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How *are we doing?*

Data Share
4/26/17
Three paths to fulfill FWIL

Population (Student Enrollment = 2,205)
- 50.3%
- 39.7%
- 10.0%

Faculty Population (Faculty Members = 91)
- 60%
- 29%
- 11%
Faculty Participation Rates (n = 57)

- ENGS1: 65% (n = 17)
- HCOL85: 100% (n = 10)
- TAP/TAPFYI: 55% (n = 30)
Rating Day

Sample (Student Enrollment = 241)

- 40.2% ENGS1
- 40.2% HCOL
- 19.5% TAP FYI

97 TAP/ TAP FYI papers
97 ENGS 001 papers
47 HCOL papers

241 papers read by 22 raters
The Raters
The Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source quality</th>
<th>4 = exceptional</th>
<th>3 = solid</th>
<th>2 = almost there</th>
<th>1 = just starting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>uses sophisticated well-chosen source material</td>
<td>uses source material/s that mostly seem appropriate to the task</td>
<td>uses texts that are inconsistently appropriate</td>
<td>uses sources that seem inappropriate in some way (bias, credibility, relevance, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engages sources meaningfully with depth, framing, and analysis</td>
<td>generally contextualizes with compelling set-up and commentary</td>
<td>sprinkles texts without contextualizing or discussing them (aka “quote bombs”)</td>
<td>does not engage with other texts meaningfully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizes and synthesizes sources into a point or question of compelling significance</td>
<td>flows well, with clear signals for readers, using textual evidence regarding a coherent point or question</td>
<td>may be organized confusingly at times, or as a linear march without considering sources’ relationships to one another</td>
<td>does not synthesize or analyze, and/or has an incoherent or confusing organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seems to fulfill a clear purpose well</td>
<td>generally achieves what seems to be its purpose</td>
<td>may be approaching a purpose, but is not yet clear</td>
<td>does not appear to fulfill a purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome addressed: **Text draws on multiple appropriate sources, organizing and synthesizing information from those sources to serve a specific purpose**
Holistic Results: TAP/TAPFYI, ENGS1, HCOL
Holistic Means: TAP/TAPFYI, ENGS1, HCOL

ENGS1: 2.7
HCOL85: 3.0
TAP/TAPFYI: 2.5
Engagement Quality Result: All Paths
Engagement Quality Results: TAP/TAPFYI, ENGS1, HCOL
Engagement Quality Results: TAP/TAPFYI, ENGS1, HCOL
Engagement Quality Means: TAP/TAPFYI, ENGS1, HCOL

- ENGS1: 2.6
- HCOL85: 2.9
- TAP/TAPFYI: 2.4
Source Quantity Results: TAP, ENGS1, HCOL
Do fewer sources result in greater engagement?
Do fewer sources result in greater engagement?

NO
Holistic Result: Cumulative Frequency
Engagement Quality Result: Cumulative Frequency
So what do you make of all this?