

# Writing 2005

## University-Wide Junior-Level Writing Assessment

**Report Prepared by:** Marga Madhuri (Educ), Eric Grekowitz (Eng) and Aghop Der-Karabetian (Psych), April 2006

**Conducted by:** ULV Assessment Committee, in conjunction with the Excellence in Writing Committee

### Summary

A sample of 192 randomly selected writing assignments of Junior student across all campuses and colleges (except Law) was assessed using a rubric evaluating four areas: Content Specific, Development, Organization, and Language Use and Format. Findings showed no differences between colleges and campuses sites, no relationship of scores to where first and second writing courses were taken (ULV or elsewhere), utilization of the Learning Enhancement Center, and submission of earlier drafts. Women scored higher than men in all areas, higher GPAs and earlier times of taking the first writing course predicted better writing scores, European Americans scored higher than Latino Americans and the other combined group in Organization and Content-Specific areas, and Native speakers scored higher than non-native speakers only in the Content-Specific area. About one-in-three students scored at the fair and poor levels in Organization and Language use and Format. Action recommendations focus on Organization and Language mechanics, and continued training for faculty.

### Learning Outcome:

Through the General Education writing courses, and writing assignments across the curriculum students will learn to write well in the areas of development, organization, and language use.

### Purpose

- Gather assessment information on upper-division writing using actual student writing samples from class assignments
- Compare competency by colleges
- Compare Traditional Main campus, CAPA (Main campus adult), and RCA (off-campus adult) populations
- Determine need (if any) for improvement

### Procedure

- Sample of actual Junior-level class writing assignments across the institution were collected.
- Samples came from almost every major in Business, Education, and Arts and Science colleges, as well as from the Main campus traditional, CAPA, and RCA sites.

- Identified courses within each major with a high probability of written assignments
- Adjuncts who taught at on and off campus sites were told about the project at their yearly workshop meeting, and volunteers were solicited
- Coordinated with the provost's office to gather papers from identified courses
- Culled a random sample from the submissions, leaving out submission with missing information or courses with missing documentation such as description of assignments, etc.
- Students submitted a “blind” copy of their papers to their instructors, attached to an assessment questionnaire. The questionnaire included items inquiring about their history of writing courses, attitudes about writing, and study skills related to writing assignments
- Instructors submitted their packet of student papers, with an instructor-specific questionnaire that described the nature of the assignments and how they supported the writing assignment
- Altogether 192 randomly selected student writing-submissions with accompanying self-report questionnaires were used in this project

### **Student Self-Report Questionnaire (Attached)**

- The self-report questionnaires attached to each writing sample inquired about kinds of prior writing instruction (where and when), confidence in writing, need for additional support, value of clear and strong writing, composition process, scaffolding, use of the Learning Enhancement Center, and demographic information including department and campus location
- The questionnaire was drafted by the members of the writing assessment committee, followed by several revisions. Also, it was presented to the Assessment Committee for revisions and suggestions
- The instructor also completed a questionnaire indicating type of writing support offered to the students throughout the course and suggestions about how ULV can help to support instructors with writing projects

### **Scoring**

- A call for full & part-time instructors interested in scoring was sent out through Email
- Instructors who had shown interest in writing (by attending workshops or meetings of the Writing Committee) were targeted specifically
- Scorers were offered \$25 per hour, lunch & snacks as incentives
- A grading panel was created, comprised of individuals from all ULV units (except Law who did not participate in this assessment project). The panel was composed of 8 scores:
  - 3 Arts & Sciences
  - 2 Business
  - 1 Education
  - 1 Representative from LEC
  - 1 Librarian
- Two days, 9 am - 3 pm, were set-aside for scoring, and the actual time to the scoring of 192 papers was 10 hours
- The panel normed the ULV writing rubric using sample student papers from multiple disciplines by comparing their scoring of the papers. During the scoring process the rubric was re-normed several times. The rubric (Attached) measured four areas of

writing: Content-specific, Development, Organization, and Language use and Format using a -point scale (excellent = 4, good = 3, fair = 2 and poor = 1)

### **Summary of Findings**

1. Taking the equivalent of the first semester writing course at ULV or at some other college was unrelated to the writing scores (Table 6, 7, 8)
2. Taking the equivalent of the second semester writing course at ULV or at some other college was unrelated to the writing scores (Table 6, 7, 8)
3. Utilizing the Learning Enhancement Center services or not for the assignment that was evaluated, or for any writing assignments was unrelated to the writing scores (Table 6, 7, 8)
4. Submitting earlier drafts of the assignments that were evaluated was unrelated to the writing scores (Table 6, 7, 8)
5. In a multiple regression analysis predicting the total writing score, the only significant predictions of higher writing scores were higher GPAs and earlier years of the 1<sup>st</sup> semester writing course
6. 77 percent of students were at the good or excellent levels in the content-specific and development domain
7. 70 percent of students were at the good or excellent levels in the organization domain.
8. 68 percent of students were at the good and excellent levels in the language use and format domain.
9. Women scored higher than men on all writing categories (Table 1)
10. There were no differences between different campus locations (Table 2)
11. There were no differences between different colleges (Table 3)
12. European American students scored higher than Latino American and combine other groups only in the Organization and Content-specific areas (Table 4)
13. Native speakers scored higher than non-native speakers only in the Content-Specific area (Table 5).

### **Action Recommendations**

1. Focus writing improvement efforts in the areas of language mechanics and organization
2. Reactivated the Excellence in Writing Committee

3. Conduct a follow-up survey of faculty about their practices in support of student writing and their needs for support
5. Train faculty to use rubrics to assess writing assignments
6. Create workshops to support faculty
7. Train faculty in peer revision & to teach students to use rubrics
8. Collect rubrics randomly and periodically for ongoing assessment

Table 1  
Means, standard deviation, and F-tests of writing scores for women and men.

Writing Scores	Women (n=120)		Men (n=55)		F	P
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Content Specific	3.12	.85	2.84	.96	3.77	.054
Development	3.06	.75	2.78	.85	4.71	.031
Organization	3.04	.87	2.76	.88	3.80	.053
Language Use & Format	2.89	.74	2.65	.62	4.26	.040
Total	12.08	2.81	10.98	2.86	5.63	.019

November 15, 2005

Table 2

Means, standard deviations, and F-test of writing scores for different ULV campuses/programs.

Writing Scores	Traditional Main Campus (n=55)		CAPA (n=45)		Off-Campus Sites (n=74)		F	P
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Content-Specific	3.04	.90	2.89	.94	3.09	.86	.75	.474
Development	2.95	.71	2.87	.82	3.04	.85	.69	.503
Organization	2.84	.90	2.91	.90	3.05	.87	1.00	.370
Language Use & Format	2.76	.82	2.91	.70	2.80	.64	.57	.566
Total	11.58	2.87	11.56	3.12	11.91	2.76	.29	.751

November 15, 2005

Table 3

Means, standard deviations, and F-test of writing scores for different colleges.

Writing Scores	Business (n=62)		Education (n=59)		Arts & Sciences (n=51)		F	P
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Content-Specific	2.87	1.05	3.22	.74	2.98	.84	1.61	.188
Development	2.82	.92	3.14	.73	2.92	.68	1.64	.182
Organization	2.89	1.03	3.19	.71	2.73	.85	2.53	.058
Language Use & Format	2.65	.70	2.97	.69	2.82	.71	2.02	.112
Total	11.19	3.35	12.49	2.47	11.39	2.59	2.30	.079

November 15, 2005

Table 4

Means, standard deviations, and F-tests of writing scores for different ethnic groups.

Writing Scores	Latino American (n=59)		European American (n=60)		Other (n=44)		F	P
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Content-Specific	2.90	.94	3.28	.83	2.89	.95	3.55	.031
Development	2.88	.81	3.15	.71	2.84	.89	2.47	.088
Organization	2.83	.83	3.18	.81	2.75	1.01	3.79	.025
Language Use & Format	2.68	.68	2.93	.73	2.80	.73	1.90	.153
Total	11.19	2.82	12.55	2.69	11.25	3.24	4.05	.019

November 15, 2005



Table 5

Means, standard deviations, and F-tests of writing scores for native and non-native English speakers.

Writing Scores	Native Speaker (n=131)		Non-native Speaker (n=44)		F	P
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Content-Specific	3.11	.83	2.80	1.02	4.07	.045
Development	3.03	.72	2.77	.96	3.52	.062
Organization	2.99	.86	2.82	.97	1.28	.260
Language Use & Format	2.87	.72	2.64	.69	3.58	.060
Total	11.95	2.73	11.00	3.18	3.69	.057

November 15, 2005

Table 6  
 Correlations of writing scores with various academic and curricular measures for  
**traditional main campus students** (n=53).

	Writing Scores				
	Total	Content-Specific	Development	Organization	Use & Format
<b><u>Previous Writing Instruction</u></b>					
1. Took Eng 106 or Equivalent (Q 1) (1=no 2=yes)	-	-	-	-	-
2. Took 1 <sup>st</sup> Semester College Writing (Q 3) (1=at another place 2=at ULV)	-	-	-	-	-
3. Took 2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester College Writing (Q 5) (1=at another place 2=at ULV)	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Writing Needs</u></b>					
4. Confidence in Writing Ability (Q 6) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	.35*
5. Support Needed in Course Work (Q 7) (1=low 4=high)	-.30*	-	-.26*	-.26*	-.29*
6. Support Needed to Prep for Post-graduation Occupation (Q 8) (1=low 4=high)	-.32*	-	-	-.32*	-.40**
7. Level of Writing in Current Job (Q 9) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
8. Current Writing Level Adequate for Current Job (Q 10) (1=low 4=high)	.30+	-	.29+	.31+	-
9. Time Dedicated to Writing Assignments (Q 11) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
10. Value Strong Academic Writing (Q 12) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	.27*

Table 6 continued

**Process Information for Submitted Paper**

11. Received Feedback Before Final Draft (Q 14) (1=no 2=yes)	-	-	-	-	-
12. Helpfulness of Instructor Feedback, if Present (Q 15) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
13. Utilized LEC for Any College Writing Assignment (Q 17) (1=no 2=yes)	-	-	-	-	-
14. Edit Own Writing in General (Q 19) (2= sometimes 3=most of the time)	-	-	-	-	-
15. Someone Else (not LEC) Edit Your Writing (Q 20) (1=never 2=sometimes 3=most of the time)	-	-	-	-	-

**Personal/Background Information**

16. Number of Credits in Current Semester/Term (Q 25)	-	-	-	-	-
17. Class Standing (Q 27) (1=F 2=Soph 3=Jun 4=Sr)	.24+	.23+	-	.24+	-
18. English Language Status (Q 28) (1=non native speaker 2=English speaker)	-	-	-	-	.24+
19. Gender (Q 30) (1=female 2=male)	-	-	-	-	-
20. Estimated GPA (Q 29)	.58**	.46**	.42**	.49**	.58**

- not significant

+ P<.10

\* P<.05

\*\* P<.01

November 15, 2005

Table 7

Correlations of writing scores with various academic and curricular measures for **CAPA students** (n=45).

	Writing Scores				
	Total	Content-Specific	Development	Organization	Use & Format
<b><u>Previous Writing Instruction</u></b>					
1. Took Eng 106 or Equivalent (Q 1) (1=no 2=yes)	-	-	-	-	-.28*
2. Took 1 <sup>st</sup> Semester College Writing (Q 3) (1=at another place 2=at ULV)	-	-	-	-	-
3. Took 2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester College Writing (Q 5) (1=at another place 2=at ULV)	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Writing Needs</u></b>					
4. Confidence in Writing Ability (Q 6) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
5. Support Needed in Course Work (Q 7) (1=low 4=high)	.30*	-	-.34*	-.27+	-.32*
6. Support Needed to Prep for Post-graduation Occupation (Q 8) (1=low 4=high)	-.37*	-.30*	-.42**	-.38*	-
7. Level of Writing in Current Job (Q 9) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
8. Current Writing Level Adequate for Current Job (Q 10) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
9. Time Dedicated to Writing Assignments (Q 11) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
10. Value Strong Academic Writing (Q 12) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-

Table 7 continued

**Process Information for Submitted Paper**

11. Received Feedback Before Final Draft (Q 14) (1=no 2=yes)	-	-	-	-	-
12. Helpfulness of Instructor Feedback, if Present (Q 15) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
13. Utilized LEC for Any College Writing Assignment (Q 17) (1=no 2=yes)	-	-	-	-	-
14. Edit Own Writing in General (Q 19) (2= sometimes 3=most of the time)	-	-	-	-	-
15. Someone Else (not LEC) Edit Your Writing (Q 20) (1=never 2=sometimes 3=most of the time)	-	-	-	-.30*	-

**Personal/Background Information**

16. Number of Credits in Current Semester/Term (Q 25)	.34*	.38*	.38*	.33*	-
17. Class Standing (Q 27) (1=F 2=Soph 3=Jun 4=Sr)	-	-	-	-	-
18. English Language Status (Q 28) (1=non native speaker 2=English speaker)	-	-	-	-	-
19. Gender (Q 30) (1=female 2=male)	-	-	-	-	-
20. Estimated GPA (Q 29)	-	-	-	-	-

- not significant

+ P<.10

\* P<.05

\*\* P<.01

November 15, 2005

Table 8  
 Correlations of writing scores with various academic and curricular measures **for off-campus (RCA) students** (n=75).

	Writing Scores				
	Total	Content-Specific	Development	Organization	Use & Format
<b><u>Previous Writing Instruction</u></b>					
1. Took Eng 106 or Equivalent (Q. 1) (1=no 2=yes)	-	-	-	-	.27*
2. Took 1 <sup>st</sup> Semester College Writing (Q.4) (1=at another place 2=at ULV)	-	-	-	-.22+	-
3. Took 2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester College Writing (Q. 7) (1=at another place 2=at ULV)	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Writing Needs</u></b>					
4. Confidence in Writing Ability (Q. 8) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
5. Support Needed in Course Work (Q. 9) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
6. Support Needed to Prep for Post-graduation Occupation (Q. 10) (1=low 4=high)	-.21+	-.23*	-	-.20+	-.25*
7. Level of Writing in Current Job (Q. 11) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
8. Current Writing Level Adequate for Current Job (Q. 12) (1=low 4=high)	.24+	-	-	.30*	.31*
9. Time Dedicated to Writing Assignments (Q. 13) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
10. Value Strong Academic Writing (Q. 14) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Process Information for Submitted Paper</u></b>					
11. Course Number of the Paper (Q. 16) (higher=higher # courses)	-	-	-	-	-

12. Received Feedback Before Final Draft (Q. 18) (1=no 2=yes)	-	-	-	-	-
13. Helpfulness of Instructor Feedback, if Present (Q. 19) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
14. Utilized LEC for Any College Writing Assignment (Q. 21) (1=no 2=yes)	-	-	-	-	-
15. Edit Own Writing in General (Q. 23) (2= sometimes 3=most of the time)	.20+	-	.20+	-	.21+
16. Someone else (not LEC) Edit Your Writing (Q. 24) 1=never 2=sometimes 3=most of the time	-	-	-	-	-

Personal/Background Information

17. Number of Credits in Current Semester/Term (Q. 29)	-	-	-	-	-
18. Class Standing (Q. 51) (1=F 2=Soph 3=Jun 4=Sr)	.28*	.26*	.20+	.23+	-
19. English Language Status (Q. 32) 1=non native speaker 2=English speaker	-	.21+	-	-	-
20. Gender (Q. 34) 1=female 2=male	-.30**	-.31**	-.22+	-.22+	-.32**
21. Estimated GPA (Q. 33)	.30**	.26*	-	.32**	.27*

+ P<.10  
\* P<.05  
\*\* P<.01

November 15, 2005

Table 8  
 Correlations of writing scores with various academic and curricular measures **for off-campus (RCA) students** (n=75).

	Writing Scores				
	Total	Content-Specific	Development	Organization	Use & Format
<b><u>Previous Writing Instruction</u></b>					
1. Took Eng 106 or Equivalent (Q. 1) (1=no 2=yes)	-	-	-	-	.27*
2. Took 1 <sup>st</sup> Semester College Writing (Q.4) (1=at another place 2=at ULV)	-	-	-	-.22+	-
3. Took 2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester College Writing (Q. 7) (1=at another place 2=at ULV)	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Writing Needs</u></b>					
4. Confidence in Writing Ability (Q. 8) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
5. Support Needed in Course Work (Q. 9) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
6. Support Needed to Prep for Post-graduation Occupation (Q. 10) (1=low 4=high)	-.21+	-.23*	-	-.20+	-.25*
7. Level of Writing in Current Job (Q. 11) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
8. Current Writing Level Adequate for Current Job (Q. 12) (1=low 4=high)	.24+	-	-	.30*	.31*
9. Time Dedicated to Writing Assignments (Q. 13) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
10. Value Strong Academic Writing (Q. 14) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-



Process Information for Submitted Paper

11. Course Number of the Paper (Q. 16) (higher=higher # courses)	-	-	-	-	-
12. Received Feedback Before Final Draft (Q. 18) (1=no 2=yes)	-	-	-	-	-
13. Helpfulness of Instructor Feedback, if Present (Q. 19) (1=low 4=high)	-	-	-	-	-
14. Utilized LEC for Any College Writing Assignment (Q. 21) (1=no 2=yes)	-	-	-	-	-
15. Edit Own Writing in General (Q. 23) (2= sometimes 3=most of the time)	.20+	-	.20+	-	.21+
16. Someone else (not LEC) Edit Your Writing (Q. 24) 1=never 2=sometimes 3=most of the time	-	-	-	-	-

Personal/Background Information

17. Number of Credits in Current Semester/Term (Q. 29)	-	-	-	-	-
18. Class Standing (Q. 51) (1=F 2=Soph 3=Jun 4=Sr)	.28*	.26*	.20+	.23+	-
19. English Language Status (Q. 32) 1=non native speaker 2=English speaker	-	.21+	-	-	-
20. Gender (Q. 34) 1=female 2=male	-.30**	-.31**	-.22+	-.22+	-.32**
21. Estimated GPA (Q. 33)	.30**	.26*	-	.32**	.27*

+ P<.10

\* P<.05

\*\* P<.01

November 15, 2005

Table 9

Percentage of **traditional main campus students** at different levels of ratings in the four writing domains (n=55).

Ratings	Content-Specific		Development		Organization		Language Use & Format	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Poor	4	7	0	0	3	6	3	6
Fair	9	16	15	27	18	33	17	31
Good	23	42	28	51	19	35	25	46
Excellent	19	35	12	22	15	27	10	18.2

Total Score

Median = 11/16=69%

Mean = 11.58/16=72%

Grade Equivalent = D+

Grade Equivalent = C-

November 16, 2005

Table 10  
 Percentage of **CAPA students** at different levels of ratings in the four writing domains  
 (n=45).

Ratings	Content-Specific		Development		Organization		Language Use & Format	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Poor	4	9	3	7	3	7	0	0
Fair	10	22	9	20	11	24	13	29
Good	18	40	24	53	18	40	23	51
Excellent	13	29	9	20	13	29	9	20

Total Score

Median = 12/16=75%

Mean = 11.56/16=72%

Grade Equivalent = C

Grade Equivalent = C-

November 16, 2005

Table 11

Percentage of **off-campus students** at different levels of ratings in the four writing domains (n=75).

Ratings	Content-Specific		Development		Organization		Language Use & Format	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Poor	4	5	4	5	3	4	1	1
Fair	9	12	10	14	14	19	21	28
Good	37	49	38	51	33	44	45	60
Excellent	25	33	22	29	25	33	8	11

Total Score

Median = 12/16=75%

Mean = 11.91/16=74%

Grade Equivalent = C

Grade Equivalent = C

November 16, 2005

Table 12

Percentage of ULV students at **all campuses** at different levels of ratings in the four writing domains (n=192).

Ratings	Content-Specific		Development		Organization		Language Use & Format	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Poor	14	7	8	4	12	6	5	3
Fair	29	15	37	19	46	24	57	30
Good	87	45	99	52	75	39	100	52
Excellent	62	32	47	25	59	31	30	16

Total Score

Median = 12/16=75%

Mean = 11.71/16=73%

Grade Equivalent = C

Grade Equivalent = C

Note:

- 77 percent of students are at the good or excellent levels in the content-specific and development domains.
- 70 percent of students are at the good or excellent levels in the organization domain.
- 68 percent of students are at the good and excellent levels in the language use and format domain.

Recommendation: Focus writing improvement efforts in the areas of language mechanics and organization.

November 16, 2005

## Writing Rubric

<b>CONTENT-SPECIFIC</b>		
Responds to entire prompt; thorough analysis and evaluation of material, clear thesis	EXCELLENT 4	
General response to prompt; adequate analysis and evaluation; clear thesis	GOOD 3	
Responds to part of prompt only; superficial analysis and evaluation; limited and unclear thesis	FAIR 2	
Inadequate response; little analysis and evaluation; no thesis	POOR 1	
<b>DEVELOPMENT</b>		
Develops thesis thoroughly with exceptional use of evidence	EXCELLENT 4	
Develops thesis effectively	GOOD 3	
Develops thesis superficially	FAIR 2	
No thesis development; redundant or repetitive	POOR 1	
<b>ORGANIZATION</b>		
Main ideas are clear; effective sequencing	EXCELLENT 4	
Main ideas are clear; minor problems in cohesiveness/formulaic	GOOD 3	
Wanders or lacks transitions but thought can be followed	FAIR 2	
Disorganized, confusing, disconnected	POOR 1	
<b>LANGUAGE USE AND FORMAT</b>		
Variety of sentence-types; precise word choice; no grammar or format errors	EXCELLENT 4	
Most sentences are correct; minor errors in grammar but without obscuring meaning	GOOD 3	
Meaning is occasionally confused because of grammar, mechanics, or format	FAIR 2	
Meaning is frequently obscured due to major or frequent sentence problems	POOR 1	
<b>TOTAL</b>		

# University of La Verne Junior-Level Writing Assessment

## Student Cover Sheet and Questionnaire

**STUDENTS:** The Assessment Committee, in conjunction with the Excellence in Writing Committee, is soliciting your paper of 2-3 pages or more in order to determine the effectiveness of ULV's delivery of writing instruction and support. This assessment will not affect your standing at ULV, nor will it affect your grade in the course from which you are submitting your paper. The assessment is to determine how well the university is fulfilling its institutional commitment to provide you with the writing skills and techniques you will require in your future endeavors. As this is a university-wide assessment, your paper will be added to papers from other parts of the university structure from Main Campus to the satellite campuses.

Please complete the following information and submit this form with your paper. Attach this form to the copy of your paper that does not have your or your instructor's name on it. Neither your name nor your instructor's name will be associated with your paper.

### **Previous Writing Instruction**

1. Did you have English 106 or another developmental writing course in preparation for English 109 or English 110 (GEWE1)? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

2. During which calendar year and semester/term did you take *first* semester writing (i.e. English 110, GEWE1)? Give an approximate date if you are unsure.  
Semester/Term \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_

3. Where did you take the equivalent of the *first* semester writing course?  
ULV Main campus \_\_\_\_\_ Off-campus site \_\_\_\_\_  
Community college (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

4. During which calendar year and semester/term did you take the *second* semester writing course (i.e. English 111 or the equivalent)? Give an approximate date if you are unsure.  
Semester/Term \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_ Have yet to take it \_\_\_\_\_

5. Where did you take the equivalent of the *second* semester writing course?  
ULV Main campus \_\_\_\_\_ Off-campus site \_\_\_\_\_  
Other college (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**Writing Needs**

6. How confident do you feel about your writing abilities?

Not confident 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ Very confident

7. What level of support do you need to aid you in your coursework?

Not much support 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ A lot of support

8. What level of support do you need to prepare you for the writing demands of your post-graduation occupation?

Not much support 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ A lot of support

9. If applicable, indicate what level of writing your current job requires (including email, memos, reports, etc.)?

Very low 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ Very high Not applicable \_\_\_\_\_

10. If applicable, is your current level of writing adequate to the writing demands of your job?

Very low 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ Very high Not applicable \_\_\_\_\_

11. How much time do you think you have to dedicate to your writing assignments?

Not enough time 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ More than enough time

12. How much do you value the importance of strong, academic writing?

Very low 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ Very high

**Paper/Process Information**

13. For which course was this paper written? Department \_\_\_\_\_ course number \_\_\_\_\_  
Course title \_\_\_\_\_

14. For the paper you are submitting, check any stages that the paper assignment required and were handed in *to the instructor*:

Outline \_\_\_\_\_ Rough draft \_\_\_\_\_ Second draft \_\_\_\_\_

No draft's were submitted to instructor \_\_\_\_\_

Other stage in the writing process (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

15. If there was a revision process to this paper, how helpful did you find the instructor's (or a peer's) feedback?

Not at all 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ Very helpful Not applicable \_\_\_\_\_

16. Have you utilized the Learning Enhancement Center's (LEC) walk-in or online tutoring services for this assignment? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Never heard of it \_\_\_\_\_

17. Have you utilized the Learning Enhancement Center's (LEC) walk-in or online tutoring services any college writing assignments? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Never heard of it \_\_\_\_\_



**Paper/Process Information**

18. If you used the Learning Enhancement Center's (LEC) services for any assignment, how helpful did you find the tutoring for your writing?

Not at all 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ Very helpful

19. Do you edit your own writing before turning the assignment in for a grade?

Never \_\_\_\_\_ Some of the time \_\_\_\_\_ Most of the time \_\_\_\_\_

20. Do you have someone else (not the LEC) edit your writing before turning it in for a grade (i.e. friend, classmate, spouse, child, etc.)?

Never \_\_\_\_\_ Some of the time \_\_\_\_\_ Most of the time \_\_\_\_\_

21. Do you think you need more assistance in any of the following (check all that apply)?

Lab reports \_\_\_\_\_ Memos \_\_\_\_\_ Resumes/cover letters \_\_\_\_\_

Case reports \_\_\_\_\_ Executive summaries \_\_\_\_\_ Analytical writing \_\_\_\_\_

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

22. How could ULV better help you develop your writing skills (check all that apply)?

\_\_\_\_\_ offer more writing courses

\_\_\_\_\_ require more writing assignments within courses

\_\_\_\_\_ offer more tutoring for help with writing

\_\_\_\_\_ embed the writing process in course instruction

\_\_\_\_\_ other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Personal Information**

What is your major? \_\_\_\_\_

Do you have a minor? If so, what is it?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Minor \_\_\_\_\_

How many credit units are you taking during the current semester/term? \_\_\_\_\_ units

To which ULV population do you belong? (check one)

Traditional Main Campus \_\_\_\_\_ CAPA \_\_\_\_\_ Off-Campus site \_\_\_\_\_

What is your class standing?

Freshman \_\_\_\_\_ Sophomore \_\_\_\_\_ Junior \_\_\_\_\_ Senior \_\_\_\_\_

Which of the following best describes you in regards to knowing/learning English?

Native English speaker \_\_\_\_\_ English as a second language \_\_\_\_\_

English as a foreign language \_\_\_\_\_

What do you estimate your grade point average (GPA) to be? \_\_\_\_\_ average

What is your gender? Female \_\_\_\_\_ Male \_\_\_\_\_

In what year were you born? \_\_\_\_\_

Ethnic background:

\_\_\_\_\_ Asian

\_\_\_\_\_ Anglo-American, non-Hispanic

\_\_\_\_\_ Hispanic

\_\_\_\_\_ Other

\_\_\_\_\_ African-American

\_\_\_\_\_ Decline to state