking Control of the Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Overview:</strong> Annotations + Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Annotations on the Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Noticing Reading</th>
<th>Focusing on Reading</th>
<th>Taking Control of the Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1. Metacognitive Conversation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Using Cognitive Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2. Strategic Use of Text</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B3. Multiple Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B4. Purpose of Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Knowledge Building**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Noticing Reading</th>
<th>Focusing on Reading</th>
<th>Taking Control of the Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B5. Word Learning Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B6. Reading Beyond Word Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continue
### C. Responses to CERA Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metacognitive Conversation</th>
<th>Noticing Reading</th>
<th>Focusing on Reading</th>
<th>Taking Control of the Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1. Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. Overall Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Using Cognitive Strategies</th>
<th>Noticing Reading</th>
<th>Focusing on Reading</th>
<th>Taking Control of the Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C4. Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5. Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6. Overall Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Building</th>
<th>Noticing Reading</th>
<th>Focusing on Reading</th>
<th>Taking Control of the Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C7. Background Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8. Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9. Word Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10. Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2B - Instructions

Hi All --

Thank you so much for participating in this assessment project. I am writing you because you expressed interest in participating in the CERA. Here are further details so that you can administer the CERA (if you haven't already) by the end of Week 2.

1) Copy the attached reading prompt and writing prompt

2) Copy a class set of each (some of you may have received copies already)


4) Review the CERA rubric for your own information and for context. We won't be using it to norm and assess until the Spring. Your are invited to join in on that process and we hope you can, but it is not required!

5) Allow 30-40 minutes for the CERA in your class.

6) **OPTIONAL** --Once completed, if you'd like to keep your students' work for your own records, copy the class sets of both the reading and writing prompts. Please send us the originals.

7) **Please label the CRNs for each class set!**

8) If you have any thoughts or observations about the CERA, your experience of administering it, students' responses, or anything else, please feel free to write it down and either email it to Theresa and me or include it when you send us your students' completed assessments.

9) Send your completed class sets of CERA reading/writing prompts to Danica Fierman and Theresa Love --RC Building 7, Room 218A via campus mail. Please send it by Week 3.
This is a pre and post assessment. We will send out reminders Week 8. The same materials will be used for the post assessment.

Thank you again for engaging in this exploration of assessing reading using the CERA, created by Reading Apprenticeship. We hope this will prove to be an interesting opportunity for collaboration and inquiry this year. We hope you can participate in the norming and evaluation process where we will also get a chance to build dialogue around our practice of teaching and assessing reading.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call or email Theresa or me any time!

Take Care,
Appendix 2C – Collection Data

DE SAC Assessment Committee CERA Project

Demographics of DE SAC Participation in CERA Assessment Project:
- 14 DE RD/WR faculty from all four main campuses participated.
- 7 Full-Time Faculty participated
- 7 Part-Time Faculty participated
- 22 DE course sections took the pre-/post- CERA
- All four campuses represented

Breakdown of the 22 Course Sections:
- 16 RD 115 sections
- 6 90-level sections
  Of the 90 level sections:
  - 3 were integrated RD/WR 90 (2 of those were Gateway to College integrated sections)
  - 3 were stand-alone RD 90 sections
Research project:

- Identify the key aspects of the problem
- Develop a hypothesis
- Collect and analyze data
- Draw conclusions

Institutional approval is necessary for this project.

1. Make sure to have all necessary permissions and approvals.
2. Ensure that all data collection methods are ethical.
4. Follow up with stakeholders regularly.

Research question:

- What factors influence student retention in STEM fields?
- How can we improve retention rates?
- What are the common challenges faced by students in STEM programs?
Curriculum Literacy: Comprehensive Writing Prompts

Please respond to the following questions (In pen).

PART I. SUMMARY

1. In your own words, write a short (1-2 sentence) summary of this piece.
   In the essay "The Importance of Stopping in Scientific Research," by Martin A. Schwartz, he explains that feeling stupid lets you know that your trying. We should focus on topics that make us feel stupid to help our understanding.

PART II. READING PROCESS

2. What kinds of things were happening in your mind as you read this?
   I was thinking that it was useful how people with PhD can feel stupid. They have the highest education yet still feel stupid.

3. What did you do that helped you to understand the reading?
   I read the piece twice and re-read it slowly, looking up words I didn't know.

4. What questions or problems do you still have with this piece?
   How can they change the way they teach students so they don't feel stupid?

PART III. SELF-ASSESSMENT

5. How easy or difficult was this piece for you? (circle one)
   pretty easy  not too hard  pretty hard  too hard

6. How well would you say you understood this piece?
   On a scale of 1-10, I would say an 8.5

Source: Reading for Understanding: How Reading Apprenticeship Improves Disciplinary Learning in Secondary and College Classrooms, page 327. Copyright © 2012 WestEd.
The importance of empathy in effective communication by Michael A. Schreiber

Date: 2015

Explain the benefits of empathy in communication. When you listen, it shows that you care about what the other person is saying. It also helps you to understand their perspective, which can lead to more effective communication. Empathy can also help to build trust and rapport with others.

Communication is a two-way process. It involves sending and receiving messages. Effective communication requires active listening, clear and concise speaking, and understanding the non-verbal cues of others. Empathy plays a crucial role in this process.

Empathy is the ability to understand and share the feelings of another person. It involves putting yourself in someone else's shoes and seeing the situation from their perspective. Empathy helps to foster stronger relationships and improve interpersonal communication.

In conclusion, empathy is an essential component of effective communication. By demonstrating empathy, you can improve your ability to connect with others and enhance your overall communication skills.
thought processes/behaviors
-
Focusing/Categorizing

Survey/Pausing

Loss of focus

Research project

Inferences/Interpreted...
Please respond to the following questions (in pen).

PART I. SUMMARY

1. In your own words, write a short (1-2 sentence) summary of this piece.

   This piece is about a PhD student who goes through his theory of being “productively stupid” to benefit kids in today’s education but is something most children today have learned.

PART II. READING PROCESS

2. What kinds of things were happening in your mind as you read this?

   I was thinking back to all the times in high school when I felt stupid in science class.

3. What did you do that helped you to understand the reading?

   My own personal experiences, along with the author’s personal experience that he relates to the readers.

4. What questions or problems do you still have with this piece?

   I am confused still on the subject of why the theory of being “productively stupid” is vital to teaching people in education. He explains it well but not to much.

PART III. SELF-ASSESSMENT

5. How easy or difficult was this piece for you? (circle one)

   pretty easy  not too hard  pretty hard  too hard

6. How well would you say you understood this piece?

   I feel as though I do understand it more than the last piece that I read. More so now that I have more enhanced reading skills with these tests.

   I think I don’t understand it completely just out of the questions the article poses to me.

Source: Reading for Understanding: How Reading Apprenticeship Improves Disciplinary Learning in Secondary and College Classrooms, page 17, Copyright © 2012 WestEd.