Examining, Exploring, and Aligning the Current Writing Assessment

For

English 91 Grammar Skills

A Special Project

Presented to

Dr. Gretta Merwin

Heritage University

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirement for the Degree of

Masters of Education

_____

Jana Freese

Spring 2008

FACULTY APPROVAL

Examining, Exploring, and Aligning the Current Writing Assessment

For

English 91 Grammar Skills

Approved for the Faculty

_____, Faculty Advisor

ABSTRACT

The purpose for the research was to examine the effects of a different assessment for the writing portion of the English 91 Grammar Skills course at a community college in eastern Washington. The researcher observed how the new assessment impacted instructor feedback regarding writing assignments. A newly created sentence level assessment, with focused and aligned course content skills, was used to guide and assess beginning level writing students, which included several English language learner students. The researcher predicted student gains as a result of the new assessment as measured by the pre and post standard language Test of Adult Basic Education.

PERMISSION TO STORE

I, Jana Freese, do hereby irrevocably consent and authorize Heritage College Library to file the attached Special Project entitled, Examining, Exploring, and Aligning the Current Writing Assessment For English 91 Grammar Skills, and make such paper available for the use, circulation and/or reproduction by the library. The paper may be used at Heritage College Library and all site locations.

I state at this time the contents of this paper are my work and completely original unless properly attributed and/or used with permission. I understand that after three years the paper will be retired from the Heritage College Library. If I choose, it is my responsibility to retrieve the paper at that time. If the paper is not retrieved, Heritage College may dispose of it.

_____, Author

_____, Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Background for the Project

According to the fall quarterly course catalog for the community college

where the research took place, the English 91 Grammar Skills course was

designed as:

A review of basic grammar including sample writing, sentence structure,

usage, and mechanics. The grade is pass/no credit. Class is held in the

Learning Opportunity Center (LOC) where instruction is a lab format.

Prerequisite: Asset score of 23-32 or COMPASS test score of 1-12.

(Columbia Basin College, 2007, p. 31)

Comparatively, a student must have scored a 43 or above on the ASSET or score

above 78 on the Computer-adaptive Placement, Assessment, and Support System

test to have been placed into an English 101 class. These two placement tests

represented the standard college entry placement exams for this community

college.

English 91 has been offered as a remedial or pre-college level course for

students that needed sentence structure and grammar review. The chapter tests on

the Plan and Profile were created by full-time instructors employed in the Basic

Skills Division at the community college where the research took place. These

formative chapter tests were based on content from the text, *Sentence Essentials,*

by Linda Wong (2002). However, the writing rubric used to score the paragraph writing assignment for each chapter on the Plan and Profile (student lesson plan) was the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System. The Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System website (CASAS, 2007) claimed that the system was field-tested and validated with both native and non-native speakers of English:

> As part of the 1993 revalidation process by the U.S. Department of Education Program Effectiveness Panel, CASAS submitted data supporting its effectiveness for both learners and programs. The findings document that learners enrolled in adult and alternative education programs that have implemented key elements of the CASAS system demonstrate significant learning gains, demonstrate increased hours of participation, and achieve increased goal attainment. This unique system includes more than 180 standardized assessments. . . . Instructors can use the system to place learners in programs, diagnose learners' instructional needs, monitor progress, and certify mastery of functional basic skills. A variety of assessment instruments measure functional reading, math, listening, writing, speaking, and critical thinking skills in everyday life and work contexts for youth and adult learners. CASAS field-tests and validates its assessments with both native and non-native speakers of English. (p.1)

Used in the intended way with Adult Basic Education programs and students, the

Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System website claimed that, through

years of research, the use of the rubric was valid and reliable; however, the

researcher at the community college contended that it failed to align with the

Developmental Education course content of English 91.

The English 91 grammar skills course offered variable credit of 1-3. To

earn one credit, a student must have completed a minimum of three chapters in

the text, 2 subsequent teacher-created chapter tests, and three writing samples. To

earn three credits a student must have completed nine chapters of text, nine

chapter tests, nine writing samples, and a final cumulative test. Except for chapter

one, the chapter content addressed grammar function such as nouns, prepositions,

and subject verb agreement. Formative assessment for this course was designed

in several ways, but a student could not move on to the next chapter until the

student had completed a written assignment for the current chapter (see Appendix

B: Plan and Profile).

According to the book, *Deciding What to Teach and Test: Developing,*

Aligning, and Auditing Curriculum, by F.W. English (2000):

> Curriculum alignment refers to the match or overlap between the content
>
> and format of the test and the content and format of the curriculum (or the
>
> curriculum surrogate such as the textbook) . . . . Curriculum alignment is

a process to improve the match between the formal instruction that occurs

in the school and the classroom and that which any test will measure.

(p. 63)

Curriculum alignment was recognized by educators as an important key for

student success and the promotion of thinking and learning (Andrade, 2000).

Statement of the Problem

In general, student success improved when a student knew both the

curriculum content of a subject matter and understood how a test was used to

measure that content knowledge. Therefore, historically, alignment of curriculum,

instruction, and assessment has been important to accurately measure student

gains. According to English (2000) a true measured gain has not been obtained if

a student was not given instruction on what was assessed. The English 91

grammar skills class at the observed community college used the writing rubric

produced by The Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System, which

included the five criteria of content, organization, word choice, sentence structure

and grammar, and spelling and punctuation; however, limited knowledge of this

rubric criteria was included in the English 91 course content. The lack of

instructional alignment with the rubric criteria made grading the writing portion

of the grammar course inconsistent among instructors, despite norming sessions.

Also, when the researcher examined student writing samples scored with the

Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment rubric, the researcher found that

instructors frequently failed to provide relevant course content feedback (from chapters of the *Sentence Essentials* text) on writing samples. Instead, the feedback given was based on the five criteria of the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment writing rubric. Therefore, assessment of the writing samples did not align with the instructional content, (grammar and sentence level), as opposed to the paragraph level of writing.

Purpose of the Project

The purpose of the project was to examine the effects of a different assessment on the English 91 grammar skills course. Instead of the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment rubric that focused on holistic paragraph skills, a sentence level assessment was created that guided the students with scoring knowledge and expectations for each chapter content. In addition, writing samples were assessed using no more than two chapter content areas, which included only the previous and current chapter being tested. These changes were implemented for the prediction of greater student gains of the course content as tested by chapter tests and a pre and post standardized language Test of Adult Basic Education.

Delimitations

The research took place in a community college in eastern Washington. The students involved were all enrolled in the English 91 grammar skills course, which was part of the Basic Skills Division. The courses took place in a lab

setting where students were required to work a minimum of 4 hours a week over an 11-week quarter. Three daytime classes were selected. The study involved 19 students. The students were self-placed or placed in this course by a college assessment test: Asset or the Computer-adaptive Placement, Assessment, and Support System test. The Basic Skills division, in general, consisted of a diverse population with varied ethnicities that included Russian, Ukrainian, African, African American, and Euro American, with a predominately Hispanic population and approximately 50 % of English Language Learners.

<u>Assumptions</u>

The Instructors working in the Learning Opportunity Center at the community college had a minimum education level of a bachelor's degree. All five full-time instructors had obtained a master's degree in education while employed as an instructor or prior to employment as an instructor at the community college. All instructors using the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System writing assessment rubric had, at minimum, one training that pertained to use and interpretation of the rubric and a minimum of one norming session where anchor papers and the rubric criteria were used to compare instructors' scoring. The text used for the English 91 course was *Sentence Essentials* by Linda Wong (2002), and online ACE practice tests provided an additional resource by the author of the text and by the publishing company, Houghton Mifflin.

The researcher had worked in the lab since 1997. In addition to facilitating the English 91 course in the lab, the researcher also taught two different levels of pre-college English in a classroom setting, which included paragraph and essay development.

Hypothesis

Aligning the writing curriculum of English 91 with a sentence level assessment, rather than using the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System writing rubric, will promote more student content comprehension of the subject matter and will increase relevant content feedback from instructors on student writing samples, which will increase student gains. Student gains will be measured through scores on the language Test for Adult Basic Education pre and post tests level D, Form 7 and 8.

Null Hypothesis

Aligning the writing curriculum of English 91 with a sentence level assessment, rather than using the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System writing rubric, will not promote more student comprehension of the content subject matter and will not increase student gains as measured through scores on the language Test for Adult Basic Education pre and post tests.

Significance of the Project

Through the researcher's past experience in scoring the writing samples for the English 91 grammar skills course, the researcher recognized inconsistent

scoring among instructors and irrelevant instructional feedback. Instructor

feedback on student writing samples, including the researcher's, had not matched

the content of the text, *Sentence Essentials,* (Wong, 2002) when instructors used

the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System writing rubric criteria (see

Appendix A: CASAS functional writing scoring rubric). When instructors focused

on the five criteria of the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System

rubric: content, organization, word choice, grammar and sentence structure, and

spelling and punctuation, instead of the content areas of the *Sentence Essentials'*

(Wong, 2002) chapters (nouns, prepositional phrases, subject verb agreement, and

other grammar skills) the students had not receive the benefit of aligned

instruction and assessment and the opportunity for more relevant feedback to

enhance understanding of the course content.

Since the introduction of the English 91 Grammar Skills Plan and Profile

revision, August 2005, several of the Learning Opportunity Center instructors

commented that students' writing skills had not benefited from the use of the

Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System scoring rubric. In addition, the

researcher believed that the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System

writing rubric used for this course was misused as a means of assessment for the

text, *Sentence Essentials*, (Wong, 2002) which focused predominately on sentence

level writing and grammar content, not paragraph development.

Procedure

  Nineteen students from three daytime classes in the Learning Opportunity
Center of the participating community college were selected. The students were
pre-tested with the language Test of Adult Basic Education level D, Form 7, to
establish a beginning level of grammar knowledge. After a grade level
equivalency was established from the result of the test, the students were given a
Plan and Profile (lesson plan) for the English 91 Grammar Skills course. The
researcher and participating instructors gave the new writing assessment to the
participating students after students completed chapter exercises. The instructors
also provided the students with chapter summary reviews to promote
understanding and reinforcement of the sentence level and grammar chapter
content, for which the students would be assessed.

  The newly formulated assessment was based on the *Sentence Essentials'
(*Wong, 2002*)* chapter content only, instead of the five criteria from the
Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System writing rubric. The new
writing assessment and chapter summaries provided a tool for student self
assessment and provided the content and criteria for which the students' writing
samples were scored. Written feedback on the writing samples were limited to
instructional content from the previous and current chapters studied.

For example, in chapter 3 students studied and completed exercises about prepositional phrases and the previous chapter's lessons involved nouns (see Appendix C: writing assessment sample chapter 2 and 3, nouns and prepositions).

The researcher scored the writing samples for chapter 3 based on only those two grammar skills. Each subsequent chapter was assessed on the current chapter and previous chapter, only. After completion of the plan and profile and all chapter tests, including the cumulative final, the students were administered a post-test of the language Test of Adult Basic Education level D, Form 8, that measured student gain.

Definition of Terms

Anchor papers: Anchor papers were example papers that showed gradation of levels for scoring papers using a rubric.

Asset: Asset (a trademarked assessment test) scores were used by the college where the research took place as a student placement guide into basic skills reading, writing and mathematics as well as advanced mathematics.

ACE practice tests: Ace practice tests were online resources: tests and practices, provided by Houghton Mifflin Publishers for college level students that can be found at college.hmco.com/devenglish/resources/writingace/students/.

Plan and Profile: The plan and profile was a lesson plan that students followed in the English 91 grammar skills course that contained the chapter lessons and test requirements for the quarter. Instructor sign-offs were required on the plan and

profile for lessons, writing samples, and tests in order for students to advance to the next chapter/lesson.

Rubrics: The website, NIU Office of Assessment Services (2007), described rubrics as: "A set of categories that define and describe the important components of the work being completed, critiqued or assessed. Each category contains a graduation of levels of completion or competence with a score assigned to each level and a clear description of what criteria need to be met to attain the score at each level." www.niu.edu/assessment/Resources/Assessment_Glossary.htm

Acronyms

ABE - Adult Basic Education

CASAS - Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System

COMPASS - Computer-adaptive Placement, Assessment, and Support System

Dev Ed - Developmental Education

ELL - English language learners

LOC - Learning Opportunity Center

TABE - Test of Adult Basic Education

CHAPTER 2

Review of Selected Literature

The examination of the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System

(CASAS) scoring rubric, analysis of the use and reliability of rubrics, assessment

of feedback on students' papers, emphasis of curriculum alignment, and the

creation of assessment were all part of the literature reviewed, whereby the

researcher gained information, created new assessment, and made

recommendations regarding aligned instruction and assessment for the English 91

course at the community college where the research took place.

The Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS)

When the researcher investigated information regarding the background

and use of the CASAS writing rubric, the researcher found that there had been

over 21 years of research completed that validated this system's reliability as a

norming, placement, or progress monitoring tool for writing. The CASAS

website (2007, p.1) claimed that "the assessment assists programs and instructors

in determining a learner's general writing level. It is appropriate for use with

students with beginning to advanced level writing skills. . . . There are three 30-

minute writing tasks (Picture, Form, and Letter)."

The CASAS website also advised that scorers be thoroughly trained in the

use of the rubrics to maintain standards, and that two readers needed to score the

writing sample if the assessment was used for accountability reporting or high

stakes situations. If only one reader was used to score the writing sample, the CASAS trainers strongly recommended that readers were continuously monitored to maintain scoring accuracy. Instructors in the Learning Opportunity Center (LOC) were trained every three years in the use of the CASAS scoring system; however, problems with scoring inconsistencies and with relevant instructional feedback persisted when the CASAS rubric was used as a grading tool for the writing samples of English 91 participants. First, the students' writing samples were not scored by two readers. Secondly, of the CASAS writing tasks mentioned above, Picture, Form, and Letter, only the picture writing task was used by the English 91 students and then only initially, as a determinant of a student's baseline writing ability. All of the other required writing topics were composed by an instructor from the LOC and did not pertain to the writing tasks for which the CASAS rubric was designed and tested. Furthermore, limited or no instruction was given to the students regarding the CASAS scoring rubric.

Rubrics "The Good, Bad, and Ugly"

The structure and purpose of rubrics have provided instructional guidance as well as assessment resources based on a criterion for a piece of work. Rubric's validity and reliability are "concerned with the consistency and accuracy of the judgments we make about students and their work" (Payne, 2003). According to (Andrade, 2005), rubrics contained "good, bad, or ugly" qualities depending on an instructor's creation or use of the rubric. Rubrics proved to be advantageous in

instruction and assessment because rubrics described not only the desirable qualities of a student's work, but also the common pitfalls. These two-fold descriptors gave students informative feedback, which helped them "think, learn and produce high quality work" (Andrade, 2005, p. 27). However, when used incorrectly or created without reliability, validity, or equity towards the students being graded, rubrics lost effectiveness.

The use of the CASAS rubric to grade the writing samples of the English 91 students represented an example of a misused rubric. The state of Washington adopted the CASAS testing system as a required standardized test to measure Adult Basic Education gains, but that assessment tool was not required for Developmental Education classes such as the English 91 course. Because the CASAS rubric was designed for a specific form, the rubric was not aligned well with the English 91 course curriculum.

Following previous research concerning how rubrics might (or might not) support academic achievement (Andrade, 2000, 2001, Goodrich, 1997), Andrade stated that the "good" characteristics of rubrics were found when an instructional rubric was designed from a list of goals for students and a chosen project that helped them learn and demonstrate student learning. In this way, the rubric helped students focus on the goal of an assignment as well as enhanced effort. The CASAS writing rubric did neither. Andrade described an instructional rubric as:

Usually a . . . one or two-page document that describes varying levels of

quality, from excellent to poor, for a specific assignment. It is usually used

with a relatively complex assignment, such as a long-term project, an

essay, or a research paper. Its purposes are to give students informative

feedback about their works in progress and to give detailed evaluations of

their final product. (2000, p.1)

Some of the most effective rubrics that promoted student understanding

and learning were rubrics Andrade co-created with students. Although the new

instructional assessment was not co-created with the English 91 students, the

researcher considered student learning goals and how the new assessment allowed

for student demonstration of the course content knowledge.

On the other hand, the "bad" use of rubrics, such as poorly created or

misused rubrics as a substitute for effective teaching, worried Andrade. Through

research with 7th graders and subsequent teaching assignments, Andrade found

that students needed help in understanding a rubric's function and use. Students

became good at both peer assessment and self assessment once a student, through

the modeled use of rubrics, was convinced of a rubric's value and the student had

practiced using one. When students used rubrics for instruction and assessment,

more accountability was assigned to the student. The original intent of the

CASAS rubric for the English 91 course was to have students self grade each

writing sample with the CASAS scoring rubric, whereby students gained

awareness of the CASAS rubric's criteria; however, that practice was not followed and the CASAS rubric lost effectiveness as a instructional and scoring tool.

Andrade (2005) stated that "ugly" rubrics were used without careful and diligent attention to reliability, validity and fairness: "I have seen some very idiosyncratic rubrics in my day, and this is where it gets ugly" (p. 30). "At a minimum, an instructional rubric must be aligned with reasonable and respectable standards and with the curriculum being taught in order to be valid. It must pass a test of reliability by resulting in similar ratings when used by different people" (Andrade 2000, p. 30). Clearly, on the point of similar ratings, the CASAS rubric failed to serve the student in that the rubric had not aligned with "reasonable and respectable standards" to the curriculum that was taught in the English 91 course. Andrade (2005) suggested that rubrics improved when aligned with standards, were shared with other instructors for critique, or when instructors requested that other teachers co-scored assignments. To heighten interrater reliability of the new English 91 assessment, the researcher requested that other instructors graded the participating students' writing assessments.

Feedback: Assessing the Impact of Evaluation on Developing Writers

Andrade (2000) stated that the need for selective criteria for assessment and a thorough understanding of that criteria, prior to being used, was essential for student gain. Student writing samples from the fall quarter of the English 91

course that were reviewed by the researcher suggested that feedback often failed to match the course content, and outside of the writing prompt, no clear explanation of expectation or scoring was given that matched the course content. Spelling errors were among the most frequent instructors' feedback found on students' papers, and although spelling was included in the criteria of the CASAS rubric, spelling was not a content consideration of the text book. Furthermore, instructor notations on previous students writing samples included such feedback as "This needs a thesis statement," and on the third rewrite of a student's draft, the researcher found the comments, "You did not fix the spelling errors," and "Have an instructor show you how to look words up in the dictionary;" thus the student failed the draft, again. No commentary on the chapter content was offered on this paper by the instructor.

A case study by Brenda Helmbrecht (2007), the current Writing Director at California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo and a teacher of first-year writing, followed one basic writer's experience with assessment throughout the student's first year writing courses. Helmbrecht's research was conducted to determine if the "marginalia" and assessment practices applied to struggling writers' essays effectively moved them into "academic discourse" or scared them away from such an ambition, altogether. Helmbrecht observed both the assessment practices of instructors and the subject's reaction and regard to them. At the conclusion of the case study, Helmbrecht (2007) suggested:

We need to determine whether our methods of evaluation encourage

students to acquire the self-assessment skills needed to develop the writing

ability and literacy preferred by other disciplinary audiences within the

academy. In this regard, when Paul looked at the assessment of his writing

and felt insulted, angry, and stupid, his instructor's comments, and perhaps

even his good intentions, ceased to be relevant for Paul, whose motivation

to learn how to write for his college courses was waning. (p. 5)

The researcher's concerns for the English 91 grammar students' attitudes toward

writing and feedback, and the students' progress, were validated by Helmbrecht's

case study, which begged the questions: Was instructors' irrelevant feedback on

the students' writing assessment negatively affecting student motivation and the

students' desire to learn? Did the students gain any academic benefit from

feedback when it was not content specific?

<u>Curriculum Alignment</u>

The English 91 grammar course had several different components:

exercises from the text, *Sentence Essentials*, (Wong, 2002), a writing assessment

that relied on the CASAS rubric to score, and a frontloaded, instructor-created

chapter assessment. In Chapter 1, English's book, *Deciding What to Teach and

Test: Developing, Aligning, and Auditing Curriculum* (2000), emphasized the

importance of curriculum alignment--a match of instruction received by the

students with what was assessed. When created, assessment was either

frontloaded or backloaded. Either method has been noted for a degree of difficulty and controversy.

Arguments for frontloading, the process by which an educator wrote the curriculum first and then created or searched for an appropriate assessment that measured content knowledge, "is nearly universal in being preferred as a practice in schools because it establishes the primacy of the curriculum to which the test must follow and not lead. . . .the test always follows the curriculum and does not 'establish' it" (English, 2000, p. 64). Researchers have found that local educators resisted, with a skeptical regard, most standardized tests. Educators have refused the practice of "teaching to the test" because it raised the question of who possessed curriculum building expertise, local educators or standardized test makers. English (2000) reported that local educators also resisted standardized tests because such tests "may represent an extremely narrow and rigid view of the actual goals and objectives of any local curriculum."

In the case of the English 91 curriculum, which was grammar and sentence level construction, the standardized CASAS rubric writing assessment was not well matched to the goals and objectives of the course. However, English (2000) asserted that frontloading assessment had problems, as well, because "locally developed tests are notoriously poor as instruments, lacking reliability and usually loaded on the bottom end of rote memorization test items requiring little, if any, upper level thinking or problem-solving abilities on the part of the

students" (p. 65). In addition, "frontloading is the most expensive way to obtain alignment because an entire curriculum has to be written before it can be aligned" (English 2000, p. 69).

On the other hand, English (2000) stated:

Backloading refers to the practice of establishing the match by working from the test 'back to' the curriculum. It means that the test *becomes the curriculum*. In this case, there is always 100% alignment because the curriculum to be taught was derived from the test to be given. (p. 70)

Two implications of backloading were that whoever wrote the test also wrote the curriculum or local control was sacrificed. Second, the issue of "teaching to the test" raised ethical and procedural questions. Backloading curriculum risked implication of a value-laden selection of test questions. What were the possibilities that the test questions excluded some important curriculum that a student should know, but was not valued by the test constructor?

So, the construction of an assessment tool that tested students fairly and equitably, without prejudice, posed a significant challenge for the researcher. Most of the decision to design a frontloaded writing assessment for the English 91 course was driven by use of a text already adopted by the college. The course curriculum, at the current point, was structured around the text, *Sentence Essentials*, (Wong, 2002). Thus, content alignment relied on using the text to construct a writing assessment, not a pre-designed rubric such as the CASAS,

which had not addressed the content of the text. English (2000, p. 86-87) emphasized that "Alignment is facilitated when situations are taught so that the learner more readily recognizes them when they occur. . . .*Alignment* is a process of teaching the learner to recognize similar situations (content and formats) by which assessment will take place" (p. 86-87). Often the majority of English 91 students needed grammar remediation and syntactical emphasis. A student would not recognize the *content and format* of the CASAS rubric when instruction concerning the rubric's criteria was not taught. The text emphasized parts of speech and sentence construction and punctuation; therefore, the researcher wanted to develop a writing assessment that aligned with the text.

Teaching Writing to English Language Learners

Although the background of ELL students varied, students who attended college as a first generation student in a higher education setting sometimes exhibited a strong attachment to both culture and native language. Thus, both the learning atmosphere and college experience were challenging and sometimes isolating. Since the English 91 class had a history of serving ELL students, the researcher was concerned about a valid assessment that would include all students and promote better writing, equitably.

In the article, *Teaching Writing to Linguistically Diverse Students*, Karen Hornick (1986) offered 14 suggestions for the inclusion of ELL students in the writing process. Her strategies were designed to promote confidence in the ELL's

language and writing skills. Many of her suggestions, such as direct instruction in specific strategies and techniques for writing, as well as teacher modeled writing and participation in the writing process, applied more to a classroom setting. Consequently, since the English 91 students participated in a lab setting instead of a contained classroom, opportunities for most direct instruction were limited. However, the suggestion to give students regular and substantial practice in writing, opportunities to practice writing for a varied audience, suggestions for teachers to moderately mark surface errors on student's writing assessment, and the suggestion for teachers to have a positive attitude were classroom factors that were controllable when the new assessment was designed for the lab environment. In addition, the students had opportunities to experience a one-to-one conference with an instructor when it was necessary for any student to repeat a writing assessment. As cited in Hornick, (1986), Bruner (1982) stated:

> Student-teacher conferences have long been viewed as a very effective means of providing writing instruction. Conferences can provide "scaffolding," a mechanism by which a more experienced learner or thinker provides temporary intellectual support that assists a learner in developing new ways of thinking. (p.3)

Summary

In conclusion, the primary concern was to examine the content of the English 91 course and align the writing assessment with the content of the text as

an equitable determinant of student gains regarding content knowledge. Factors that were considered were method of curriculum alignment, rubrics as assessment, student and learning diversity, and the impact of instructional delivery and feedback.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology and Treatment of Data

<u>Introduction</u>

The importance of a valid and reliable assessment tool was researched, including both instructional and scoring rubrics. The assessment was designed by considering the most equitable writing assessment for all participants. Of primary concern was the alignment of the writing assessment with the course text, *Sentence Essentials*, (Wong, 2002) in the English 91 course. The desired outcome was improved student understanding of the course content (parts of speech and sentence construction) as well as improved performance on chapter tests as measured through the pre and post tests of the language TABE D, Form 7 and 8, standardized test.

<u>Methodology</u>

A quantitative approach was used for the project. "Quantitative research approaches are applied in order to describe current conditions, investigate relationships, and study cause-effect phenomena" (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006, p. 10). The researcher was investigating the effect of a new assessment on the students' gains in the subject content and application of the English 91 course curriculum as delivered in the text, *Sentence Essentials*, (Wong, 2002).

Participants

The study used 19 students from the winter quarter enrollment of English 91 in the LOC at a community college in eastern Washington. The LOC provided a lab setting whereby students worked from a Plan and Profile to complete assignments with facilitated instruction, as opposed to direct instruction. The students self-selected this class or were placed in this class according to the students' COMPASS writing scores. A majority of the students in the study group were ELL, with 60% Hispanic (Spanish as a first language), 5% Russian and 5% Filipino, while 30% of the participants spoke English as a first language.

Instruments

Throughout the study, student writing assessment scores were recorded from the individual's writing sample or from the Plan and Profile, by pen, onto a student roster sheet and were kept in a folder for the project. The writing assessment scores were used as consequential data for instructors in the LOC to compare achievement in writing outcomes with students who were not using the new assessment. To measure student gain overall, the researcher used the language TABE D, Form 8, as a post test. To address the validity and reliability of the TABE test, publisher CBT McGraw-Hill 9, (2007) described the Test of Adult Basic Education as the following:

TABE is the nation's most widely used test for adult basic education. TABE provides the most reliable measurement of reading, mathematics, and

language skills for adults. It's the only basic skills test for which all items have been normed on adults. . . . . Highly validated, this norm-referenced test provides accurate pre- and post- testing and can be used for employee screening, as well as to measure post-learning gains. (paragraph 1)

Design

The author used a pre and post standardized test of the language TABE D, Form 7 and 8, which measured student gain. The assumption was that the pre/post scores would demonstrate a cause and effect phenomenon that the newly designed writing assessment caused greater student gains of the English 91 course content. The design referred to correlational research. "Correlational research involves collecting data to determine whether, and to what degree, a relationship exists between two or more quantifiable variables" (Gay et al., 2006, pp.10, 11).

Procedure

The researcher reviewed each chapter's introduction and summary of the *Sentence Essentials,* (Wong, 2002) text and reviewed additional online exercises provided by the text's publisher, Houghton Mifflin, to obtain the content for the new writing assessment. The new writing assessment focused on a single chapter with a few concepts from the previous chapter. The limited content was chosen to test for understanding and to assure that instruction matched the assessment. The former assessment required paragraph construction and was scored with the CASAS writing rubric, which had not matched the course content. The students

were provided with instructional resources when performing the writing assessment such as individual chapter summaries and lists of parts of speech (such as prepositions) when memorizing such lists was not reasonable.

The new assessment included aligned chapter content, as well as scoring and passing criteria for the student's observation. The new writing assessment was administered to the student after the same number of chapter exercises and practices were completed from the Plan and Profile as the former writing assessment, and prior to the chapter test, to see if marked improvement occurred on the chapter tests as a result of the sentence level assessment and single chapter focus. At the beginning of the quarter, students were given a TABE D, Form 7, pre test. At the end of the quarter the students who had completed all 9 chapters on the Plan and Profile and passed the cumulative final were given an exit post test: TABE D, Form 8. Both pre and post tests were administered in a proctored, private testing area.

Treatment of the Data

At the conclusion of the winter quarter at the community college where the research took place, students who completed the nine chapters of the three credit English 91 course and the cumulative final with a passing grade were administered the post test of the language TABE D, Form 8. The pre and post tests were compared using a t-test correlation table from the statistical software STATPAK (2007). Pre and post tests were compared to see if there were

consistent gains or to determine any gain in the participating students' post test scores.

Summary

After the new writing assessment was designed, it was administered to the participating students at the conclusion of the chapter lessons and before the chapter tests. To pass the writing assessment, students were required to score an eighty percent. If a student did not score an eighty percent, the student was asked to rewrite the assessment. However, the assumption was that the new assessment eliminated or reduced the need to repeat the assessment, and therefore, enhanced a student's success rate at completing three credits of the English 91 curriculum in one quarter. Failure to complete three credits in one quarter was a common problem in past quarters. The choice to change the writing assessment was one way in which the researcher addressed this course failure. Moreover, the standardized language TABE test, Level D, Form 8, was used to assess and compare student gain.

CHAPTER 4

Analysis of the Data

Introduction

The nineteen students involved in this study were taking a Grammar 91 pre college English class that primarily focused on parts of speech and sentence construction. The three credit course required the completion of nine chapters that included grammar exercises and quizzes, a writing assessment for each chapter, and a chapter test. For three credits, a student needed to complete a cumulative final test as well. At the completion of the winter quarter, the researcher gathered the remaining data from students' writing assessment scores, chapter tests scores, and for the students who completed all the course work for three credits, the scores from the TABE D Language post test, Form 8.

Description of the Environment

The research took place in a community college in eastern Washington. The students involved were all enrolled in the English 91 grammar skills course, which was part of the Basic Skills Division. The classes took place in a lab setting where students were required to work a minimum of four hours a week over an 11-week quarter. Instruction was facilitative as opposed to direct, and instructors varied throughout the day. Three daytime classes were selected. The study involved 19 students. The students were self-placed or placed in this course by a college assessment test: Asset or the Computer-adaptive Placement, Assessment,

and Support System test. A majority of the students in the study group were ELL, with 60% Hispanic (Spanish as a first language), 5% Russian and 5% Filipino, while 30% of the participants spoke English as a first language.

Hypothesis

Aligning the writing curriculum of English 91 with a sentence level assessment, rather than using the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System writing rubric, will promote more student content comprehension of the subject matter and will increase relevant content feedback from instructors on student writing samples, which will increase student gains. Student gains will be measured through scores on the language Test for Adult Basic Education pre and post tests level D, Form 7 and 8.

Null Hypothesis

Aligning the writing curriculum of English 91 with a sentence level assessment, rather than using the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System writing rubric, will not promote more student comprehension of the content subject matter and will not increase student gains as measured through scores on the language Test for Adult Basic Education pre and post tests.

Results of the Study

The TABE English language pre and post test contained 55 questions that tested the students' English language grammar, sentence structure, and sentence sequence skills. The tested skills were consistent with the skills in the Grammar

91 course text, *Sentence Essentials*, by Wong (2002). The rate of student

completion for three credits was 8/18 or 44% (of the 19 participants, one student

withdrew from the course). Of the eight students who passed with three credits,

seven posted significant gains as shown by the TABE D language pre and post

test, Form7 and Form 8 (only students who completed 3 credits were post tested).

The STATPAK (2007) statistical software was used to enter the students' pre and

post TABE scores into a t-test for nonindependent samples.

Table 1: t-test of Pre/Post TABE D Form 7/8 Engish Language Test Results W08

Test	Students	Mean	Standard Deviation
Pre	8	5.19	2.09
Post	8	7.42	2.52

df=7   t=4.47   p<.01

Table 2: Writing Assessment Total Class Averages winter 08

	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
42	Average Class Score	87.89	81.88	87.83	85.25	85.27	84.70	82.22	80.75
43	Average Class Attempts	1.44	1.06	1.00	1.25	1.09	1.20	1.22	1.38

Table 3: Unit Exam Passing Student Averages

	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
29	W08 Average Test Score	83.9	85.8	82.5	87.7	84.2	83.2	83.3	85.1	81.9
30	W08 Attempts	1.58	1.67	1.90	1.60	2.20	2.11	1.88	2.00	1.50
31	F07 Attempts	1.43	1.56	2.07	1.15	1.92	1.22	1.00	1.62	1.38
32	Attempt Dev. W08 to F07	0.15	0.11	-0.17	0.45	0.28	0.89	0.88	0.38	0.12

<u>Findings</u>

Based on the findings in Table 1, p< .01, the null hypothesis was rejected. The Grammar 91 course offered variable credit. However, only the students who completed 3 credits were post-tested. The total pass/fail rates for all 19 participants in the research project were:

A. One student withdrew.

B. Four students received a pass by reducing their credits from three credits to one or two credits.

C. Eight students passed with 3 credits.

D. The overall pass rate for all participants (1-3 credits) was 12/18 or 66.6 % (withdrawn student not included in percentage).

E. Six students failed (received a Z); however, fifty percent of the failing students (3) had completed enough course work to receive a passing grade for one or two credits, but failed to apply for the variable credit. The total pass rate for students with one to three credits increased to 15/18 or 83% when students eligible for credit (but did not apply) were included in the statistics.

<u>Discussion</u>

A main focus of the writing assessment modification for English 91 was that the modification improved student gains not only through pre and post test scores, but also through the completion of three credits. A foremost concern of the

LOC instructors and coordinator was prior students' failure to complete three credits in one quarter. Thus the researcher modified the writing component to align with the text chapters to reduce student attempts at both the writing assessment and chapter tests. The winter 08 data of the writing assessment attempts by both passing and failing students was reflected in Table 2.

Prior to the writing assessment modification for the English 91 research, students were required to write a minimum of two paragraphs that included a draft and a final. However, students were also required to write the final paragraph at a passing rate of eighty percent: a minimum score on the CASAS rubric of 56/70. Thus all students who took Grammar 91 courses in previous quarters when the CASAS rubric was used, took the writing assessment at least twice or until the eighty percent was reached. The repeated attempts at the writing assessment slowed student progress towards the completion of chapter tests and for the completion of three credits. Table 2 reflected that all winter 08 participating students (pass or fail) reduced the average number of times that the writing assessment was taken when the writing assessment was modified and aligned with the text, *Sentence Essentials,* (Wong, 2002). All students averaged less than two attempts. So, in terms of the reduction of writing assessment attempts, the modification was successful. However, Table 3 reflected that when compared to the fall 2007 passing students' chapter test attempts, the results showed that the writing assessment modification for winter 08 students had not reduced the

students' number of attempts at chapter tests (except for test four: Subject and Verbs in Simple Sentences). At the conclusion of the quarter, the researcher found that one instructor had not consistently followed the laddered structure of the writing assessment modification, which was to ensure that students always took the writing assessment before the chapter test. The writing assessment was written to help the student reduce the number of chapter test attempts.

Prior to the writing assessment modification in the English 91 course, previous research by an instructor in the LOC showed varying quarterly outcomes in passing student percentages for the English 91 course from fall 2006 through fall of 2007. In the College Assessment Report (2008), Nina Liebler, reported:

Rate of Passing Grammar 91 (LOC)

Fall 2006:	75% of those completing at least one credit. 67% of all originally enrolled.
Winter 2007:	59% of those completing at least one credit. 45% of all originally enrolled
Spring 2007:	81% of those completing at least one credit. 76.5% of all original enrolled.
Fall 2007:	45% of those completing at least one credit. 42% of all originally enrolled.

The winter 08 outcome for the research participants showed a pass rate of 12/18 or 66.6 % for students who took 1-3 credits. The varied statistical findings posed queries from other instructors in the LOC as to the cause or causes of the various outcomes. The writing assessment modification was one way in which the

researcher attempted to address and identify the differential in quarterly pass rates.

Instructor feedback on the writing assessment was another factor the researcher observed for impact on the students' course content understanding. The researcher predicted that more relevant content feedback on the writing assessment helped students achieve gains. In fact, instructor commentary on the writing assessment, although not specifically more positive, was often more relevant and content specific. For example, because the writing assessment focused on the specific chapter content skills, instructor feedback referred the student to chapter summaries, page numbers of the text, or back to the writing assessment directions when a student failed to pass the writing assessment. Such content and assessment specific guidelines may have contributed to the students' post test gains.

<u>Summary</u>

To conclude, the TABE post test scores showed that students who completed three credits made significant gains. The modified writing assessment reduced the number of attempts at the writing assessment, and the instructor feedback was more content specific. Table 3 revealed that students who participated in the writing modification research did not reduce the number of attempts at the chapter test, when compared to the students of the previous quarter, fall 2007. The writing assessment modification was one way in which the

researcher attempted to identify and address the differential in quarterly pass rates

previously seen in the Grammar 91 course as reflected in the Classroom

Assessment Report (Liebler, 2008).

CHAPTER 5

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

<u>Introduction</u>

The writing assessment modification for the English 91 Grammar Skills course was created to determine if the modification increased student content knowledge, encouraged more content specific feedback from instructors, and reduced the number of attempts students took on both the writing assessment and chapter tests. Collectively, the researcher believed that such changes increased students' chances for completion of three credits of English 91 in one quarter.

<u>Summary</u>

Andrade (2000, 2005) and English (2000) both expressed the importance of assessment and instructional alignment. Andrade found that using writing rubrics promoted thinking and learning in students. However, Andrade (2005) also found that the design of the rubric must align with the curriculum and not be misused. The researcher believed the CASAS rubric was misused in the English 91 course as it had not aligned with the course text, *Sentence Essentials*, (Wong, 2002). The researcher designed a new writing assessment and scoring system for the English 91 course. The researcher hypothesized that the new writing assessment contributed to student gain.

Conclusions

The modification of the writing assessment inspired more relevant content feedback from instructors through direct focus on chapter skills or specific directions for the current assessment. The modified writing assessment also reduced the students' average attempts at the writing samples. Table 1 demonstrated that students who finished three credits and were post tested showed significant language skill gains as predicted. Table 3 showed that, despite the researcher's prediction, the writing assessment modification had not reduced the students' attempts at the chapter tests when compared to the attempts of fall 2007 English 91 students.

Recommendations

Since the writing assessment was designed to improve the students' chapter test scores, reduce the number of times a test must be taken, and improve the chance that a student would complete all three credits of the English 91 course work, the writing assessment must be given before the chapter tests. However, some instructors failed to follow through on this laddered structure of curriculum. Therefore, one of the recommendations for future quarters is to assure that all test givers require students to do the writing assessment prior to each chapter test.

As the writing modifications did not reduce the number of attempts students made, on average, to pass the chapter tests, the researcher recommends reviewing

the chapter tests, especially the editing portions and reevaluate the points allotted to this part of the test. Reapportioning the points to reflect the test takers' knowledge more equitably across the test may reduce the number of attempts and increase student success at completing the three credits. In addition to evaluating the chapter tests, the researcher recommends examining the curriculum load to see if streamlining assignments increases students' success rate at completing the three credit course of English 91 in one quarter without compromising student knowledge outcomes.

REFERENCES

Andrade, H. G. (2000). Using rubrics to promote thinking and learning.
Educational Leadership, 57 (5), 13-18.

Andrade, H. G. (2005). Teaching with rubrics: The good, the bad, and the
ugly. *College Teaching*, *53*(1), 27-30. Retrieved October 8, 2007, from
ProQuest Education Journals database. (Document ID: 761703241).

CASAS. (2007). *Functional writing assessment*. Retrieved November 11, 2007,
from https://www.casas.org/home/?fuseaction=home.showContent &
MapID=1898

Columbia Basin College. (2007). *Quarterly course catalog, fall schedule 2007*.
Pasco, WA: Columbia Basin College.

English, F. W. (2000). *Deciding what to teach and test: Developing, aligning and
auditing curriculum*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, USA.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational research:
Competencies for analysis and application*. Upper Saddle River, NJ:
Pearson Education, Inc.

Helmbrecht, B. (2007). Giving grades, taking tolls: Assessing the impact of
evaluation on developing writers. *Teaching English in the two year
college*, *34*(3), 306-319. Retrieved October 16, 2007, from ProQuest
Education Journals database. (Document ID: 1248318301).

Hornick, K. (1986). Teaching writing to linguistically diverse students. *ERIC*

   Digest, Number 32. Retrieved January 11, 2008, from

   http://www.ericdigests.org/pre-924/diverse.htm

Liebler, N. (2008). *Classroom assessment report: Winter 2008, basic skills*.

   Pasco, WA: Columbia Basin College.

Northern Illinois University (NIU) Office of Assessment Services. (2007).

   Assessment term glossary. Retrieved November 20, 2007, from

   www.niu.edu/assessment /Resources /Assessment_Glossary.htm

Payne, D. A. (2003). *Applied educational assessment* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA:

   Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

STATPAK statistical software. (2007). Old Tappan, N.J.: Pearson Education, Inc.

TABE. (2007). Monterey, CA: CTB/McGraw Hill.

Wong, L. (2002). *Sentence essentials: A grammar guide.* Boston, MA: Houghton

   Mifflin Co.

CASAS Functional Writing Rubric

CASAS Functional Writing Assessment

Test Form #_____

Picture Scoring

Reader 1

	Rating	Weighting	Score
Content		x5	
Organization		x3	
Word choice		x3	
Grammar and sentence structure		x2	
Spelling and punctuation		x1	
		TOTAL SCORE	

Reader 2

	Rating	Weighting	Score
Content		x5	
Organization		x3	
Word choice		x3	
Grammar and sentence structure		x2	
Spelling and punctuation		x1	
		TOTAL SCORE	

Reader 3 or Combined Scores

	Rating	Weighting	Score
Content		x5	
Organization		x3	
Word choice		x3	
Grammar and sentence structure		x2	
Spelling and punctuation		x1	
		TOTAL SCORE	

Total Score: (0-70) [ ]

Level: (0-5) [ ]

Pass/Fail: _____

Score to Level Conversion

0-13 = 0
14-27 = 1
28-41 = 2
42-55 = 3
56-69 = 4
70 = 5

COMMENTS:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

© CASAS, 199-

English 91 Plan & Profile

Unit 1: Chapter 1 **The Writing Process** Read Pages 1-10 • Process steps • Paragraphs • Key Elements • Format • Website **Instructor sign-off** Date_____	**CH 1: Web experience**, Page 10 **Ask Instructor:** Favorited on LOC computers under Sentence Essentials Web address: http://college.hmco.com/devenglish/wong/sentence_essentials/1e/students/index.html	**GRAMMAR 91 PLAN & PROFILE**	**CASAS Functional Writing** Assessment (picture essay – any version) See Instructor for explanation of scoring using rubrics Score: ___/70 Date:_____ **Ask for weekly topics below early so you can think about them before you write.**	**TABE D:** Form 7 Test 4 _____% _____grade Date_____
WORK IN CHAPTER	**EXERCISES**	**ACE PRACTICE QUIZZES**	**WRITING ASSIGNMENT**	**TESTS**
Chapter 2: Nouns Read pages 11-39 • Nouns • Noun Markers • Capitalization Complete all practices **Instructor sign-off** Date____	Check using answer Key at desk: Exer. 2.2____ Exer. 2.3____ Exer. 2.4____ Instructor sign-off Date_____	Instructor sign-off in LOC 80% + Noun ID_____ A & an _____ Sing & Plu_____ Caps_____ Commas_____	**5 sentence paragraph** Get 1st Credit Writing Instructions and Topics from Instructor before writing. **Written in Assessment 1oom.** Draft: _____/70 Final: _____/70 56/70 passing Date_____	**Chap. 2 TEST** 80% + To pass Score____ Date_____
Chapter 3: Prepositions Read pages 41-60 • Prepositions • Object pronouns • Infinitives Complete all practices Instructor sign-off: Date_____	Check using key at desk: Exer. 3.2_____ Exer. 3.3_____ Exer. 3.4_____ Instructor sign-off Date_____	Instructor sign-off in LOC 80% + Preps. 1_____ Preps. 2_____ ID of Prep Phrs_____	**5 sentence paragraph** Get 1st Credit Writing instructions and topics from Instructor before writing. **Written in Assessment Room:** Draft _____/70 Final:_____/70 56/70 passing Date:_____	**Chap.3 TEST** 80% + To pass Score_____ Date_____
COMPLETE	**FOR**	**ONE**	**CREDIT**	

CREDIT 2	EXERCISES	ACE QUIZZES	WRITING	TESTS
Chapter 4:Subj. & Verbs in Simple Sentences Read pages 63-102 • Subjects • Verbs • Fragments • Sub/verb patterns Complete all practices **Instructor sign-off** Date_____	Check Key at desk: Exer. 4.2_____ Exer. 4.3_____ Exer. 4.5_____ Exer. 4.6_____ Instructor sign-off Date_____	Instructor sign-off in LOC 80% + Subj ID 1_____ ID subj Pros_____ ID comp subj_____ ID verbs_____ ID comp verbs_____	**Seven sentence paragraph:** Get instructions for 2nd credit writing assignments and topics from instructor before writing: **Written in Assessment Room**: Draft:_____/70 Final:_____/70 56/70 passing Date_____	**Chap. 4** **TEST** 80% + To pass Score____ Date_____
Chapter 5: Verb Forms Read pages 105-146 • Simple Tenses • Present & Past • Verb Phrases Complete all practices: **Instructor sign-off:** Date_____	Check Key at desk: Exer. 5.2_____ Exer. 5.3_____ Exer. 5.4_____ Instructor sign-off Date_____	Instructor sign-off in LOC 80% + Verb Forms_____ S-V agreement_____ ID Past Tense_____ Fragments_____ Using Participles_____	**Seven sentence paragraph** Get instructions and topics from instructor before writing. **Written in Assessment Room:** Draft:_____/70 Final:_____/70 56/70 passing Date_____	**Chap. 5** **TEST** 80% + To pass Score____ Date_____
Chapter 6:Pronouns Read pages149-182 • Personal Prons. • Indefinite Prons. • Neither/nor Complete all practices: **Instructor sign-off:** Date_____	Check Key at desk: 6.2_____ 6.3_____ 6.4_____ Instructor sign-off: Date_____	Instructor sign-off in LOC 80% + ID Pronouns 1_____ Using Pronouns_____ Using self & selves___ Id subjects_____ Verb/subj agree 1____	**Ten sentences or two paragraphs** Get instructions and topics from instructor before writing: **Written in Assessment Room:** Draft:_____/70 Final:_____/70 56/70 passing Date_____	**Chap. 6** **TEST** 80% + To pass Score____ Date____
COMPLETE FOR TWO CREDITS				

CREDIT 3	EXERCISES	ACE QUIZZES	WRITING	TESTS
Chapter 7: Modifiers Read pages 185-212 • Adjectives • Adj. Patterns • Adverbs • Commas / adj Complete all practices: **Instructor sign-off:** Date_____	Check Key at desk: 3 Worksheets: _____,_____,_____ Exer. 7.2_____ Exer. 7.4_____ Exer. 7.5_____ Instructor sign-off: Date_____	Instructor sign-off in LOC 80% + ID Adj. 1_____ Comp/Super. _____ Adverbs & adj._____ Commas_____	**Ten Sentence Paragraph** Get instructions and topics from instructor before writing: **Written in Assessment Room:** Draft:_____/70 Final:_____/70 56/70 passing Date_____	**Chap. 7** **TEST** 80% + To pass Score_____ Date_____
Chapter 8: Compound Sentences Read pages 215-246 • Constructions of • Commas with • Run-on & comma splices • S/V Agreement Complete all practices: **Instructor sign-off:** Date_____	Check Key at desk Exer. 8.2_____ Exer. 8.3_____ Exer. 8.5_____ Exer. 8.6_____ Instructor sign-off: Date_____	Instructor sign-off in LOC 80% + Subj in Comp _____ Comma Pr. _____ Cor. Comma Spl.____	**Ten Sentence Paragraph or Two Paragraphs** Get instructions and topics from Instructor before writing: **Written in Assessment Room:** Draft:_____/70 Final _____/70 56/70 passing Date_____	**Chap. 8** **TEST** 80%+ To pass Score____ Date_____
Chapter 9: Complex Sentences Read pages 249-286 • Adverb Clause • Adjec. Clause • Noun Clause • Fragments Complete all Practices **Instructor sign-off** Date_____	Check Key at desk Exer. 9.2_____ Exer. 9.3_____ Exer. 9.4____ Instructor sign-off Date_____	Instructor sign-off in LOC 80% + Subj. in Complex____ Subord. Conj._____ Commas_____ ID Fragments_____	**Ten Sentence paragraph or two paragraphs** Get instructions and topics from Instructor before writing. **Written in assessment Room:** Draft:_____/70 Final:_____/70 56/70 passing Date_____	**Chap. 9** **TEST** 80% + To pass Score____ Date____
COMPLETE FOR	**3 CREDITS**		**3 CREDIT FINAL_____**	**Date_____**

APPENDIX C

**Writing Assessment Samples Chapter 2 Nouns
And
Chapter 3 Prepositions**

English 91, Grammar Skills
Chapter 2: Sentence Essentials: Nouns
Sentence Level Writing Assessment

Review the **chapter summary** attached to this assessment before writing your
sentences. Refer to your book, when needed, to confirm your knowledge of noun
types and usage. Also, see pages 64-66 in your text to understand the definition of
a SIMPLE sentence and the SUBJECT of a sentence.

On a separate sheet of paper, write **7** sentences that include **two nouns in each
sentence**.

                     S
Examples: The <u>boy</u> ran across the school <u>yard</u>.

               S, PL
       The <u>girls</u> climbed on the jungle <u>gym</u>.

After you have completed your sentences, <u>underline</u> **2** nouns in each sentence and
mark the **subject** in **3** of your sentences with an "**S.**"
(1 point for each noun underlined and 1 point for each of the 3 subjects identified)

Have you used a plural noun in one of your sentences?   Yes / No   (1 point)
 If so, mark the **plural noun** with a **PL** above the word.
Have you used a **proper noun** in one of your sentences?   Yes / No   (1point)
If so, mark the proper noun with a **P** above the word.

Total points possible _____/ 19

      A SCORE OF 80 % OR BETTER IS REQUIRED TO PASS.

Eng 91, Grammar Skills
Chapter 3, Prepositions
Sentence Level Writing Assessment

Review the chapter **3** Summary attached to this writing assessment (p. 59-60 of your text). Use your text to help you with your sentence writing. See page 42 for the list of prepositions.

Using a complete sentence(s), define a prepositional phrase: (**2 points**)
        _____/ 2

What part(s) of speech is the object of the preposition? (**2 points**)   _____/ 2

Write **seven** sentences; include a **prepositional phrase** in each sentence. At least **two**

sentences must include a **two or three word** preposition.

Underline **one preposition** and its **object** in each of your sentences. (**1 point each**)

__/ 14

What type of **noun** is the **object of the preposition** in each of your sentences? Label it.

There may be more than one choice; choose only **one** below. (**1 point each**) _____/ 7

C=   COMMON NOUN
P=   PROPER NOUN
SN= SINGULAR NOUN
PL= PLURAL NOUN

Identify the **subject** of each sentence with an "S". (**1 point each**)_____/ 7

A total of **32** points are possible. An 80% is needed to pass.

                         S   C

Example sentences: My **dog** ate my homework <u>in</u> my <u>bedroom</u>.

                S   PL
           I went with Jim <u>to </u>the <u>concerts</u>.