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Executive Summary

The objective of Johnston Community College’s (JCC’s) Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is to improve student writing. The Institution’s selection of writing as the QEP topic reflects input from faculty, staff, alumni, students, representatives from the Board of Trustees, members of the Johnston Community College community, student performance results, current literature/best practices, and research on student attitudes and aptitudes.

The following mission statement guided the planning of the QEP:

*JCC’s Quality Enhancement Plan will evolve curriculum and coordinate campus resources to empower students with improved written communication. Our students have a voice, and our QEP will help them discover, develop, and employ that voice in their academic, professional, and personal lives.*

The plan focuses on enhancing existing courses that emphasize writing instruction and developing new writing intensive courses. Instrumental to achievement of this goal is the strengthening of resources for student writing beyond the classroom. These measures will help build a campus community that values writing as integral to learning.

As a result of the College’s implementation of the QEP, students will: produce texts that demonstrate an awareness of situation, audience, and tone; produce texts that are unified, coherent, and fully developed; utilize supplemental resources beyond the classroom to enhance their writing; view writing as a process and understand its importance in the pursuit of academic and professional goals; and recognize their improved writing as a result of the Johnston Community College experience.

*On the Write Path* will be phased in over a five year period. Both formative and summative assessments will be used to measure the implementation and outcomes of the QEP. To ensure the effectiveness of the plan, an organizational structure is in place to monitor results and make adjustments to the plan on an ongoing basis.

Johnston Community College is committed to providing the fiscal and personnel resources to ensure the successful implementation of the QEP. *On the Write Path* is supported by each division of Johnston Community College, and the College is committed to providing the resources to ensure successful realization of the QEP. The College plans to allocate $1,055,177 over the next five years for QEP initiatives, with an expenditure of $208,881 during the first year, 2012-2013. The detailed budget in the “Resources” section shows the entire financial commitment to implementing and assessing the QEP for the five year period, 2012-2017.

*On the Write Path* is a plan designed to prepare students for the challenges of writing in both professional and academic environments. The overarching goal of the plan is to improve student writing proficiency. Actions to be implemented within the QEP will provide curriculum enhancements and numerous supplemental resources to assist students in discovering and developing a writing voice.
Introduction of the College

Johnston Community College (JCC) is a two-year, post-secondary college that provides accessible, high-quality educational and community enrichment opportunities for the successful development of learners. The College’s service area, primarily Johnston County, has a population of over 165,000, and the county’s 38% growth rate ranks it as one of the fastest growing counties in North Carolina. The county is experiencing both rapid growth and transition from a rural, agricultural based economy to a service and industry based economy. To accommodate this growth, JCC operates additional facilities throughout the county to supplement the programs and services offered at the main campus in Smithfield.

Opened in July of 2005, The Workforce Development Center is a collaborative effort between Johnston County, Johnston County Public Schools, Johnston County Economic Development, the College, and local biopharmaceutical industries. This 30,000 square foot, state-of-the-art educational and technical skills training center houses classrooms, computer and science labs, the Small Business Center, and a functioning sterile fill line. The Cleveland Center is a satellite facility that serves the Cleveland Community of Johnston County. The Cleveland Center houses a computer lab and classrooms used for Continuing Education programs. The Rudolph Howell & Son Environmental Learning Center, also known as Howell Woods, is an educational and recreational center that includes over 2,800 acres of farmland and a hardwood/pine forest located on the Neuse River. The Arboretum, located on the main campus, promotes prudent and responsible use of cultivated plants and the conservation of native species through the acquisition, evaluation, and aesthetic display of selected plant materials in an educational environment for students, visitors, and local citizens.

The College offers degree, diploma, and certificate programs that include concentrations in college transfer studies, applied/industrial technology, business, engineering, art, music, natural and health sciences, and truck driver training. Additionally, continuing education and occupational programs of study are offered in support of student, industry, and community needs.

In 2011-2012, the College enrolled 4,403 students, with 2,865, or 65.1%, women. While over 70% of enrolled students are residents of Johnston County, 48 of the 100 North Carolina counties are represented in the student body. In both ethnicity and age, JCC’s student body is highly diverse. The majority of students (80%) are Caucasian or African-American, with the remaining 20% representing students of Hispanic, Native American, and Asian backgrounds. The students range in age from 14 to 70, with a median age of 28.

To accomplish its mission, JCC maintains a continuous cycle of planning and assessment that strengthens student learning and the effectiveness of programs and services. As part of the planning process, the QEP seeks to address quality instruction and student success as they pertain to writing. These elements align with the College’s mission statement, various institutional goals, and one of the College’s strategic areas of emphasis:

Mission

Johnston Community College provides accessible, high-quality educational and community enrichment opportunities for the successful development of learners.
Related Institutional Goals

- Support student achievement of academic goals, enhanced employment opportunities, or transfer to four-year colleges.
- Collaborate with appropriate agencies and groups to meet workforce and community needs.
- Ensure high quality and continuous improvement in all programs and services.
- Engage in strategic planning, ongoing quality improvement, and responsiveness to community needs.

Components of the QEP encompass faculty development, student learning, and campus-wide participation, which all support one of the College’s strategic areas of emphasis:

Engagement of students, employees, and the community in a college environment that nurtures personal growth, diversity, and academic success.

JCC students, faculty, and staff are excited about the many possibilities that arise from On the Write Path. The QEP will strengthen JCC student writing skills, while at the same time creating a culture that embraces and celebrates the art of writing.
Identification of the Topic

The process used to identify the QEP topic of writing was broad-based including current and former students, faculty, staff, trustees, and community business and industry leaders. A Topic Selection Committee composed of volunteers representing Instruction, Institutional Effectiveness, and Student Services, narrowed the QEP topic to writing based on research and analysis of institutional data, faculty input, and student input.

Topic Selection Committee

The QEP Topic Selection Committee included representatives from a diverse cross-section of College divisions. Committee membership included:

Nahel Awadallah, QEP Director/Director of Mathematics, Social and Natural Science Programs
Dale O’Neill, Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness
Sherwood Williams, Psychology and Sociology Instructor
Terri Lee, Director of Instructional Technology and Distance Education
Bill Johnson, Transition Program Instructor
John Lee, Philosophy Instructor
Dawn Day, Nursing Instructor
David Thomas, Biology Instructor
Thomas Dean, Counselor

The Topic Selection Committee surveyed faculty, staff, and students during the Spring 2011 semester. The surveys resulted in a total of 43 topic suggestions, with 22 topics from faculty and staff and 21 topics from students. In June, 2011, the Topic Selection Committee met to organize and analyze survey results. Most of the suggestions from the faculty and students fell into one of three categories: Workforce Preparation, Communication, and Math/Problem Solving. The Committee decided to solicit input from JCC trustees, current and former students, and employers to further clarify and refine the focus.

The Topic Selection Committee met at the end of June with targeted student guests and trustees. The student guests included a former SGA president and tutor in JCC’s Tutoring and Writing Center; a former JCC student who served as a college ambassador and tutor and is currently enrolled in a four-year institution as an education major; and the then-current SGA president. The trustees included a former middle school and high school educator and a business and industry representative. While engaging in a roundtable discussion, the Committee and guests discussed the top three categories of potential topics. These discussions resulted in narrowing the focus on the need to enhance communication skills, both written and oral. Additionally, the trustees shared comments from area employers and business leaders that indicated the need for stronger communication skills for employees.

The Topic Selection Committee then began to explore professional communication, particularly in the health programs, as a possible topic. The Committee also considered the possibility of enhancing the communication component of ACA 111 (College Student Success). To further
refine the topic, the Committee sought additional faculty input. The Committee’s findings led to a recommendation that written or oral communication, or the combination of the two, would be the most appropriate direction for JCC’s QEP. In August 2011, the Committee explored course descriptions that referenced “communication” and considered an approach to the topic that would include enhancing those courses with communication as a component. The Committee narrowed the topic to writing, with a possible focus on English 111 (Expository Writing), the initial composition course in first year writing, as the primary course for which to plan enhancements. At this time, the Committee invited the students and trustees back for further discussions. From these discussions, the plan eventually broadened to include the creation of writing intensive courses (WIC), the enhancement of developmental writing courses, and the strengthening of resources beyond the classroom.

Analysis of results from employer surveys performed by the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Division supported the selection of writing as the QEP topic. Additionally, a survey conducted by North Carolina Business Services Representatives, as reported in “Closing the Gap: 2012 Skills Survey of N.C. Employers” (2012), demonstrated that employers specifically noted a number of problem areas with their new hires including: lack of work ethic, lack of professionalism, problems of by-passing the chain of command, lack of conflict resolution skills, and, most importantly, lack of effective communication skills, including writing. The survey referenced in “Closing the Gap” was administered to all employers in North Carolina employing 10-499 employees. Of the surveys sent out, 1,152 valid surveys were collected. The survey indicated that 58.9%, or 634 of the surveyed employers, agreed that potential employees showed a deficit in communication and/or interpersonal skills during recruiting efforts. Such concerns are mirrored in the College’s institutional data.

**Institutional Data**

Analysis of data compiled on JCC student English placement from Fall 2006 to Fall 2011, also indicated a need to address the deficit in writing skills in JCC students. Of the 5,300 students tested through Accuplacer, SAT, Compass, or ACT, 54% (2,871) placed into one or more developmental English course(s). One percent of JCC students placed into the STAR (Successful Transition and Academic Readiness) program. STAR is an academic initiative designed to strengthen students’ skills and performance in remedial English, reading, and math. The program gives students the opportunity to place out of lower level remedial courses and moves students toward their degree faster. See Figure 1.
Furthermore, student performance from Fall 2006 to Fall 2011 on Accuplacer Sentence Skills declined two percentage points. See Figure 2.

With more than 50% of entering students enrolling in one or more developmental English course, and with the steady decline in writing skills, a QEP focused on writing meets a clearly identified need of JCC students.
Faculty Observations

Once the Topic Selection Committee focused upon writing as a potential area of improvement, they sought input from faculty to refine the topic from faculty. They administered two different surveys to JCC faculty in Fall 2011, and each revealed the importance of communication, and specifically, writing, in their curricula. Among respondents, 76.6% of JCC faculty included more than one writing assignment in their coursework, and 90.9% of JCC faculty believed writing assignments strengthened student learning in their discipline. Yet these same survey participants acknowledged the critical need for improvement. Only 39.4% of faculty expressed satisfaction with the quality of their students’ writing, while 76.7% of faculty said their students struggle with grammar and mechanics.

Additionally, the faculty surveys revealed that 26% of faculty disagreed with the statement “I refer my students to campus resources that assist with student writing,” while a troubling 20.2% were unaware the resources existed, or did not believe they applied to their particular courses. While faculty members recognized the importance of writing in their respective fields, data supported the conclusion that students are ill-prepared to develop consistently strong writing skills.

Student and Trustee Observations

Information from two focus groups of 20-25 English 111 students held in November 2011 reinforced the conclusion drawn from faculty observations and institutional data that students enter JCC fundamentally unprepared to write well and have critical misunderstandings about writing and the writing process. Students expressed overwhelmingly negative experiences with writing in high school, stating they received little to no instruction in writing skills and strategies, while the instruction they did receive restricted individual thought and creativity. In one group, approximately 18 students who had completed writing assignments in high school said they had been instructed that the five paragraph model was the only way to write an academic essay.

The students who expressed negative associations with writing upon entering college also stated that they did not understand writing as a process and were accustomed to receiving grades on their written work, but limited feedback on specific errors. Most students also said writing assignments caused them considerable anxiety, which they believed hindered their ability to successfully complete their work. These same students provided valuable input on strategies and instruction methods that they believed helped their writing improve significantly, and that they believed should be incorporated into the writing program at the college. These strategies included regular feedback from their writing instructors, a process-based approach to writing instruction, and opportunities to write outside of English courses.

The student leaders and trustees, who had provided input to the Topic Selection Committee, were invited back for an update on the progress toward topic selection. In their experience as leaders and tutors at JCC, these students had the opportunity to interact with many students who had struggled with writing. They were presented with all of the data gathered up to that point. The observations shared by the current student focus groups were reinforced by the comments of these student leaders. These students also shared their current experiences at four-year universities and discussed writing enhancements which would have made their transition smoother. Both trustees expressed their support for a QEP focused on writing.
improvement and felt this focus would be well-received by the service area community and would meet needs which had been conveyed by area employers.

Institutional data, faculty input, student input, and employer survey responses all point to an opportunity to enhance instruction and student learning pertaining to writing at the College. It is anticipated that the College will experience a number of benefits, both direct and indirect, from the QEP as follows:

- Increased student learning in multiple disciplines related to rhetorical styles and genres of writing
- Professional development in writing pedagogy for faculty and staff
- Improved written communication skills for graduates
- Smoother transition to four-year colleges for students
- Increased use of campus resources by students
Process Used to Develop the QEP

JCC began the process to develop its QEP with a presentation during the spring semester All Personnel meeting held February 7, 2011. This meeting began with an explanation of SACS accreditation requirements by the College’s Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness, Dale O’Neill. The QEP Director, Nahel Awadallah, introduced the QEP process, detailing QEP components relevant to faculty and staff, and led a follow-up question and answer session.

In March 2011, open forums provided faculty, students and staff exposure to the internal and external benefits of the QEP. The objective of these forums was to inform faculty, students, and staff concerning the overall reaffirmation process, the role of the QEP in this process and to describe the procedure for developing the QEP. Forum leaders offered participants the opportunity to ask questions. These meetings took place both on the main campus and at an off-campus site, the Workforce Development Center in Clayton, North Carolina. Subsequently, the QEP Director emailed faculty and staff, asking them to share their questions and concerns about the QEP, the QEP process, and QEP topic selection. The QEP director also sought input from faculty and staff by phone and in office visits. The QEP Topic Selection Committee formed in Spring 2011 and was charged with identifying a topic for the college’s QEP.

As the focus of the QEP settled on writing, the Topic Selection Committee evolved into the QEP Steering Committee, charged with preparing the QEP. (See Appendix A). The Steering Committee wanted to continue to reflect the plan’s systemic approach to strengthening writing campus wide. As such, representatives from curriculum and developmental English faculty, natural sciences faculty, radiology faculty, and representatives from the Tutoring and Writing Center (TWC), Library, Student Services, and Academic Skills Center joined the committee. (Note: The TWC was renamed the Tutoring Center in July 2012). With the survey results from faculty, compiled data from Student Services, the TWC, and the Academic Skills Center on student writing needs, the Institutional Effectiveness division, the Student Services Division (student placement test scores), and the registrar’s office (student grades in English 111), the committee identified the salient issues in student writing: coherence, thesis, unity, development, sentence structure, tone, and audience.

At its December 2011, meeting, the committee developed an outline for the QEP document. Subcommittees that would focus on specific areas of the QEP were identified: Literature Review and Best Practices, Student Learning Outcomes, Implementation, Assessment, Marketing, and Resources. Beginning in January 2012, the Steering Committee met on a weekly basis to receive updates from the subcommittees and review drafts of the QEP.

The QEP proposal was authored by a writing team consisting of two full-time English faculty and the Lead Content Specialist. The writing team received input from the QEP Steering Committee, Senior Administration, and the QEP sub-committees. Various drafts of the QEP proposal were reviewed by the QEP Steering Committee, Senior Administration, the QEP sub-committees, and a consultant. Final editing of the document was completed by the QEP Project Administrator, the Lead Content Specialist, the Director of Research and Institutional Effectiveness, and the Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness. Once the QEP proposal was finalized, it was made available on the QEP web site for campus dissemination.
Consultant

For assistance in developing the QEP, the QEP Steering Committee worked with a consultant, Dr. Susan Miller-Cochran. Dr. Miller-Cochran is the Associate Professor of English and Director of the First Year Writing Program at North Carolina State University. Her background includes experience as English faculty at Mesa Community College, Arizona, and she has served on the Executive Committee of the Conference on College Composition and Communication. She also has expertise in the intersection between technology and second language writing. As a faculty member at NC State University, she represents an institution where a large number of JCC students transfer. Dr. Miller-Cochran provided assistance to the QEP Steering Committee by recommending research literature, meeting with the QEP Steering Committee in February, April, and June 2012, for discussions, and reviewing the proposed QEP activity.
Literature Review and Best Practices

Johnston Community College enrolls more than 4,000 students. Over half of those students begin their coursework with at least one developmental course in writing. Of the nearly 100 sections of English courses offered in the Fall 2012, over 30 are developmental courses. There is also an increasing demand for online courses, with 25 online sections of English courses offered during the Fall 2012. Utilization of adjunct faculty has also increased, with over 60 sections of English courses during the Fall 2012, taught by part-time faculty. With the considerable number of students taking developmental courses, the growth of online course offerings, and the increasing use of adjunct faculty in English courses, the need to provide consistent writing instruction across a diverse student group is evident. The QEP Literature Review and Best Practices subcommittee was guided by a desire to identify the best practices that would be most effective within the Johnston Community College environment.

Many college educators, nationally and at JCC, have noted weaknesses in student writing, but the approaches to addressing those weaknesses are not simple. The Council of Writing Program Administrators’ (WPA) Statement for First-Year Composition (2008) identified writing as a “complex process, both individual and social, that takes place over time with continued practice and informed guidance” (para. 2). The Statement also suggested that “teachers, administrators, and a concerned public do not imagine that these outcomes can be taught in reduced or simple ways” (para. 2).

In their landmark text *Elements of Style*, E.B. White and William Strunk (1972) argued that “There is…no infallible guide to good writing, no assurance that a person who thinks clearly will be able to write clearly, no key that unlocks the door, no inflexible rule by which writers may shape their course. Writers will often find themselves steering by stars that are disturbingly in motion” (p. 66). Too often writing instruction and assessment ignore the fundamental fact that writing is a highly individualized skill, that there is no panacea to what ails writing students, and that writing is, by its nature, a recursive, non-linear process. In the National Commission on Writing’s report *Writing and School Reform* (2006), Texas teacher Valerie Taylor spoke to the need for thoughtful reform: “Reform should value what teachers know,” she said, “not impose scripted solutions on them. Reform should reflect the complexity of the challenge, instead of pretending the answers are simple” (p. 13).

The report also cited David Ward, former Chancellor and President of the University of Wisconsin and President of the American Council on Education, who synthesized the challenges facing writing instruction and reform with one critical question: “The interesting challenge posed by the Commission’s writing agenda is that you’re suggesting we need to customize learning in an age of standardization. How do you propose to do that?” (p. 16).

Findings from JCC's literature and best practices review offer several answers to Dr. Ward’s important question that also acknowledge the complexity of writing mentioned by Strunk and White and Taylor. For instance, the WPA’s Statement for First-year Composition includes outcomes for student writing and identifies solutions and methods of implementation that will most effectively meet student needs. The Statement is included in Appendix B and serves as a guidepost for writing instruction. Among the WPA’s many valuable suggestions, teaching writing as a process stands out as a critical pedagogy.
Teaching and Assessing Writing as a Process

Without question, a central feature of strengthening student writing is evaluation, with a particular emphasis on the need to align writing standards, writing instruction, and writing assessment (McLeod et al., 2009). To ensure optimal alignment, the review of literature and best practices focuses on rubrics, portfolios, and peer review as integral components of process-based writing instruction.

One of the most common writing assessment tools is the rubric, which can provide consistent and uniform criteria that can benefit both instructor and student (Zhizui & Zhijun, 2011). As such, the rubric can play a key role in assessing student learning outcomes.

In their critique of the analytic rubric, however, McLeod et al. noted drawbacks characteristic of rubrics in general. Rubrics are useful in identifying broad areas for improvement in student writing, but they are sometimes difficult to use because they address general qualities of effective writing without reference to the way those qualities operate in specific rhetorical modes, such as comparison/contrast or process. (McLeod et al., 2009).

In his article “The Trouble with Rubrics” Alfie Kohn (2006) pointed to research that indicated that the more grade-centered students are, the less they will learn. Kohn noted that students “whose attention is relentlessly focused on how well they are doing often become less engaged with what they are doing” (p. 13). While Kohn cautions against uniform and standardized rubric-based grading, the literature also identifies the valuable role a rubric can play in assessing student learning outcomes.

As the rubric’s strength lies in assessing designated criteria, the portfolio method of instruction allows for fluid, flexible development of student writing. Portfolios give student writing the opportunity to breathe and develop through low stakes assignments, while also ensuring writing in process receives instructor feedback. Low stakes assignments generally focus on the expression of ideas and are less concerned with grammar and convention. Examples of low stakes writing assignments include: brainstorming, journaling, mind-mapping, and informal responses to prompts. High stakes assignments are typically formalized assignments derived from content created during the early, or low stakes, part of the writing process. Examples of high stakes assignments include: essays, proposals, research papers, and assignments that adhere to discipline-specific conventions. While both types of assignments may be used for grading purposes, high stakes generally impact student grades more than low stakes.

The portfolio addresses the initial challenge of finding a way to customize instruction. At the same time the portfolio answers the challenge of finding a common approach to diverse environments for writing instruction, such as the many sections taught online or sections taught by adjuncts at JCC. A learning-based portfolio that includes a collection of formal and informal student writing reinforces the importance of process in writing and also serves as a valuable assessment tool.

Indeed, research indicates that the most effective tool for process-based instruction and assessment is the portfolio. In their article “Not Only Assessment: Teachers Talk About Writing Portfolios,” Wendy Bishop and Gay Lynn Crossley (1992) observed that the portfolio can alter the role of both instructor and student. Instructors are transformed from gatekeeper and editor to facilitator and coach. Portfolios can also move students away from the “extrinsic rewards of
grades toward the desirable intrinsic rewards of writing," while shifting the instructor’s focus to balancing process and product (p. 33).

Writing portfolios are holistic and process-oriented. They help students identify connections and see the value of writing as a tool across disciplines. Portfolios also allow instructors to incorporate elements of process into writing assessment. Because portfolios often include low stakes writing assignments, they can encourage students to write without restriction. When students are not concerned with every misplaced comma and are not bound by strictly prescriptive guidelines, they are much more likely to engage in writing as a process and thus, generate the drafts and revisions that will enrich their high stakes, formal writing assignments. Further, the portfolio allows instructors to uphold the standard for assessment established by the 2007 International Reading Association/National Council of Teachers of English Joint Task Force on Assessment:

Quality assessment is a process of inquiry. It requires gathering information and setting conditions so that the classroom, school, and community become centers of inquiry where students, teachers, and other stakeholders can examine their learning—individually and collaboratively—and find ways to improve their practice (para. 1).

One such process of inquiry is the practice of peer review. Peer review provides students with an opportunity to read and respond to student writing within a structured framework in which students provide and receive formalized feedback on drafts. In addition to receiving feedback, providing feedback allows students to see similar problems and weaknesses in their own writing (Covill, 2010; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). Peer review allows students to view their writing in a broader context of audience and can also reduce the sense of competition in an academic environment. Moreover, peer review fosters a spirit of collaboration and encourages dialogue in which two-way feedback is established and thinking is negotiated between two sides (Rollinson, 2005).

### Writing Across the Curriculum and the Writing Intensive Course

The need for students to develop and extend writing skills beyond composition classes is evident in the research. Lee Ann Carroll (2002) argues that colleges should “provide more options” for students to handle writing tasks across disciplines (p.134). Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) has been “championed…as a means to improve writing skills and critical thinking” across disciplines (Hennessy & Evans, 2005, p.269). In order to maximize the benefit of Writing Across the Curriculum, faculty development should foster communication between composition instructors and instructors interested in incorporating writing in their disciplines. Hennessy and Evans further observed, “Writing centers need to have the resources and structure to support students in the writing and revision processes for WAC to be fully effective” (p. 273).

Writing intensive courses (WIC) optimize the benefits of Writing Across the Curriculum by providing opportunities to practice writing as a process. A writing intensive course can be identified as a discipline-specific course that includes writing assignments throughout the term to improve both writing proficiency and content mastery.
Even though the research establishes that teaching writing promotes integrative learning and clear thinking, it is important to recognize that there may be faculty resistance to establishing writing components in their courses. Robert Boice (1990) noted the following objections among social science faculty to teaching writing:

- Writing assignments add extra work load.
- Class time is already fully scheduled.
- Students dislike the extra work.
- Lack of expertise to teach writing
- Lack of enjoyment of writing (p. 14).

Such objections can in part be allayed by establishing clear guidelines and criteria for identifying and establishing a writing intensive course.

## General Guidelines for Writing Intensive Courses

Farris and Smith (2000) noted that guidelines for WIC at different institutions are strikingly similar; most include at least some of the following elements:

1. **Class size or instructor/student ratio.** Most guidelines insist that WIC include no more than 15 to 25 students.
2. **Required number of papers or words.** Guidelines range from a total of 2,500-5,000 words, which may include some combination of formal and informal writing, in-class and out-of-class writing, drafts, and journals.
3. **Revision.** Some guidelines specify how many papers should go through a complete revision process. Guidelines generally indicate that drafts may be read by the instructor, peers, or other readers. Some guidelines make clear that feedback and revision must involve more than pointing out and correcting surface errors.
4. **How writing will affect final grade.** Guidelines may stipulate or recommend that grades on written work make up a certain percentage of the course grade. This is a point sometimes not easily negotiated in WIC taught by faculty in disciplines other than English. A total of 70% of the grade devoted to writing would be good; 20% is probably too low.
5. **Types of assignments.** Guidelines require or recommend that writing be spread throughout the course in a sequence of related assignments rather than concentrated in a large term paper. Guidelines may specify that a certain number of papers engage students in particular tasks, for example, summary, analysis, and integration of sources.
6. **Assignment-related instruction and evaluation of papers.** Guidelines suggest, require, or provide teaching techniques demonstrated in workshops, for example, collaborative work, directed lessons on research techniques, checklists for feedback on drafts, and minimal marking.
7. **Support services.** Guidelines suggest or require that instructors make use of available consultation with English faculty, or that their students use the tutoring services in the campus writing center.
Resources Beyond the Classroom

Students benefit from resources beyond the classroom. Numerous studies indicate that there is a direct correlation between a student’s success and a student’s ability to seek, find and use information (Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 1998). Clearly, the library and other resources beyond the classroom play significant roles in a student’s academic achievement.

Information literacy forms the basis for lifelong learning. It is common to all disciplines, to all learning environments, and to all levels of education. According to the Association of College and Research Libraries (2000), information literacy enables learners to master content and extend their investigations, become more self-directed, and assume greater control over their own learning. An information literate individual is able to:

- Determine the extent of information needed.
- Access the needed information effectively and efficiently.
- Evaluate information and its sources critically.
- Incorporate selected information into one’s knowledge base.
- Use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.
- Understand the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and access and use information ethically and legally.

Many scholars suggest that community colleges need to incorporate required information literacy classes in the curriculum. Research indicates that students need such classes in order to compensate for their inadequate information-seeking skills, to become literate in searching online article databases, and to increase their overall chances of success as a student (Groce, 2008). Such efforts involve constructive partnerships between faculty and library personnel. Faculty members want students to use trusted resources from respected publishers, but students become frustrated because they find it difficult and time-consuming to locate these resources. If resources needed by students are presented in a manner that makes the finding process easier, students will return to the library to obtain information they need for other purposes (Kirkwood, 2011).

In a large-scale, in-depth study specifically focused on Web use by university undergraduates, the International Council of Educational Media determined that there is an urgent need for students to develop information literacy skills and apply these skills in the electronic information environment (Wang & Artero, 2005). Results suggested that universities and colleges:

- Recognize that information literacy skills are essential for student academic success.
- Move aggressively to develop plans for student information literacy training.
- Address students’ needs to receive information literacy training as soon as they enter school.
- Cultivate an integrated approach as the most effective way to address student information literacy development, with faculty and librarians forming partnerships.
- Place the teaching of information literacy skills in the curricular content.

Another significant resource beyond the classroom to strengthen student writing is the writing center. According to Robinson (2009), the writing center can serve less prepared students; however, many students who visit the writing center are not always clear about what kind of
assistance they need. In a study conducted by Nelson-Bums and Wilson (2007), roughly half of the students approaching the writing center were unable to articulate the kind of writing assistance they were seeking. Likewise, the study highlights the importance of educating both faculty and students about the purposes and goals of the writing center, and it also raises questions about the alignment of writing center practices with instructional goals, purposes, and principles.

According to The Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) of the National Council of Teachers of English (1989), “the effectiveness of classroom writing instruction is significantly improved by the assistance students receive in writing centers” (para. 28). The CCCC also stated that “because these centers enhance the conditions of teaching and learning, their development and support should be an important departmental and institutional priority” (para. 28). Many colleges offer writing support for students, but the debate continues over how faculty and writing center staff should work together. Writing center staff and individual faculty may have a difficult time reaching a consensus concerning varying approaches to the writing process. While there are many ways a campus can provide writing support for students, it is important to provide some form of cohesive support to best serve students.

The writing center and faculty who instruct writing are often separated both organizationally and fiscally. This separation can create a disconnect between the philosophies of the English faculty and the writing center staff. Lisa Ede (1989), in “Writing as A Social Process: A Theoretical Foundation for Writing Centers,” examined the continued debate over classroom pedagogy and the writing center environment. Although an advocate of collaborative learning practice in the writing center environment, Ede also argued that sometimes the relationship between the writing center and faculty is not collaborative. Ede asserted that there are “several lines of research that either explicitly or implicitly place writing centers at the heart, rather than the periphery of current theory in composition studies” (p. 5).

Much like many advocates for the writing center model, Ede concluded that the collaborative learning model is a best practice for writing centers. She referenced researcher Marilyn Cooper’s theory that the cognitive approach to writing should be “an ecological model of writing, whose fundamental tenet is that writing is an activity through which a person is continually engaged with a variety of socially constructed systems” (p. 10). Ede also warned that producing a writing center that works as a solitary unit can result in a “fix it shop” approach that is in direct opposition to the pedagogical approach to writing as a process, which is so important for a student’s writing development.

Mark Waldo (1990) referred to this error in approach as the “grammar garage” effect. Both Ede and Waldo warned that the purpose of a writing center should not be to function separately from the faculty and curriculum, but they should function as partners. Further, Waldo argued that both the writing center and the faculty “want to produce the best independent student writers they can” (p. 74). Both want to advance critical thinking skills and show students how writing shapes learning. Both also want to prepare students to step into the academic and professional writing community.

However, with limited budgets comes limited staffing. This approach can create a dynamic where writing tutors are simply fixing errors and not mirroring the classroom approach to process. Waldo drew on his own experience in Montana State University’s (MSU) writing center where the writing center staff and faculty worked collaboratively through professional development and instructional partnerships to offer a quality program, both in and out of the classroom. MSU’s writing center budget exists outside of the English Department, but the center
still partners with English faculty. This partnership ensures that classroom pedagogies transfer to the writing center. Waldo issued the following challenge to other schools: “A comprehensive project of this scope requires the direct support of upper administrators, who see the marked advantages to students and faculty that its success can bring” (p. 79). Clearly, the effective writing center is integrated into the academic life of the college, and faculty and writing center staff collaborate in developing shared goals and outcomes.

Core Skills in the Digital Age

Any review of literature and best practices in writing must acknowledge the growing importance of digital literacy. While digital literacy’s role expands, core skills remain integral to writing in the new age. In *Literacy in the Digital Age*, Burniske (2007) stated that even if the tools have changed from paper and pens to hypermedia and keypads, the core skills continue to be central to understanding, communicating, and using information. Others sound a note of alarm at the pace of change for both students and their teachers. According to Lee Rainie (Pew Internet & American Life Project, 2012), there is a valid concern “that new social and economic divisions will emerge as those who are motivated and well-schooled reap rewards that are not matched by those who fail to master new media and tech literacies” (para. 10). Even earlier, Stuart Selber (2004) worried that “the stakes could not be higher. For at issue is the future shape of writing instruction and its significance to students” (p. 3).

Thus, as students develop core communication skills, their writing with a sense of audience and tone, in particular, must evolve to show an understanding of the ways digital media is reshaping communication. Indeed, as Clark (2010) maintained, “many of the ideas of the academy are far behind social and cultural innovation, not leading them. Academia has been slow to adopt the teaching of these new habits of thought to our students” (p. 28). Clark also argued that college composition courses should be revised to include digital literacy. Students would benefit, according to Clark, by instruction that helped them develop and write blogs, wikis, ePortfolios, and other modes aimed at improving their digital literacy.

The portfolio, in particular, translates well to the digital age. Pullman (2002) claimed that the portfolio and ePortfolio reinforce the importance of the writing process for students. Pullman stated, “As a writing pedagogy, using the portfolio is a better practice than using a one-time essay or in-class writing because it encourages students to see writing as an ongoing process, as a public act of communication, and as an opportunity to create meaning and identity through sharing and collaboration” (p. 151). Pullman also argued that “electronic portfolios show considerable pedagogical, student-outcomes, and program assessment promise” (p. 151).

Carter and Dunbar-Odom (2009) claimed that writing programs must change to embrace students from diverse cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds by providing equal access to digital communication technologies. The writers address the 2008 National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) position statement on 21st century literacies, by identifying specific needs for communication in the future. Twenty-first century readers and writers need to:

- Develop proficiency with the tools of technology.
- Build relationships with others to pose and solve problems collaboratively and cross-culturally.
- Design and share information for global communities to meet a variety of purposes.
- Manage, analyze, and synthesize multiple streams of simultaneous information.
Conclusions

The literature and best practices review points to numerous enhancements and approaches that will strengthen writing instruction at Johnston Community College. Upon comparing current practices at the College and the best practices suggested in the literature, it became apparent the College could benefit from the formulation of a unifying philosophy about writing and writing instruction. To this end, a clearly articulated set of Principles and Practices is required. The Principles and Practices is intended to serve as a guidepost to assure consistent quality in the design, development, and application of actions to be implemented within the QEP. The Johnston Community College Principles and Practices of Writing Instruction can be seen on page 28.

Literature Review and Best Practices: Summary

- The best writing instruction is process-based and allows for multiple revisions with feedback at various stages.
- With proper contextualization, the writing rubric provides clear and consistent criteria and is one of many means to assess student writing.
- The Writing Program Administrators (WPA) goals for first-year writing provide a consistent framework for writing instruction.
- The portfolio is the best methodology for process-based writing instruction.
- While digital literacy is of growing importance, students who are proficient in traditional, core writing skills will be able to transfer those skills to the requirements of the digital age.
- Core writing skills are reinforced in Writing Across the Curriculum and writing intensive courses.
- Resources beyond the classroom such as libraries, tutoring centers, writing centers, and academic skills centers strengthen student writing.
- Student information literacy and writing are strengthened by a partnership that includes faculty, library staff and writing tutors.
Desired Student Learning Outcomes

The conclusions from the literature review and best practices, combined with consistent survey findings, lead to several implications for Johnston Community College. The actions that will most benefit JCC students include establishing a path that develops consistently strong writing skills in both English and discipline-specific courses; ensures that resources beyond the classroom are integrated into writing instruction; encourages writing as a process; and provides opportunities to write in various situations and for diverse audiences. These actions will result in the following Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs):

1) Students will produce texts that demonstrate an awareness of situation, audience, and tone.
2) Students will produce texts that are unified, coherent, and fully developed.
3) Students will utilize supplemental resources beyond the classroom to enhance their writing.
4) Students will view writing as a process, understand its importance to their academic and professional goals, and recognize their improved writing as a result of the JCC experience.

Actions to be Implemented

The primary goal of the Johnston Community College QEP is to identify, develop, and implement strategies focused on improving writing proficiency. Based on current institutional capability and the review of literature and best practices, the QEP Steering Committee deemed the following areas of emphasis important for overall success of the QEP:

- structural enhancements centered around the organization of human resources, faculty professional development, and campus-wide awareness training
- curriculum enhancements designed to address identified needs and to establish uniform standards
- resource enhancements provided beyond the classroom to reinforce student learning
QEP Enhancements Table

The following table outlines enhancements in curriculum and resources beyond the classroom and connects them to the appropriate SLOs. Professional Development activities for individual enhancements are detailed in the Timeline on page 39.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Enhancements</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SLOs Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Principles &amp; Practices of Writing Instruction</td>
<td>The Principles and Practices of Writing Instruction reflect current thinking in best practices of writing instruction, value academic freedom, and establish criteria for writing based courses in English and other disciplines.</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) ACA Course Enhancements</td>
<td>ACA courses are introductory, 1-2 credit classes focused on ensuring student success at the college level. ACA courses orient students to campus resources and teach foundational skills. ACA courses reach the majority of JCC students and will provide two cornerstones of QEP implementation. (1) The QEP introductory module will introduce students to the QEP and direct them to key resources. (2) The Library Orientation/Resource Overview will orient students to library resources related to the writing process.</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) ENG Enhancement: Cornerstone Essay</td>
<td>Descriptive essay completed by all ENG 090 students. Randomized samples will be selected and evaluated externally.</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) ENG Enhancement: Touchstone Essay</td>
<td>Narrative essay completed by all ENG 111 students. Randomized samples will be selected and evaluated externally.</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) General Enhancement: Portfolio Method of Instruction</td>
<td>Method of instruction and assessment will ensure writing is taught and evaluated as a process in writing intensive and English courses.</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) General Enhancement: Writing Intensive Courses</td>
<td>The addition of writing-based courses outside of English will impact student writing in various disciplines and reinforce key QEP initiatives across curriculum.</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) General Enhancement: MyLabs</td>
<td>The Pearson MyLabs program has customized features including pre- and post- diagnostic testing, tutorials, online writing feedback, instructional audio and video, testing modules, interactive teaching modules as well as blogs and ePortfolio options that will supplement instruction in ENG 090 and 111 courses.</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Enhancements</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>SLOs Addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) LibGuides</td>
<td>The LRC will develop a writing-specific LibGuides component that links students to periodicals, books, online resources, and NCLive research links.</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Student Writing Resource Library</td>
<td>In order to provide quality writing assistance and resources to students, JCC will develop an online writing resource library for students.</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Faculty Online Resource Library</td>
<td>The online resource library for faculty will be designed to include instructional resources on writing standards such as rubrics, grading standards, proper instruction on writing for different genres and other topics that may assist non-English faculty in adding writing enhancements to their courses.</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Tutoring Center</td>
<td>The mission and goals of the Tutoring Center have been revised to support the Student Learning Outcomes of the QEP. Tutor training manuals will be updated to reflect QEP actions. The Tutoring Center will provide a number of promotional enhancements specifically in support of QEP implementation. Communication between the Tutoring Center and faculty will be enhanced through TutorTrac software.</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Writing Studio</td>
<td>The mission and goals of the Writing Studio were developed, in part, to support the Student Learning Outcomes of the QEP. The Writing Studio will provide a place for students to explore advanced writing skills.</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Celebrations of Writing</td>
<td>The celebrations of writing will offer an opportunity to recognize successful student writing.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Structural Enhancements

To ensure effective implementation of actions, management of assessment data, and evaluation of overall effectiveness, the QEP calls for additional faculty and staff support through the following structural enhancements:

- QEP Project Administrator
- Lead Content Specialist
- QEP Analyst
- The QEP Resource Team
- Professional Development
QEP Project Administrator

The QEP Project Administrator will facilitate and provide administrative support for QEP operations. The primary function of the QEP Project Administrator will be to provide direct administrative support for the realization of established QEP initiatives and objectives.

Lead Content Specialist

The Lead Content Specialist will serve as the facilitator for the preparation and implementation of professional development, assisting in the management of assessment data, communication of QEP outcomes, and coordination between faculty, administration, students and staff.

QEP Analyst

The QEP Analyst will gather all documents relating to QEP assessment. In addition to gathering the data for each assessment question, the QEP Analyst will analyze the data to determine if the achievement targets were met. The QEP Analyst serves on the QEP Resource Team and provides input on the assessment process.

QEP Resource Team

The QEP Resource Team will assist the Lead Content Specialist in the implementation of actions and serve as a resource for faculty and staff involved in writing instruction. This team will be available for comprehensive support for the first three years of implementation and as needed for years four and five. The QEP Resource Team will include:

- Lead Content Specialist/Writing Studio Coordinator
- QEP Project Administrator
- QEP Analyst
- All Full-time English faculty
- Tutoring Center Coordinator
- SGA President
- Director of Research and Institutional Effectiveness
- Director of Student Success
- Librarian
- Manager of Media Services
- Instructional Designer

Professional Development

JCC recognizes that professional development is pivotal to the success of the Quality Enhancement Plan. Professional development ensures campus-wide awareness and clarity of understanding of the QEP at all stages of the process. Having a well-designed,
purposefully directed professional development/general training plan will save time, money, and effort as the QEP is implemented.

Faculty development, in particular, will encompass training focused on:

- Instructional methodologies
- Teaching aids
- Online tools
- Best practices

Desired outcomes for faculty development for those directly involved in QEP implementation (WIC and ENG faculty) are improved instructional capabilities that facilitate enhanced student learning and enrich classroom experiences. Desired outcomes for general faculty and staff training are heightened awareness of the QEP goals, actions, and progress.

II. Curriculum Enhancements

The literature and best practices review supports the foundation and framework for curriculum enhancements. This review indicates an opportunity for Johnston Community College to:

- Establish campus-wide principles and practices for writing instruction.
- Adopt, expand, and enhance methodology used to teach writing as a process.
- Develop a consistent threshold in standards for evaluating writing.

To accomplish these goals, the writing team developed a framework to support all QEP objectives. The Principles and Practices of Writing Instruction were created by JCC English faculty to establish a shared set of philosophies and methodologies that reflect current literature and best practices. Principles and Practices were designed to establish criteria for effective instruction while encouraging the academic freedom to inspire successful implementation. All faculty and staff will have access to Principles and Practices through JCC’s online resource libraries; however, WIC and ENG faculty will be required to incorporate the Principles and Practices into their writing instruction.

The College expects that the adoption of the Principles and Practices will strengthen courses beyond WIC and ENG courses by establishing a baseline for all college writing. General awareness training of the Johnston Community College Principles and Practices of Writing Instruction will be provided to the broader college population. The objectives for the awareness training will be to familiarize faculty, staff, and students with the principles and practices and associated resources. Additionally, English faculty and WIC faculty will complete more in-depth training related to instruction and implementation of the principles and practices. The Principles and Practices will guide all QEP curriculum enhancements.
Johnston Community College Principles and Practices of Writing Instruction

**Process**
Writing instruction will emphasize process. Formal high stakes assignments will generally undergo multiple drafts and receive both formal and informal feedback before final drafts are submitted. Good writing takes time and often comes from humble beginnings. Students will learn to develop and trust their own process. Instructors will encourage revision and allow sufficient time for students to revise drafts.

**Feedback**
Feedback is more than providing a letter grade on the final draft of a paper. Instructors will provide students with timely, enriching instructional feedback throughout the writing process, using a variety of methods including comments on evolving drafts and individual conferences. Feedback on early drafts will focus on matters related to content, purpose and organization; proofreading concerns should be reserved for later stages in the writing process.

**Evaluation**
Evaluative criteria should reflect assignment specific goals and requirements. There is no single way to write an academic paper. Students will be instructed in a variety of writing techniques and conventions and will learn that writing is a dynamic, evolving process. Generic assignment and evaluation sheets can restrict student output, or make them too reliant on a particular format or structure. Rubrics may be used but should be explained in detail and not used simply as a method to streamline the evaluation process or serve solely as a tool for grade justification. Writing is a complex skill that is more than the sum of its parts—rubrics can be used to help identify particular areas of focus but should not ignore the holistic nature of the writing process. Instructors are encouraged to develop and implement their own evaluative criteria, as long as that criteria is provided to students in writing and reflects best practices.

**Active Engagement**
Students will develop critical reading skills and analyze texts for technical and stylistic elements, in addition to critical interpretations of content. Good writing instruction rarely involves lecture. Instructors will facilitate discussion on diverse reading selections and seek opportunities to engage with students through a variety of instructional techniques. Peer review is an important part of the writing process and is a recommended strategy to help students engage as both readers and writers.

**Digital Literacy**
As students move toward becoming writers in the 21st century, they will become part of the future of writing, a future that will be based on a global, collaborative text where much writing has the potential to become public. This future of writing creates a digital imperative that calls for the College to reshape its pedagogy with an awareness of the new technologies that are changing personal and professional lives. The College welcomes the digital rhetoric at the heart of this profound shift from a book culture to an online culture and is committed to preparing students for the future.
The Student
Good writing instruction is geared to the individual. Aptitudes and experiences vary greatly, as such, instruction must filter to the level of students and their particular challenges and places of promise. Writing intensive courses will be capped at 22 students and instructors will be expected to make use of class time to work with students on the level of the individual. Grammar instruction is not a focal point of composition courses, though many students will require effort in the area of mechanics. Diagnostic testing will be used to provide students with an assessment, and the corresponding exercises for challenged areas. Pre- and Post-diagnostics do not need to be evaluated beyond a credit/no-credit participation grade but will be facilitated by the instructor to ensure students develop an awareness of specific problem areas. Additionally, instructors will be encouraged to work closely with The Tutoring Center to put students in touch with the resources that can help them.

Course Enhancements

Three types of course enhancements have been targeted for improvement as part of the QEP:

- ACA (Student Success/Orientation)
- ENG (English Cornerstone and Touchstone Essays)
- General (including portfolio method of instruction, MyLabs, and WIC).

ACA (Student Success/Orientation)

Johnston Community College offers a series of classes with the prefix ACA, which stands for Academic Related. ACA classes are focused on student success and orientation to the College. These classes introduce students to the College’s physical, academic, and social environment and promote personal development essential for success. Topics include campus facilities and resources; policies, procedures and programs; study skills; and life management issues such as health, self-esteem, motivation, goal-setting, diversity, and communication. The majority of students are required to enroll in these classes. To assure student exposure to and encourage broad participation in the QEP’s mission, ACA classes will orient and inform students about the QEP and available campus writing resources through introductory modules. All ACA courses will also include a Library Orientation/Technology Overview that may be completed online or in a face-to-face classroom setting.

English Cornerstone and Touchstone Essays

A common assignment that is purposefully designed and utilized by all instructors in specified English courses will strengthen instructional methodology and student learning through:

- Improved collaboration between foundational study and curriculum English instructors by establishing continuity between courses.
- Greater cohesion and planning among foundational study and curriculum English instructors.
Stronger writing preparation for students in foundational studies as they transition to curriculum courses.
Practice in, and greater understanding of, various rhetorical modes of writing for all students.

Cornerstone and Touchstone Essays will strengthen instructional methodology and student learning in English (ENG) 090 and English (ENG) 111, respectively. ENG 090 is the final developmental English course at Johnston Community College prior to enrolling in curriculum English courses. ENG 090 provides practice in writing, stresses effective paragraph development, and emphasizes learning and applying the conventions of standard written English. ENG 111 is the first in a sequence of curriculum English courses at JCC. ENG 111 emphasizes the writing process including audience analysis, topic selection, thesis support and development, editing, and revision.

The required Cornerstone for ENG 090 and Touchstone Essays for ENG 111 are designed to: a) provide uniform assignments for students to apply knowledge and practice skills learned b) foster greater understanding of rhetorical modes of writing, and c) provide data for measuring and improving writing proficiency.

Collaborative design of the Cornerstone for ENG 090 and Touchstone for ENG 111 essay assignments among developmental and curriculum English instructors provides cohesion of content, learning objectives, and instructional methodologies between ENG 090 and ENG 111. The Cornerstone/Touchstone Essays are designed to work as seamlessly as possible within instructors’ existing course structure. A descriptive style was chosen for the Cornerstone Essay in ENG 090 due to its emphasis on concrete detail and its appropriateness for beginning writers. (See Appendix C). A narrative style was chosen for the Touchstone Essay due to its common use in composition courses and because the form allows for a variety of topics and stylistic choices. (See Appendix D).

The Cornerstone and Touchstone Essay assignments balance the assessment benefits of a uniform assignment with the critical asset of academic freedom. The QEP Writing Team concluded that assessment accuracy and viability was important enough to justify a uniform essay assignment. Each essay will be required of all ENG 090 and ENG 111 students, while a sample of those essays will be selected at random and submitted to the K-16 Education Center at the University of Texas at Austin for scoring. (For detailed assessment information, see the “Assessment” section.)

General

The Portfolio Method of Instruction

The Literature Review and Best Practices review indicates a portfolio method of instruction is one of the best approaches for process-based writing instruction. The portfolio method of instruction will be required in the ENG courses listed below as well as a select group of discipline-specific courses. All other courses instructors will be encouraged to incorporate the portfolio method in their writing assignments. Through a phased implementation throughout the QEP, the portfolio method of instruction will be deployed in the following English courses:
- English (ENG) 090 - Composition Strategies
- English (ENG) 102 - Applied Communications II
- English (ENG) 111 - Expository Writing
- English (ENG) 112 - Argument-Based Research
- English (ENG) 113 - Literature-Based Research
- English (ENG) 114 - Professional Research & Reporting

The portfolio method of instruction (the portfolio) will:

- Ensure a process centered approach to instruction
- Ensure students receive timely feedback at various stages in the writing process
- Encourage dialogue between instructors and students
- Encourage holistic approaches to instruction and assessment
- Balance low stakes writing assignments with traditional high stakes or formal writing assignments

The portfolio is a collection of student work that reflects their progress and growth in a writing-based class. While a portfolio can be used as a showcase for student work or student credentials, JCC’s QEP calls for a learning-based portfolio, reflective of student work within a single course. A learning-based portfolio requires students to gather and maintain informal writings (such as brainstorming notes, short assignments, journal entries, and rough drafts) and formal writings (such as final drafts, completed essays, and research papers). The writings are compiled in a centralized location which can consist of digital space and/or physical three-ring binders. Digital space for centralized storage is the current trend based on ease-of-access and elimination of physical space needs.

The portfolio method of instruction integrates all parts of the writing process. Final drafts are not stand alone documents but reflections of a process. Instructors are encouraged to meet individually with students inside and outside the classroom to discuss their portfolios and provide feedback at various points in the writing process. Further, the portfolio should balance high stakes formal essay grades with low stakes assignments designed to generate ideas and material. Portfolios will be required in all first year composition and WIC courses.

The portfolio method of instruction will be phased in for writing intensive courses (WIC) over several years, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Cohort</th>
<th>Develop</th>
<th>Implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort A: Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort C: Business, Public Services, &amp; Technology</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic &amp; Community Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A fundamental advantage of the portfolio is its flexibility. The portfolio provides a broad framework for instructors to work within, while also encouraging academic freedom. Due to the many possibilities the portfolio provides, it is necessary to define what the QEP portfolio means at Johnston Community College.
Portfolio Guidelines

- The portfolio allows students to write in varying styles. Traditional essay styles include: classification, narrative, comparison/contrast, argument, description, analysis and others. Essay styles will be determined in part by a particular course requirement.

- Portfolios will include revision(s) of student writing. Portfolios will contain at least one writing assignment that consists of multiple drafts.

- The portfolio does not mean deferred grading. Instructors will provide feedback and scoring for their students throughout the course of a semester. While it is acceptable to have certain elements of the portfolio scored at the end of the semester, (low-stakes assignments like journals, for instance) instructors should be sure to provide detailed feedback at appropriate points throughout the course. The portfolio does not replace the need for individually scored essays but offers a vehicle through which the instructor and student may recognize progress and identify specific areas of need.

- Low stakes assignments are critical to the portfolio but must not exceed 30% of a student’s overall course grade.

- The portfolio may or may not be used as a grading device. While the individual components of a portfolio will be scored, instructors may differ on the value of providing a grade for the portfolio as a whole. A Portfolio Assessment Rubric (PAR) has been developed for the purpose of scoring the portfolio. PAR will not be a required grading device, but may be employed and/or customized by instructors.

Writing Intensive Courses

As students complete English 112, English 113, or English 114, they move toward writing opportunities in multiple disciplines. These opportunities will reinforce and extend the skills developed in English courses. To promote continued focus on Principles and Practices of Writing Instruction throughout the student’s college career, the Instructional Division will develop writing intensive courses. These courses will ensure that students write in varying contexts and for various audiences in discipline-specific courses.

A writing intensive course (WIC) at JCC will incorporate writing assignments that facilitate student learning in specific disciplines. WICs will ensure students extend writing skills learned in ENG courses, develop discipline-specific writing skills, and understand the unique ways writing occurs in a given discipline. Implementation of WICs will reflect current research and best practices through the following criteria:

- Writing intensive courses will be capped at an enrollment of 22 students.
- Writing intensive courses will require a total of 3,000 words, or fifteen pages.
- Writing intensive courses will include both high and low stakes writing assignments.
- Writing intensive course instructors will provide feedback at multiple points in the writing process.
- Writing intensive courses will involve peer review.
- Writing intensive course instructors will use the portfolio method for developing, revising, and assessing student writing.
Writing intensive courses will require writing assignments throughout the semester. Writing intensive courses will be identified, developed, and implemented through a partnership including the Lead Content Specialist, QEP Resource Team, and appropriate faculty. In the semester prior to implementation, respective faculty will participate in professional development aligned with the objectives and methodology of the writing intensive course. Further support for faculty who teach writing intensive courses will include workshops and mentoring from appropriate QEP Resource Team members.

Writing intensive courses will be phased in over several years, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Cohort</th>
<th>Develop</th>
<th>Implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort A: Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort C: Business, Public Services, &amp; Technology</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic &amp; Community Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to full implementation, each cohort will pilot one writing intensive course section during the second half of the development year.

Faculty and instructional administrators identified potential courses to offer as WIC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>PHI 240, Introduction to Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIS 111, World Civilizations I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>PHM 140, Trends in Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDU 144, Child Development I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>ISC 112, Industrial Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUS 260, Business Communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MyLabs

The Pearson MyLab program has customized features including pre- and post-diagnostic testing, tutorials, online writing feedback, instructional audio and video, testing modules, interactive teaching modules as well as blog and ePortfolio options. Pearson Publishing facilitates MyLab programs which offer online learning solutions for individualized student assessment and resources that help students increase their understanding of core skills. To implement the On the Write Path objectives for improved writing proficiency, English faculty will integrate the MyWritingLab and MyCompLab online programs into English 090 and English 111 courses. The QEP calls for the creation of an environment where students will learn to utilize supplemental resources such as the MyLab programs to increase their understanding of writing concepts. These supplemental resources align with the Writing
Program Administrators (WPA) objectives as well JCC’s QEP Student Learning Outcomes (See Table on page 31).

All of these resources offer a variety of options for the instructor and the student. Specifically, the pre- and post- diagnostic tests offer opportunities to determine a student’s strengths and weaknesses in writing, grammar and research concepts. These results can be used to modify and strengthen the English curriculum to better meet student needs. After completing the pre-diagnostic test, students also have the opportunity to study areas where they have deficiencies in English writing foundations. The results obtained through the pre-diagnostics testing and subsequent online work will benefit the students as they complete writing assignments in courses beyond English.

Pearson Publishing offers several varieties of MyLabs which are designed for different levels of English. Traditionally, the MyWritingLab program is used for developmental English courses, and MyCompLab is used for first year composition courses. To avoid repetition, MyCompLab will not be required in courses such as English 112 or English113; however, it may still be used as a resource for research strategies.

Although the MyWritingLab program has been required in JCC developmental English courses for several years, English 111 courses have not utilized the program. In the Fall 2011 semester, three instructors tested the MyCompLab system in their English 111 courses. For Spring 2012, English faculty decided to add the MyCompLab access codes to the textbook for all English 111 sections. These codes give students access to the MyCompLab program, and instructors have the option to customize the MyCompLab space to the objectives of the course. Because full implementation will require professional development, MyCompLab will be added into the English 111 course in stages, with pilot in the Fall 2012 semester and full implementation in the Spring 2013 semester. (See Timeline on page 44). Although access to MyLabs will initially be obtained through ENG courses, students will be able to use the resources in any course at JCC. The QEP Analyst will maintain pre- and post-diagnostic testing data at the end of each semester. Diagnostic data will be collected, analyzed, and maintained by the QEP Analyst in order to continuously improve and evaluate the QEP.
### MyCompLab Topics and Writing Program Administrator Outcome Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WPA Outcomes for First Year Composition</th>
<th>MyCompLab Content and Exercises</th>
<th>JCC QEP SLOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhetorical Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Focus on a purpose                     | 1. Resources > Writing > The Writing Process  
   2. Resources > Writing > Writing Purposes | 1,2,3,4      |
| Respond to the needs of different audiences | 1. Resources > Writing > The Writing Process  
   2. Resources > Writing > Writing Purposes | 1,3          |
| Respond appropriately to different kinds of rhetorical situations | 1. Resources > Writing > Writing Purposes (Analyze, Argue/Persuade, Compare/Contrast, Describe, Evaluate, Extend, Inform, Reflect, Synthesize) | 1,3          |
| Use conventions of format and structure appropriate to the rhetorical situation | 1. Resources > Writing > Writing Purposes (Analyze, Argue/Persuade, Compare/Contrast, Describe, Evaluate, Extend, Inform, Reflect, Synthesize)  
   2. Resources > Writing > Writing and Visuals | 1, 2,3,4     |
| Adopt appropriate voice, tone, and level of formality | 1. Resources > Writing > Writing Process > Drafting (also see Revising) | 1,3,4        |
| Understand how genres shape reading and writing | 1. Resources > Writing > Writing and Visuals  
   2. Resources > Writing > Writing Samples | 1,3          |
| Write in several genres | 1. Resources > Writing > Writing Purposes (Analyze, Argue/Persuade, Compare/Contrast, Describe, Evaluate, Extend, Inform, Reflect, Synthesize)  
   2. Resources > Writing > Writing and Visuals | 1,2,3        |
| **Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing** |                                 |              |
| Use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating | 1. Resources > Writing > Writing Process > Planning  
   2. Resources > Writing > Writing Purposes  
   3. Resources > Writing > Writing and Visuals (Note: This outcome could be met in several ways in the Writing and Research buckets. For example, there are exercises and assignments asking students to watch a video, look at an internet site, and respond in various ways, including short answer or essay format.) | 3,4          |
| Understand a writing assignment as a series of tasks, including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing appropriate primary and secondary sources | 1. Resources > Writing and Resources > Research (multiple topics) | 3,4          |
| Integrate their own ideas with those of others | 1. Resources > Research > The Research Assignment > Integrating Sources  
   2. Resources > In MyCompLab, instructors can assign both Collaborative assignments and Peer Review assignments: ToDo > Create Assignment > Peer Review (or Collaboration) | 2,3,4        |
| Understand the relationships among language, knowledge, and power | 1. Resources > Writing > Writing Purposes > Argue or Persuade (as well as Compare/Contrast, Describe, Evaluate, Extend, Inform, Reflect, Synthesize) 2. Resources > Writing > Writing and Visuals (assets about rhetoric) | 3,4 |
| Processes | Be aware that it usually takes multiple drafts to create and complete a successful text | 1. Resources > Writing Process > Revising. Features Include: Composing tab where students can write and submit multiple drafts. ToDo tab, where instructors can create assignments and request multiple drafts. | 3,4 |
| Develop flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proof-reading | 1. Resources > Writing Process > Revising 2. Resources > Writing Process > Finishing and Editing 3. Resources > Grammar (topics for Sentence Grammar, Basic Grammar, Usage and Style, Punctuation and Mechanics) | 3,4 |
| Understand writing as an open process that permits writers to use later invention and re-thinking to revise their work | Multiple areas, including Resources > Writing Process > Revising. To Do > Create Assignments feature and Composing tab (writing space and Writer's Toolkit) also encourage revising. | 3,4 |
| Understand the collaborative and social aspects of writing processes | Resources > Writing Process > Finishing and Editing > Peer Review. In MyCompLab, instructors can also assign both Collaborative assignments and Peer Review assignments: ToDo > Create Assignment > Peer Review (or Collaboration) | 3,4 |
| Learn to critique their own and others' works | Resources > Writing Process > Finishing and Editing > Peer Review. In MyCompLab, instructors can also assign both Collaborative assignments and Peer Review assignments: ToDo > Create Assignment > Peer Review (or Collaboration) | 1,2,3,4 |
| Learn to balance the advantages of relying on others with the responsibility of doing their part | Resources > Writing Process > Finishing and Editing > Peer Review. In MyCompLab, instructors can also assign both Collaborative assignments and Peer Review assignments: ToDo > Create Assignment > Peer Review (or Collaboration) | 3,4 |
| Use a variety of technologies to address a range of audiences | Resources > Writing > Writing and Visuals (includes several multimedia tutorials for visual rhetoric) | 1,3 |
| Knowledge of Conventions | Learn common formats for different kinds of texts | 1. Writer's Toolkit > Writing Samples > models listed by discipline and by writing purpose (105 models total) 2. Resources > Writing > Writing Process > Finishing and Editing (includes assets for using technology as well as formatting and designing documents) | 1,2,3 |
| Develop knowledge of genre conventions ranging from structure and paragraphing to tone and mechanics | 1. Resources > Writing > Writing Process; 2. Resources > Writing > Writing Purposes 2. Writer's Toolkit > Writing Samples > models listed by discipline and by writing purpose (105 models total) | 1,3 |
| Practice appropriate means of documenting their work | Resources > Research. In addition to pre-tests and post-tests for Citations, this bucket provides multiple instruction, multimedia, and assessment content for Avoiding Plagiarism, Finding Sources, Evaluating Sources, Integrating Sources, Citing Sources, Writing a Research Paper, and Research Samples | 1,3,4 |
| Control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling | 1. Resources > Grammar. This is an extensive section that includes granular topics for Sentence Grammar, Basic Grammar, Usage and Style, Punctuation and Mechanics.  
2. Writer’s Toolkit > Grammar and Editing FAQs  
3. When commenting in the Composing space, instructors can insert pre-set common grammar error comments that link students to instruction, multimedia and exercises to learn about that error | 3 |
| **Composing in Electronic Environments** | Resources > Writing > Writing Process (covered in several subsections, including Narrowing a Subject Online, Outlining using a Word Processor, Working with Text on a Word Processor, Working with Illustrations on a Word Processor.  
*The Composing space for submitting assignments encourages using the electronic environment for the entire writing and revision process. | 3,4 |
| Use electronic environments for drafting, reviewing, revising, editing, and sharing texts | Resources > Research > The Research Assignment > Finding Sources and Evaluating Sources  
Resources > Research > Citing Sources  
The Avoiding Plagiarism tutorial also covers electronic sources | 3,4 |
| Locate, evaluate, organize, and use research material collected from electronic sources, including scholarly library databases; other official databases (e.g., federal government databases); and informal electronic networks and internet sources | Resources > Research > The Research Assignment > Finding Sources and Evaluating Sources  
Resources > Research > Citing Sources | 3,4 |
III. Resources beyond the Classroom

In addition to traditional classroom enhancements, faculty, staff and students will have a rich menu of online resources designed to improve student writing. Professional development will be provided to train faculty on using available resources and aligning student needs with those resources. Resources beyond the classroom include LibGuides, Student Writing Resource Library, Faculty Online Resource Library, the Tutoring Center, and the Writing Studio.

LibGuides

LibGuides is a content management system used by the JCC Library to create research guides and share subject-specific resources to help students focus their research. Currently, the JCC Learning Resource Center (LRC) webpage offers LibGuides (formerly Pathfinders) to help students locate information available in the LRC and online. LibGuides links are available on the LRC website page, and visitors to the site can click on a variety of options to locate information and links for specific topics. LibGuides topics include Computer Technology, Math, Science, and Massage Therapy. Presently, there is not a LibGuides for Writing.

As part of QEP Implementation, the LRC will develop a Writing LibGuides that will link students to periodicals, books, online resources. LibGuides will add additional resources for students searching for further understanding of writing topics. It will also link students to other JCC online resources such as The Tutoring Center page. This enhancement will help students utilize writing resources in a variety of locations and formats.

LibGuides will also provide access to NC Live research links. From the NCLIVE website:

NC LIVE is North Carolina’s statewide online library service and is dedicated to providing North Carolinians with online library and information resources that support education, enhance statewide economic development, and increase quality of life. Designed for at-home use, NC LIVE eBooks, magazines, newspapers, journals, media, and other online materials are available from any Internet connection via library websites, and through www.nclive.org. NC LIVE offers free electronic access to resources for all ages on topics ranging from careers, business, and investing, to auto repair, health, history, and genealogy. NC LIVE resources are available to all North Carolinians through their local public, community college, or academic library (NCLIVE, 2012, para. 1).

Student Writing Resource Library

In order to provide quality writing assistance and resources to students, QEP Resource Team members will develop an online student writing resource library. Presently, the Tutoring Center has a resource webpage that is designed to assist students who need additional online resources and links. The Tutoring Center Coordinator and Lead
Content Specialist will work together to develop additional links and learning modules that concentrate on writing. This page will be linked from the main JCC website as well as the LRC LibGuides to ensure students have multiple opportunities to access information.

**Faculty Online Resource Library**

*On the Write Path* calls for faculty, staff, and students to embrace the writing experience. While English faculty have an extensive background with writing instruction standards, other faculty members may need additional resources to help them implement proper writing pedagogy into their courses. The online resource library for faculty will be designed to include instructional resources on writing standards such as rubrics, grading standards, proper instruction of writing for different genres and other topics that may assist non-English faculty in adding appropriate writing enhancements to their courses. Learning modules will also be added. Modules will include Power Point presentations, videos and other multi-media links that can either be used in classes or viewed by the faculty for additional study of best practice writing instruction standards.

**Tutoring Center**

The Tutoring Center (TC) is an evolution of what began as the Tutoring and Writing Center. The Tutoring and Writing Center was established in Fall 2010 with a mission to provide high-quality academic support to students enrolled at the College. As of July 2012, the Tutoring and Writing Center was renamed The Tutoring Center, and the Writing Studio (WS) was established. The Tutoring Center will continue to provide group and individual assistance in both writing and other of subject areas. It is anticipated QEP implementation will increase both student and faculty interaction with The Tutoring Center.

Since Fall 2010, the Tutoring Center has offered: individual tutoring by both peer and professional tutors, writing workshops for students and faculty, professional development training for tutors and faculty, online tutoring (Smarthinking) assistance, online resource links, various print materials and classroom presentations. The Tutoring Center is currently used as a source for remedial assistance.

The mission and goals of the TC have been revised to support the Student Learning Outcomes of the QEP. The TC will support the QEP in the following areas:

- Increase awareness of the TC and Smarthinking (Online Tutoring) services through classroom presentations with an emphasis on improving student writing.
- Create an online video presentation on the TC and Smarthinking (Online Tutoring) services for distance learning students with an emphasis on improving student writing (link on the TC web page).
- Continue to provide on-campus workshops and develop new workshops for students.
Increase purchase of Smarthinking hours for potential increase of student writing submissions in support of QEP implementation.

In Spring 2012, the TC Coordinator created training manuals for TC tutors. The QEP will require the following additions to tutor training manuals:

- Understand the philosophy, principles, mission, goals, strategies, and key initiatives associated with the QEP.
- Use the language of the QEP.
- Be knowledgeable of the QEP SLO’s.
- Understand and support the TC’s role in QEP implementation.
- Comprehend the tutor’s role in the QEP implementation.
- Promote and represent the TC services pertaining to QEP implementation.

The QEP will increase student demand for writing services. As such, the TC will partner with the Writing Studio (WS) and faculty to align student needs with the appropriate resource beyond the classroom. Many enhancements will center on TutorTrac software, which the TC currently uses to monitor student activity. TutorTrac provides for scheduling of appointments online, recording of visits, documenting session notes, accessing of records, and reporting. Additionally, TutorTrac will provide the tools necessary to foster increased collaboration and communication between the Tutoring Center and faculty. The following enhancements will facilitate faculty use of TutorTrac and improve TC effectiveness:

- All faculty whose students have received Tutoring Center services will receive an automated report weekly from TutorTrac detailing student activity.
- The QEP Analyst will compile and synthesize TutorTrac data to review outcomes.

Writing Studio

Based on research, input from the QEP consultant, Dr. Susan Miller-Cochran, and discussions at the senior administrative level, the decision to develop the Writing Studio (WS) as a separate entity from the Tutoring Center was reached in Summer 2012. The Writing Studio is designed to strengthen current writing resources offered in an environment that is collaborative, participatory, and productive. Students in the WS will receive assistance in academic writing, writing for literary competitions, creative writing, and the writing associated with career planning.

The following is a list of Writing Studio (WS) promotional items specifically in support of QEP implementation:

- Create a Writing Studio web page with “Writing Resources” links for writing in specific disciplines.
- Connect the WS’s web page information to the JCC Library web page.
- Offer Webcast Workshops.
- Create promotional materials, such as fliers, WS brochure, pamphlets, and create materials for discipline-specific courses, WIC, and QEP writing purposes.
- Provide on-campus workshops and develop new workshops for students.
The Writing Studio was not originally anticipated at the beginning of the QEP process; however, recognizing the increased student need for a place to explore advanced writing skills and having the opportunity to immediately address this need, the College made the decision to open the Writing Studio in the Fall of 2012. The Writing Studio promises increasing potential as the QEP is implemented and evolves.

**Celebrations of Writing**

*On the Write Path* is intended to create a positive environment for writing on the JCC campus. There will be many academic projects associated with the QEP; however, it is also imperative that the QEP sends a positive message to students that writing and the appreciation of writing skills are important to their personal growth. JCC intends to offer several celebrations of writing throughout each year.

One celebration of writing event will occur annually and center around the Cynthia DeFord Adams Literary Competition. The competition is a longstanding JCC tradition that recognizes excellence in student poetry and prose. The QEP Resource Team will select the competition winners, in addition to choosing other noteworthy student writers to participate in the event. The event will be planned by the QEP Resource Team and hosted by the LRC. The festivities will include student readings and a reception.

**Marketing Plan**

The purpose of the Marketing Plan is to raise awareness of JCC’s Quality Enhancement Plan while helping students appreciate the value of writing and its importance in their chosen career paths. In preparation for marketing the QEP, the following steps were taken:

- The JCC Student Government Association agreed to fund prizes for and help manage a student video contest.
- The JCC Marketing Team offered funding for posters and created content for a display case in the main Wilson building hallway.
- JCC Media Services agreed to provide videotaping services, created a QEP website and Facebook page, and broadcast QEP Marketing messages on the campus digital signage network.
- JCC Student Services partnered with the marketing team to rename JCC Fall Fest, an annual student celebration, *On the Write Path*.
- JCC’s Curriculum Committee and Vice President of Instruction approved an introductory paragraph on the QEP to be included in the Fall 2012 syllabus template.
- JCC Information Technology agreed to the installation of QEP desktop wallpaper on all school lab computers throughout the Summer session and Fall 2012 semester.
The following table outlines key marketing strategies, the parties responsible for implementation, and associated deadlines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QEP logo creation</td>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[See Appendix E ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad campaign on campus digital signage monitors</td>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>Teaser ad January 2012; then logo promotion and subsequent ads for and future semesters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[See Appendix E ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-of-mouth/Face-to-face</td>
<td>QEP Marketing Committee, JCC SGA, JCC Tutoring Center</td>
<td>December 2011-August 2012; then as per evaluation recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Hold information sessions with selected JCC committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Develop a paragraph about the QEP for all college syllabi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Man-on-the-street videos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Creation of ‘Ask me about the QEP’ desktop cards for Steering committee members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Email blasts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Graffiti wall[s]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a QEP Web site.</td>
<td>QEP Marketing Committee, Media Services</td>
<td>February 2012 initially, and update as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[See <a href="http://www.johnstoncc.edu">http://www.johnstoncc.edu</a> and Appendix F ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a JCC QEP Facebook site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Logo on all JCC computer lab desktops</td>
<td>QEP Marketing Committee, IT</td>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters &amp; Fliers</td>
<td>QEP Marketing Committee, Publications Manager, and Art Instructors</td>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty advertising items [i.e. pens, t-shirts, table tents, etc. with QEP logo]</td>
<td>QEP Marketing Committee and Publications Manager</td>
<td>First items, August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student contests</td>
<td>QEP Marketing Committee, JCC SGA</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Video contest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Paragraph of the week contest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a member of the QEP Resource Team, the Manager of Media Services will work with the Team to identify and develop additional marketing strategies throughout the life of the QEP. As the QEP budget indicates, a total $7,000 has been allotted for initial and continuing marketing needs.
### Timeline for Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Enhancements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Establish/Hire Lead Content Specialist and QEP Analyst (TO BE HIRED SUMMER 2012)</td>
<td>VP of Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum Enhancements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) ENG 090 Cornerstone Assignment</td>
<td>Lead Content Specialist QEP Resource Team</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>D/T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) ENG 111 Touchstone Assignment</td>
<td>Lead Content Specialist QEP Resource Team</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>D/T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Mylabs ENG 090 &amp; ENG 111</td>
<td>Lead Content Specialist QEP Resource Team</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Portfolio Method of Instruction</td>
<td>Lead Content Specialist QEP Resource Team</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>D/T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5) ACA Syllabus Enhancements:
- **QEP Introductory Module**
- **Library Orientation/Technology Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) LibGuides</td>
<td>Lead Content Specialist</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QEP Resource Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Faculty Resource</td>
<td>Lead Content Specialist</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>QEP Resource Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Student Writing</td>
<td>Lead Content Specialist</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Library</td>
<td>QEP Resource Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Expanded Writing</td>
<td>Lead Content Specialist</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Writing Studio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QEP Resource Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Tutor Training</td>
<td>Lead Content Specialist</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutoring Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6) Webcast Workshops for Distance Learning Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Content Specialist</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Studio</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Resource Team</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Resource Team</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Resource Team</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Resource Team</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Resource Team</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Resource Team</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7) Create Writing Studio Webpage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Content Specialist</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Studio</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Resource Team</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Resource Team</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Resource Team</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Resource Team</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Resource Team</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Resource Team</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table Key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Train</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### QEP Resource Team Membership

- Lead Content Specialist
- Writing Studio Coordinator
- QEP Project Administrator
- Director of Research and Institutional Effectiveness
- QEP Analyst
- All Full-time English Faculty
- Tutoring Center Coordinator
- Director of Student Success
- SGA President
- Librarian
- Manager of Media Services
- Instructional Designer
Organizational Structure

The organizational structure for the implementation of *On the Write Path* is predicated on the concept of multi-disciplinary inter-departmental teams, with administrative coordination and oversight. This approach will provide the level of quality and expediency necessary to achieve desired outcomes for this initiative.

The organizational structure depicted below is designed to:

- Facilitate ongoing communication of institutional vision, mission, goals and actions in such a way that stakeholders affected by the QEP understand its purpose and their roles.
- Assure access to, and support from, senior administrators throughout the life of the QEP; expedite early detection and resolution of issues/problems that could impact successful implementation of the QEP.
- Assure adjustment, alignment, and management of shifting priorities, demonstrated capabilities, and resources during implementation stages of the QEP.
- Prioritize and launch actions to be implemented; monitor financial/human resources; leverage and engage talent across campus to meet objectives.
Functional Roles and Responsibilities

QEP Resource Team

The QEP Resource Team includes cross-functional Core Content Specialists (discipline-specific subject-matter experts/consultants) that serve as catalysts and "drivers" for execution of actions to be implemented. In addition to Core Content Specialists, the QEP Resource Team will include representation from both the student body and staff. The primary roles and responsibilities of the group are to:

- Design, develop, and deploy materials and training modules associated with the QEP.
- Provide support and consultation to others within, as well as, outside the group.
- Liaise and establish small ad-hoc working groups/teams accountable for "operationalizing" actions to be implemented in specific program areas. The facilitator of the QEP Resource Team will be the Lead Content Specialist.

The QEP Resource Team will be comprised of:

- Lead Content Specialist/Writing Studio Coordinator
- QEP Project Administrator
- QEP Analyst
- All Full-time English faculty
- Tutoring Center Coordinator
- SGA President
- Director of Research and Institutional Effectiveness
- Director of Student Success
- Librarian
- Manager of Media Services
- Instructional Designer

The QEP Resource Team will consult with applicable ad-hoc members from faculty and staff associated with a particular implementation in a given discipline or program. With consultation and support from Core Content Specialists, the QEP Resource Team will implement actions of the QEP into given programs of study. Work of the QEP Resource Team will be focused on actual deployment and execution of actions in specified areas.

Lead Content Specialist

In addition to consultation, subject matter expertise, and leadership, primary roles and responsibilities of the Lead Content Specialist will be to:

- Schedule and lead Core Content Specialists and QEP Resource Team meetings.
- Lead professional development activities outlined in the QEP.
- Lead faculty mentoring activities and workshops.
- Lead content creation and provide oversight for Faculty Resource Library.
Evaluate, analyze, and continually improve the QEP in collaboration with Core Content Specialists and others.
Ensure sharing of QEP outcomes with stakeholders.
Assure coordination of communications and actions between full-time and part-time faculty in the deployment of the QEP.
Consult with QEP faculty participants regarding curriculum development and writing intensive courses.
Prepare, in collaboration with the Core Content Specialists, Director of Institutional Effectiveness and the QEP Analyst, the QEP five-year report.

QEP Project Administrator

The primary focus of the QEP Project Administrator will be to guide and assure realization of established QEP initiatives and objectives. The QEP Project Administrator will:

- Work collaboratively with the Lead Content Specialist in the execution of the QEP.
- Provide leadership and support to the QEP Resource Team and other action teams implementing key initiatives described in the Quality Enhancement Plan document.
- Plan, design, and develop project management tools/aids.
- Act as liaison between and within the divisions of the College in order to facilitate an integrated, systemic, on-going process of enhancement, assessment, and planning.
- Manage QEP expenditures and consult with appropriate personnel regarding human and financial needs required for the ongoing successful implementation of the QEP.
- Work with appropriate personnel to assure on-campus and external activities take place that inform and market the QEP to students, faculty, administrators, staff and external constituents.
- Assist in the design, development, and delivery of faculty development, training modules related to the QEP topic and key initiatives.
- Facilitate relationship building, timely communication, and resolution of conflict to assure the successful implementation of the QEP.

QEP Executive Team

The QEP Executive Team is comprised of the Vice-President-Curriculum, Deans, Controller, the Director of Research and Institutional Effectiveness, the Lead Content Specialist, the QEP Project Administrator, and one full-time English faculty member. The QEP Executive Team's work focuses on oversight responsibilities, strategic direction and alignment, compliance, senior-level decision making, resource support/management, and full accountability for the QEP's success.
The organizational structure outlined is consistent with Johnston Community College’s stated Institutional Goal 8 which states, “Ensure the efficient, appropriate, and effective use of all available resources.”

The organizational structure will facilitate:

- Clarity of direction in execution of the QEP.
- Results-oriented problem solving.
- Clearly understood lines of authority for decision-making.
- Adaptability in the utilization of resources throughout the QEP life cycle.
Resources

On the Write Path will become an integral part of each division of Johnston Community College, and the College is committed to providing sufficient human and fiscal resources to ensure successful realization of the QEP. The College plans to allocate $1,055,177 over the next five years for QEP initiatives, with an expenditure of $208,881 during the first year, 2012-2013. The detailed budget that follows shows the entire financial commitment to implementing and assessing the QEP for the five year period, 2012-2017. The majority of funding is derived from state and local funding. During the development of the budget, the College’s Controller was a key member of the budget development process. The funds ultimately allocated for the QEP project are provided by state appropriations. These allocated funds were the result of the overall College’s budgeting process. The overall budgeting process included many discussions with the College President and Administrative Council (senior management from all of the College’s divisions). All divisions within the College scrutinized their respective budgets and committed to the QEP process by reducing their budgets to fund the QEP initiative. The budget was originally approved by the President and Administrative Council on March 14, 2012; a revised budget was approved August 14, 2012. The budget will be reviewed and evaluated annually.

The following budget summarizes expenditures by major expenditure category and year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QEP PROJECTED COSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead QEP Content Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT QEP Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Editors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Project Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARDWARE/SOFTWARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MyLabs+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Hardware/Software Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Orientation/ Academic Technology Overview Module for ACA Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Method of Instruction, Principles and Practices, Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Courses, and MyLabs+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Introduction Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornerstone Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touchstone Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Professional Dev. Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Tools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assessment Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER COSTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing of QEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Event Celebrating Exemplary Student Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Smarthinking Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TutorTrac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Cap Reduction for ENG 111 &amp; WIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Other Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 0 2011-12</th>
<th>Year 1 2012-13</th>
<th>Year 2 2013-14</th>
<th>Year 3 2014-15</th>
<th>Year 4 2015-16</th>
<th>Year 5 2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$18,200</td>
<td>$19,720</td>
<td>$19,720</td>
<td>$19,720</td>
<td>$19,720</td>
<td>$34,720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COST SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Year 0 2011-12</th>
<th>Year 1 2012-13</th>
<th>Year 2 2013-14</th>
<th>Year 3 2014-15</th>
<th>Year 4 2015-16</th>
<th>Year 5 2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>$5,590</td>
<td>$184,524</td>
<td>$184,524</td>
<td>$184,524</td>
<td>$158,575</td>
<td>$158,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware/Software Services</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$3,920</td>
<td>$12,920</td>
<td>$12,920</td>
<td>$12,920</td>
<td>$12,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$2,237</td>
<td>$2,237</td>
<td>$2,237</td>
<td>$2,237</td>
<td>$2,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$18,200</td>
<td>$19,720</td>
<td>$19,720</td>
<td>$19,720</td>
<td>$34,720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COSTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 0 2011-12</th>
<th>Year 1 2012-13</th>
<th>Year 2 2013-14</th>
<th>Year 3 2014-15</th>
<th>Year 4 2015-16</th>
<th>Year 5 2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,590</td>
<td>$208,881</td>
<td>$219,401</td>
<td>$219,401</td>
<td>$193,452</td>
<td>$208,452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL QEP BUDGET** $1,055,177

The College realizes that resource allocation for a project of this scope and duration will require annual review and adjustment. Faculty, staff, administration, and trustees are supportive of the QEP effort and are committed to alignment of the necessary resources for its success.
Assessment Plan

Introduction

JCC recognizes assessment as an iterative process designed to inform and improve processes within an organization. Accordingly, assessment is not viewed as a static function, but a dynamic, cyclical exercise that provides the opportunity to ultimately implement change. Therefore, JCC values assessment plans that incorporate both summative measurements of student performance and formative evaluations that assist in modifying, shaping, and improving programs and services. To ensure widespread engagement in the QEP assessment plan, the Assessment Committee included employees from most divisions within the institution, a student representative, and a member of the Board of Trustees.

Summative Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

The assessment plan for On the Write Path incorporates both summative and formative assessments. The summative assessments are designed to measure student achievement of QEP Student Learning Outcomes. The questions that guide the summative assessment design are:

- To what extent do JCC students demonstrate an awareness of situation, audience, and tone?
- To what extent do JCC students produce texts that are unified, coherent, and fully developed?
- To what extent has On the Write Path increased student utilization of supplemental resources?
- To what extent has On the Write Path changed students’ perceptions and attitudes about writing as a process, its importance to their academic and professional goals, and improved writing as a result of the JCC experience?

JCC will have met the goal of its QEP when it successfully reaches the achievement targets set for each of the summative assessment questions.

The methods for the summative assessments for JCC’s QEP will include both direct and indirect approaches to provide evidence of student achievement. Direct assessments require the student/participant to prove knowledge and skills while indirect assessments allow the student/participant to reflect upon his/her learning. The assessment strategy will be layered to include multiple measures for various SLOs. The collection and analysis will rely mainly on quantitative data and methods.

The Summative Assessment Table uses assessment questions to connect instruments, methodologies, analysis, and achievement targets. The table is followed by detailed explanations organized by SLOs of the measurements, the data gathering process, and the designated responsibility for data analysis.
## Summative Assessment Table

**Outcomes Assessed:**

**SLO 1:** Students will produce texts that demonstrate an awareness of situation, audience, and tone.

**SLO 2:** Students will produce texts that are unified, coherent, and fully developed.

**SLO 3:** Students will utilize supplemental resources beyond the classroom to enhance their writing.

**SLO 4:** Students will view writing as a process, understand its importance to their academic and professional goals, and recognize their improved writing as a result of the JCC experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Question</th>
<th>Assessment Instrument</th>
<th>When, Where, and How</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Achievement Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] To what extent do JCC students demonstrate an awareness of situation, audience, and tone?</td>
<td>JCC Writing Assessment Rubric</td>
<td>Year 1-5: Random selection from ENG 090 and ENG 111 Cornerstone/Touchstone essays and writing assignment from writing intensive courses assessed by the Education Center at UT Austin. Data collection and analysis coordinated by QEP Analyst.</td>
<td>Percentage of students demonstrating a total score of meets or exceeds expectations.</td>
<td>By Year 5, at least 80% of JCC students enrolled in ENG 090, 111 or WIC will receive a composite score of at least meets or exceeds expectations on the JCC Writing Assessment Rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JCC Portfolio Assessment Rubric</td>
<td>Year 2-5: Random selection of ENG 111 &amp; writing intensive course portfolios for review by the QEP Resource Team. Data collection and analysis coordinated by QEP Analyst.</td>
<td></td>
<td>By Year 5, at least 80% of JCC students enrolled in ENG 111 or WIC will score at least meets or exceeds expectations on SLO #1 of the JCC Portfolio Assessment Rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Question</td>
<td>Assessment Instrument</td>
<td>When, Where, and How</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Achievement Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] To what extent do JCC students produce texts that are unified, coherent, and fully developed?</td>
<td>JCC Writing Assessment Rubric</td>
<td>Year 1-5: Random selection from ENG 090 and ENG 111 Cornerstone/Touchstone essays and writing assignment from writing intensive courses assessed by the Education Center at UT Austin. Data collection and analysis coordinated by QEP Analyst.</td>
<td>Percentage of students demonstrating a total score of <em>meets or exceeds expectations</em></td>
<td>By Year 5, at least 80% of JCC students enrolled in ENG 090, 111 or WIC will receive a composite score of at least <em>meets or exceeds expectations</em> on the JCC Writing Assessment Rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JCC Portfolio Assessment Rubric</td>
<td>Year 2-5: Random selection of ENG 111 &amp; writing intensive course portfolios for review by the QEP Resource Team. Data collection and analysis coordinated by QEP Analyst.</td>
<td></td>
<td>By Year 5, at least 80% of JCC students enrolled in ENG 111 or WIC will score at least <em>meets or exceeds expectations</em> on SLO #2 of the JCC Portfolio Assessment Rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MyWritingLab/ MyCompLab Pre/Post test</td>
<td>Year 1 Spring- Year 5: ENG 090 and ENG 111 take MyWritingLab/ MyCompLab grammar/mechanics assessment at the beginning and end of course. Data collection and analysis coordinated by QEP Analyst.</td>
<td>Percentage of students demonstrating a proficient score (80% or higher) in grammar/mechanics</td>
<td>By Year 5, at least 80% of JCC students enrolled in ENG 090 or 111 will show at least a proficient score in grammar/mechanics scores on the MyWritingLab/MyCompLab pre-test and/or post-test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Question</td>
<td>Assessment Instrument</td>
<td>When, Where, and How</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Achievement Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smarthinking data</td>
<td>Year 1-5: End of semester statistics documenting Smarthinking usage. Data collected by TC Coordinator and provided to QEP Analyst.</td>
<td>Number of unduplicated students utilizing Smarthinking services for writing.</td>
<td>Ratio of unduplicated students utilizing Smarthinking for writing to the total unduplicated headcount increases 5% each year of the QEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] To what extent has <em>On the Write Path</em> increased student utilization of supplemental resources?</td>
<td>TC and WS Usage data</td>
<td>Year 1-5: End of semester TC and WS data. Data collected by TC and WS Coordinators and provided to QEP Analyst.</td>
<td>Number of unduplicated students utilizing tutoring and writing studio services for writing.</td>
<td>Ratio of unduplicated students utilizing TC (specifically writing) and WS services to the total unduplicated headcount increases 5% each year of the QEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Website statistics</td>
<td>Year 1-5: End of semester writing LibGuide and Student Writing Resources Library page statistics</td>
<td>Number of website “hits”.</td>
<td>Number of hits for the writing LibGuides and Student Writing Resource Library increases by 5% each year of the QEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JCC Graduate Survey Results</td>
<td>Year 1-5: Paper survey administered to all graduating JCC students. Data collected by Institutional Effectiveness and provided to the QEP Analyst.</td>
<td>Student indication of writing resource use.</td>
<td>By year 5, 80% of JCC graduate respondents indicate that they sometimes or often utilized supplemental writing resources when completing writing assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JCC Portfolio Assessment Rubric</td>
<td>Year 2-5: Random selection of ENG 111 &amp; writing intensive course portfolios for review by the QEP Resource Team. Data collection and analysis coordinated by QEP Analyst.</td>
<td>Percentage of students demonstrating a total score of meets or exceeds expectations.</td>
<td>By Year 5, at least 80% of JCC students enrolled in ENG 111 or WIC will score at least meets or exceeds expectations on SLO #3 of the JCC Portfolio Assessment Rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Question</td>
<td>Assessment Instrument</td>
<td>When, Where, and How</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Achievement Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] To what extent has <em>On the Write Path</em> changed students’ perceptions and attitudes about writing as a process, its importance to their academic and professional goals, and improved writing as a result of the JCC experience?</td>
<td>JCC Graduate Survey Results</td>
<td>Year 1-5: Paper survey administered to all graduating JCC students.</td>
<td>Student perception of writing as a process</td>
<td>By year 5, 80% of JCC graduate respondents <em>agree or strongly agree</em> that they perceive writing as a process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data collected by Institutional Effectiveness and provided to the QEP Analyst.</td>
<td>Student perception that writing is important in their academic and professional goals.</td>
<td>By year 5, 80% of JCC graduate respondents <em>agree or strongly agree</em> that writing is important to their academic and professional goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student perception that the JCC experience resulted in their improved writing.</td>
<td>By year 5, 80% of JCC graduate respondents <em>agree or strongly agree</em> that the JCC experience resulted in their improved writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JCC Writing Event Statistics</td>
<td>Year 1-5: Data gathered for each writing event.</td>
<td>Number of students participating in writing events.</td>
<td>Participation in writing events increases 5% each year of the QEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data collected and analyzed by the QEP Analyst.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JCC Portfolio Assessment Rubric</td>
<td>Year 2-5: Random selection of ENG 111 &amp; writing intensive course portfolios for review by the QEP Resource Team.</td>
<td>Percentage of students demonstrating a total score of <em>meets or exceeds expectations</em>.</td>
<td>By Year 5, at least 80% of JCC students enrolled in ENG 111 or WIC will score at least <em>meets or exceeds expectations</em> on SLO #4 of the JCC Portfolio Assessment Rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data collection and analysis coordinated by QEP Analyst.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessing SLO #1

Students will produce texts that demonstrate an awareness of situation, audience, and tone.

JCC Writing Assessment Rubric

The Cornerstone and Touchstone Essay assignments are required essays in ENG 090 and ENG 111, respectively. In addition to the Cornerstone and Touchstone essay assignments in ENG courses, students will have the opportunity to develop further their skills in writing intensive courses. These courses are outside of the ENG curriculum. Writing assignments in ENG 090, ENG 111 and writing intensive courses are assigned to be written during the second half of the course and as such provide a cumulative portrayal of the student’s writing ability. These writing assignments are designed, not as an evaluation measure of JCC instructors, but to meet existing course requirements while also providing external evaluators with direct evidence of JCC student writing proficiency.

The Cornerstone and Touchstone Essay assignments are designed to work as seamlessly as possible with instructors’ existing, formal writing assignments. Much thought was given to the question of balancing the assessment benefits of a uniform assignment with the question of infringing on the critical asset of academic freedom. Ultimately, the QEP committee decided that assessment accuracy and viability were important enough to justify one uniform essay assignment per semester. Measures were taken to ensure the essay was focused enough to provide actionable data, while remaining careful to avoid prescribing particular teaching methods or strategies.

The QEP Writing Team developed the JCC Writing Assessment Rubric (Appendix G) to guide external evaluators in the scoring of the sample essays. In an effort to relieve JCC faculty from some of the time-intensive burden of scoring, and to ensure impartial, objective assessment, the QEP committee sought external reviewers for JCC student writing. The JCC Writing Assessment Rubric is designed for the external reviewers and speaks to specific QEP SLOs but can also be used as a stand-alone classroom assessment. Instructors may find it useful to add elements to the rubric to help integrate into an existing assessment strategy but are not encouraged to use it for more than the Cornerstone/Touchstone assignment unless appropriate adjustments are made.

The QEP committee explored several external review options. Electronic scoring services were found to be too restrictive. While there were some logistical advantages to streamlined, electronic scoring, scoring systems could not be directly applied to the QEP’s specific SLOs. Accurate QEP assessment requires trained professionals in the discipline who are able to contextualize scoring and provide feedback specific to the QEP’s focused initiatives.

The K-16 Education Center at University of Texas (UT)-Austin is able to provide exactly such feedback. The Education Center will work with a JCC developed rubric and also provide input on improving the assessment process as the plan is implemented. The Education Center will give QEP assessment the flexibility and responsiveness that will ensure accurate, operational data. As previously stated in the “Actions to be Implemented” section, the UT-Austin Education Center is a SACS accredited institution. Education Center essay scoring is done by trained professionals, including former college professors, rather than the computer generated scoring
offered by many other services. Additionally, Education Center readers are experienced in holistic scoring, a method in which trained evaluators score writing for its overall quality.

The QEP Analyst will use a randomized number generator to select at least two essay samples, per section, per semester. The QEP Analyst will contact instructors of the selected students, and then compile the essays to be sent to the evaluators at the Education Center. Prior to submission to UT-Austin, the QEP Analyst will remove all identifying information from the sample essays, including: student names, instructor names, and section numbers. The Center will provide detailed feedback to JCC throughout the scoring process, ensuring efficiency and accuracy.

**Cornerstone Essay**

As described in the “Actions to be Implemented” section the descriptive style was chosen for the ENG 090 Cornerstone Essay. Instructors will have many ways to customize instruction and the use of the rubric for course grading. The Cornerstone Essay will be assigned in all ENG 090 courses, and each instructor will use the same prompt. Historically, approximately fifteen sections of ENG 090 are offered each semester, providing a total sample size of approximately thirty essays per semester.

**Touchstone Essay**

As described in the “Actions to be Implemented” section the narrative style was chosen for the ENG 111 Touchstone Essay. Instructors will have many ways to customize instruction and the use of the rubric for course grading. The Touchstone Essay will be assigned in all ENG 111 courses, and each instructor will use the same prompt. Historically, twenty-five sections of ENG 111 are offered each semester, providing a total sample size of approximately fifty essays per semester.

**Writing Intensive Course Assignment**

A course-specific writing assignment will be included in all writing intensive courses. In these courses instructors will assign a specific writing assignment which will vary based on the particular course’s student learning outcomes. Details of the assignment will be left to the individual instructor’s discretion but should follow the characteristics of a writing intensive course outlined in the “Actions to be Implemented” section.

**JCC Portfolio Assessment Rubric**

Writing intensive courses are transitioning to the portfolio method of instruction and will require assessment that reflects this process-based methodology. Portfolio-based instruction will require students to write for varying audiences and contexts through both formal and informal writings. The Cornerstone/Touchstone Essays as well as the writing intensive course assignments will be included in the portfolios for their respective courses.

The QEP Assessment Committee considered the prospect of reading and assessing entire portfolios but found the prospect to be a strain on resources. The committee decided to incorporate a Self-Reflection Essay (See Appendix H). This essay will give students the valuable opportunity to assess their own growth as a writer, while also streamlining many of the
assessment needs of the committee. Portfolios will still be reviewed in their entirety for evidence of the writing process, but much of the detailed assessment will be achieved through the Self-Reflection Essay. The Self-Reflection Essay will assess SLO #1 through the Situation, Audience, and Tone prompt and also by the writer’s ability to address the assignment’s specific components.

The QEP Analyst will select at least two portfolios from each section of ENG 111 and all WIC outside of English using a randomized number generator. While portfolios will be used in ENG 102, 112, 113, and 114, they will not be part of the assessment sample due to resource constraints. The sample generated from ENG 111 and WIC will be sufficient to determine achievement of SLOs. The selected portfolios will be assessed by ENG faculty of the QEP Resource Team using the Portfolio Assessment Rubric to measure proficiency in each SLO and overall QEP effectiveness. (See Appendix I). The ENG faculty of the QEP Resource Team will then collectively discuss and reach consensus on scoring of each portfolio.

Assessing SLO #2

Students will produce texts that are unified, coherent, and fully developed.

JCC Writing Assessment Rubric and Portfolio Assessment Rubric

The Touchstone/Cornerstone Essay Assignment and the Self-Reflection Essay will address SLO #2 through the Writing Assessment Rubric and the Portfolio Assessment Rubric. The Self-Reflection Essay will not contain a particular prompt related to SLO #2 but will use the document itself to assess unification, coherency, and development.

MyWritingLab/MyCompLab

MyWritingLab/MyCompLab are online supplemental resources that will be available to students registered for ENG 090 and 111 respectively via an access code that is packaged with the textbook. The Pearson MyLabs have been available for the last decade and have recently undergone system upgrades to include online portfolios and one-on-one online tutoring for writing assistance. In MyWritingLab/MyCompLab, students can be assessed through pre- and post- diagnostic testing for grammar, writing and research. Once a student completes the pre-diagnostic test, the system will assign modules designed to develop areas of deficiency. The system also allows for instructor personalization and instructor directed assignments. Thus, whether an instructor just wants to allow the student to work on his or her personal deficiencies or assign specific modules to an entire class, students will receive the benefit of supplemental work and resources that can be accessed outside of class time.

The MyWritingLab/MyCompLab sites are available online and can be utilized from any laptop, PC, Smartphone or tablet device. Students will benefit from the interactive modules that include handouts, audio podcasts, video clips, PowerPoint presentations and quizzes. Both the student and instructor will be able to review the online gradebook to determine the student’s individual progress.

All ENG 090 and 111 students will be required to take the pre- and post-diagnostic tests. Diagnostic results will be reviewed to determine if students are increasing their knowledge of grammar, writing and research concepts associated with ENG competencies. In the fall of 2012,
JCC will use the standard MyLab system and will transition to the MyLabs Plus system by year 3 of the QEP; however, the diagnostic tests will remain the same and will not impact the QEP assessment. Each semester, ENG 090 and 111 instructors will give the MyWritingLab/MyCompLab pre- and post- diagnostic results to the QEP Analyst for analysis.

**Assessing SLO #3:**

Students will utilize supplemental resources beyond the classroom to enhance their writing.

A significant part of strengthening student writing at Johnston Community College involves empowering students to take responsibility for their academic success and understanding the role writing skills play in that academic success. In taking such responsibility, students will learn about and use appropriate supplemental resources beyond the classroom. Specifically, students will use the Tutoring Center (TC), Writing Studio (WS), Smarthinking, and LibGuides as resources to improve their writing skills. The QEP Assessment Plan provides for the collection of both direct and indirect evidence in a formative assessment of students’ use of the above resources in the following methods:

**Tutoring Center and Writing Studio Usage Data**

Currently, the Tutoring Center (TC) utilizes TutorTrac to collect data about TC usage. The Web based application, TutorTrac, is also used by JCC to manage student appointments with the Tutoring Center. Reporting features of TutorTrac include usage statistics, tutor progress reports, and student comments. The TC Coordinator will use TutorTrac to compile reports on student use of the TC for writing assistance. Additionally, the Writing Studio (WS) Coordinator will track student usage of its services. Both the TC and WS Coordinator will provide reports to the QEP Analyst.

**Smarthinking Data**

Smarthinking is an online tutoring service that is available 24/7. Students connect from any computer that has Internet access to live tutors who are trained and qualified. Students can submit their writing for critique by writing tutors, they can ask questions, and they can schedule appointments for assistance with their writing. The TC coordinator will track use of Smarthinking for students who use the service for writing and provide reports to the QEP Analyst.

**LibGuides and Student Writing Resource Library**

LibGuides is a portal to high quality research information. It is fully customizable, accessible via Internet or mobile device, has email alert and RSS newsfeed features, and offers content that can be shared by users on social media. The Student Writing Resource Library provides students with easy access to useful writing resources (Ex. OWL at Purdue and ChompChomp). The library will monitor LibGuides usage and provide reports to the QEP Project Administrator. The webmaster will provide website statistics annually to the QEP Analyst for the Student Writing Resource Library.
Graduate Surveys

To measure students’ use of supplemental writing resources, the Graduate Survey, a paper survey administered to each graduating student, will include questions relating to student use of such resources. The Graduate Survey is already a part of the annual Institutional Effectiveness planning process and as such, the results will be collected by the Director of Research and Institutional Effectiveness and provided to the QEP Analyst.

JCC Portfolio Assessment Rubric

The Self-Reflection Essay will address SLO #3 through the Portfolio Assessment Rubric. The Self-Reflection Essay will contain a particular prompt related to SLO #3.

Assessing SLO #4

Students will view writing as a process, understand its importance to their academic and professional goals, and recognize their improved writing as a result of the JCC experience.

JCC Writing Event Statistics

In an effort to generate campus-wide interest in writing, there will be at least one writing event planned per academic year. The English faculty and QEP Resource Team will plan a student-centered event to celebrate student writing accomplishments. This event will be tied to a scholarship or literary contest winner to showcase exemplary writing of JCC students. In addition, the celebration will involve a reception that will include student readings and reflections, question and answer sessions, and sharing of writing opportunities available to students outside of their course assignments.

These celebrations will be assessed through attendance of participating students at these events. Through marketing and increased campus wide knowledge of these events, student attendance and participation should increase by at least 5% each academic year. This data will be collected and analyzed by the QEP Analyst.

JCC Portfolio Assessment Rubric

The Portfolio Assessment will assess SLO #4 both indirectly and directly. The Self-Reflection Essay will address SLO #4 indirectly through a particular prompt related to SLO #4. The portfolio itself will serve as direct evidence to demonstrate student writing as a process.

Graduate Surveys

The Graduate Survey will include additional questions to measure the impact of the QEP. These questions will gauge students’ perceptions and attitudes about writing as a process, its importance to their academic and professional goals, and their improved writing as a result of
the JCC experience. The results will be collected by the Director of Research and Institutional Effectiveness and provided to the QEP Analyst in years 1-5 of the QEP.

**Formative Assessment of QEP Actions**

In addition to summative assessment of QEP SLOs, JCC will also conduct formative assessments of QEP actions to determine the effectiveness of various processes and procedures. The main goal of formative assessments is to provide feedback on an ongoing basis to help “form” and improve programs and procedures, determine best use of organizational resources, and measure accomplishment of program goals.

JCC’s QEP formative assessments will collect both quantitative and qualitative data; however, achievement targets will be based on quantitative data. The following questions guide the formative assessment design:

- How effective is instruction for faculty in QEP related workshops?
- How effective is instruction in MyWritingLab/MyCompLab for ENG faculty?
- How effective are TC workshops?
- How systemic is the incorporation of writing as a process within the JCC curriculum?
- To what extent are employers of JCC graduates satisfied with their employees’ writing skills?

The methods for the formative assessments for JCC’s QEP will include indirect approaches that allow for individual reflection on satisfaction of programs and services. The assessments will include survey questions that measure participant reaction, learning, and application. In order to ensure the highest response rate, those responsible for data collection will make multiple attempts to procure completed surveys. Each assessment instrument is discussed below. The Formative Assessment Table on page 66 follows the discussion of assessment instruments.

**QEP Faculty Professional Development Form**

The QEP Faculty Professional Development Form was developed to assess the effectiveness of QEP related workshops (both face-to-face and online). While the achievement target for effectiveness is an overall satisfaction rating for the workshops, the evaluation form incorporates questions gauging confidence and commitment with the material presented. Each workshop leader will administer the evaluation at the completion of a workshop. The workshop leader will submit the forms to the QEP Analyst for analysis. Results will be used to improve future offerings.

**The Pearson MyWritingLab/ MyCompLab Faculty Evaluation Form**

The Pearson MyWritingLab/ MyCompLab Faculty Evaluation Form will assess the effectiveness of MyWritingLab/MyCompLab workshops (both face-to-face and online). While the achievement target for effectiveness is an overall satisfaction rating for the workshops, the evaluation form incorporates questions gauging confidence and commitment with the material presented. The Pearson representative will administer the evaluation at the completion of each workshop. The Pearson representative will submit the forms to the QEP Analyst for analysis. Results will be shared with the Pearson representative and used to improve future offerings.
Student Workshop Evaluation Form

The Student Workshop Evaluation Form will assess the effectiveness of TC and WS workshops and other student-centered writing events. While the achievement target for effectiveness is an overall satisfaction rating for the workshops, the evaluation form incorporates questions gauging confidence and commitment with the material presented. The TC and WS Coordinators will administer the evaluation at the completion of each workshop. The TC and WS Coordinators will submit the forms to the QEP Analyst for analysis. Results will be used to improve future offerings.

Annual Faculty Writing Survey

The Annual Faculty Writing Survey was developed to determine the level of incorporation of writing as a process into the JCC curriculum. The QEP Analyst will administer the survey electronically to all JCC faculty and analyze the data against the achievement target.

JCC Employer Satisfaction Survey

The JCC Employer Satisfaction Survey is a paper-based survey administered annually to select employers of JCC students. In addition to their overall satisfaction of employee preparedness, employers are asked to indicate their degree of satisfaction with the preparation of their employees in the area of written communication skills. The survey is distributed, collected and analyzed by the Institutional Effectiveness Division on behalf of the Instructional Division as part of its annual program review process. The Director of Research and Institutional Effectiveness will submit the results to the QEP Analyst.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>When, Where, and How</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Achievement Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] How effective is instruction for faculty in QEP related workshops?</td>
<td>QEP Faculty Professional Development Evaluation Form</td>
<td>Upon completion of each QEP related workshop, all faculty will be asked to complete the evaluation form. Data collected and analyzed by the QEP Analyst.</td>
<td>Percentage of faculty indicating <em>satisfied</em> or <em>very satisfied</em> overall.</td>
<td>90% of faculty respondents are <em>satisfied</em> or <em>very satisfied</em> with training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] How effective is instruction in MyWritingLab/MyCompLab for ENG faculty?</td>
<td>Pearson MyWritingLab/MyCompLab Faculty Evaluation Form</td>
<td>Upon completion of each Pearson Professional Development session, all faculty will be asked to complete the evaluation form. Data collected by Pearson representative and provided to the QEP Analyst.</td>
<td>Percentage of faculty indicating <em>satisfied</em> or <em>very satisfied</em> overall.</td>
<td>90% of faculty respondents are <em>satisfied</em> or <em>very satisfied</em> with training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] How effective are TC and WS workshops?</td>
<td>QEP Faculty Professional Development Evaluation Form</td>
<td>Upon completion of each TC and WS workshop (faculty and students), all participants will be asked to complete the evaluation form. Data collected by TC and WS staff and provided to the QEP Analyst.</td>
<td>Percentage of students indicating <em>satisfied</em> or <em>very satisfied</em> overall.</td>
<td>90% of student respondents are <em>satisfied</em> or <em>very satisfied</em> with training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Question</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>When, Where, and How</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Achievement Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] How systemic is the incorporation of writing as a process within the JCC</td>
<td>Annual faculty writing survey</td>
<td>Year 1-5: Survey administered to all JCC Faculty.</td>
<td>Number of faculty utilizing writing as a process in their courses.</td>
<td>Percent of all JCC faculty respondents using writing as a process in classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Data collected and analyzed by the QEP Analyst</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1: 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2: 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 3: 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 4: 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 5: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] To what extent are employers of JCC graduates satisfied with their employees'</td>
<td>JCC Employer Satisfaction Survey results</td>
<td>Year 1-5: Survey administered to select employers of JCC students.</td>
<td>Employers’ (of JCC students) perception of their employees written communication skills.</td>
<td>By year 5, 80% of employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written communication skills?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Data collected by Institutional Effectiveness and provided to the QEP Analyst.</td>
<td></td>
<td>respondents of JCC students will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>indicate that they are satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or very satisfied with the written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>communication skills of their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection, Organization, Analysis and Reporting

Both the Summative Assessment Table and the Formative Assessment Table summarize responsibilities for data collection and analysis. Assessment activities occur either on an annual or semester basis. Detailed Statements of Work presented to the Resource Committee outline each individual assessment action, responsible parties, timeframe, and hours needed to accomplish each task. The majority of assessment responsibilities rests with the QEP Analyst.

The QEP Analyst will gather all documents relating to QEP assessment. All QEP assessment raw data (sample essays, portfolios, evaluation forms, etc.) will be stored electronically in a QEP Sharepoint site. Within the Sharepoint site, the data will be organized first by assessment question and then by term/year.

In addition to gathering the data for each assessment question, the QEP Analyst will analyze the data to determine if the achievement targets were met. Once the data are analyzed, the QEP Analyst will input the results into Compliance Assist Program Review Module. Compliance Assist, developed by CampusLabs, provides a customizable content management system for planning and assessment activities. JCC currently licenses all components of Compliance Assist.

Within the Compliance Assist Program Review Module, a node for the QEP will be created within the institutional hierarchy. Within the QEP node, an entry will be created under Assessment Plans for each SLO as well as each formative assessment question. After data analysis, the QEP Analyst will input the assessment methods, results, use of results, and upload any relevant documentation for the SLOs and formative assessments.

In addition to storing and organizing data, Compliance Assist allows for the production of assessment reports. Additionally, it supports linking of outcomes to program, department, and institution goals. The reports generated from Compliance Assist will be beneficial in drafting the QEP portion of the Fifth Year Report.

The Director of Research and Institutional Effectiveness will provide guidance and support for data collection, organization, analysis, and reporting as needed throughout the QEP process. S/He will also assist in the revision of QEP activities as both summative and formative assessment results prove necessary. Jointly, the QEP Analyst and the Director of Research and Institutional Effectiveness will ensure timely reporting of assessment results to appropriate stakeholders. Both individuals will serve on the QEP Resource Team and accordingly, they will present and discuss assessment results on a regular basis. In addition, key assessment results will be added to the QEP web site periodically.
Conclusions

Johnston Community College’s *On the Write Path* was developed as a strategic quality initiative designed to improve student learning. The Quality Enhancement Plan meets fully the criteria established by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The plan focuses on a clearly identified need, and the topic of writing was developed with broad-based input from the campus community. The outcomes of the plan reflect both documented institutional needs and a careful review of the best practices in the instruction of writing. The actions to be implemented follow a specific timeline, and the organizational structure establishes clear lines of responsibility. The formative and summative assessment measures identify specific benchmarks against which to gauge the success of the plan. The College’s administration is committed fully to providing the fiscal and human resources necessary for the achievement of the plan’s goals. In anticipation of this project, many of the College’s planning units have already incorporated QEP objectives into their annual plan. While the plan focuses primarily on improving student learning in courses in which writing is a component, the plan’s anticipated effect of helping to build a community of learners who value writing will reach beyond English classes. The College is excited about the potential of the plan to transform the learning opportunities of students for the next five years and beyond.
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Appendix A: The QEP Team

QEP Director:
Nahel Awadallah - Director of Mathematics, Social and Natural Science Programs

The Steering Committee:
Carrol Arnold - English Instructor
Susan Austin - English Instructor
Nahel Awadallah - Director of Mathematics, Social and Natural Science Programs
Jaxie Bryan - Librarian
Joy Callahan - Dean of Economic and Workforce Development
Dee Dee Daughtry - Vice President of Instruction
Dawn Dixon - Dean of Arts, Sciences and Learning Resources
Pam Earp - Dean of Foundational Studies and Academic Support
Tom Howerton - Adjunct English Instructor
Veronda Hutchinson - English Instructor
Bill Johnson - Basic Skills Instructor
Terri Lee - Director, Instructional Technology and Distance Education
Roxanna McGraw - Director of Academic Enrichment Programs
Travis Mulhauser - English Instructor
Dale O’Neill - Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness
Amber Parker - Manager, Media Services
Erin Smith - Director of Programs for Allied Health and Education
Linda Smith - Dean of Health Sciences and Early Childhood
Michael Starling - Dean of Business, Public Service and Technology
Christa Strube - Lead Coordinator, Tutoring and Writing Center
Don Warren - Director of Humanities, Health, Physical Education, and Pre-Engineering Programs
Sherwood Williams - Sociology Instructor

The Writing Committee:
Susan Austin - English Instructor
Tom Howerton - Adjunct English Instructor
Travis Mulhauser - English Instructor

Literature and Best Practice Committee:
Jaxie Bryan, Chair - Librarian
Susan Austin - English Instructor
Ellen Boyd - AE/AS Instructor
Pam Earp - Dean of Foundational Studies and Academic Support
Tom Howerton - Adjunct English Instructor
Veronda Hutchinson - English Instructor
Bill Johnson - Basic Skills Instructor
Travis Mulhauser - English Instructor
Jody Parrish - Student
Jane Robbins - Communication Instructor
**SLO Committee:**
Christa Strube, Chair - Lead Coordinator, Tutoring and Writing Center  
Carrol Arnold - English Instructor  
Joy Callahan - Dean of Economic and Workforce Development  
Tom Howerton - Adjunct English Instructor  
Travis Mulhauser - English Instructor  
Carrol Warren - Director of Student Support Services  
Sherwood Williams - Sociology Instructor

**Planning and Implementation Committee:**
Susan Austin, Co-Chair - English Instructor  
Donald Warren, Co-Chair - Director of Humanities, English, Physical Education, and Pre-Engineering Programs  
Ellen Boyd - AE/AS Instructor  
Dawn Dixon - Dean of Arts, Sciences and Learning Resources  
Heidi Harris - Coordinator of School Age Education and Teacher Renewal Program  
Tom Howerton - Adjunct English Instructor  
Travis Mulhauser - English Instructor  
Shane Wells - Development Studies Instructor  
Christa Strube - Lead Coordinator, Tutoring and Writing Center  
Jody Parrish - Student

**Resources Committee:**
Roxanna McGraw, Chair - Director of Academic Enrichment Programs  
Frank Casanova - Director of Technology and Office Systems  
Dee Dee Daughtry - Vice President of Instruction  
Gwen Green - Controller  
Christa Strube - Lead Coordinator, Tutoring and Writing Center  
Sherwood Williams - Sociology Instructor  
Durwood Woodall - Trustee

**Assessment Committee:**
Terri Lee, Co-Chair - Director, Instructional Technology and Distance Education  
Erin Smith, Co-Chair - Director of Programs for Allied Health and Education  
Susan Austin - English Instructor  
Tom Howerton - Adjunct English Instructor  
Bill Johnson - Basic Skills Instructor  
Sharron Latta - Associate Degree Nursing Instructor  
Travis Mulhauser - English Instructor  
Richard Ravert - Network Technician  
Megan Shaner - Director of Student Success  
Linda Smith - Dean of Health Sciences and Early Childhood  
Carrol Warren - Director of Student Support Services  
Haywood Watson - Trustee  
Sherwood Williams - Sociology Instructor  
Angela Kearney - Director of Joint High School Programs  
Marilee Tingen - Student
Marketing Committee:
Amber Parker, Chair - Manager, Media Services
Nahel Awadallah - Director of Mathematics, Social and Natural Science Programs
Jacqueline Blanco - Student
Barry Keith - Biology Instructor
Steve Penny - Medical Sonography Lead Instructor
Jane Robbins - Communication Instructor
Sharon Stalls - Distance Learning Specialist
Michael Starling - Dean of Business, Public Service and Technology

Topic Selection Committee:
Nahel Awadallah - Director of Mathematics, Social and Natural Science Programs
Thomas Dean - Counselor
Bill Johnson - Basic Skills Instructor
John Lee - Philosophy Instructor
Terri Lee - Director, Instructional Technology and Distance Education
David Thomas - Biology Instructor
Sherwood Williams - Sociology Instructor

The following individuals met after the topic of written communication had been determined to plan the transition from a Topic Selection Committee to the full Steering Committee:

Susan Austin - English Instructor
Nahel Awadallah - Director of Mathematics, Social and Natural Science Programs
Tom Howerton - Adjunct English Instructor
Bill Johnson - Basic Skills Instructor
Travis Mulhauser - English Instructor
Sherwood Williams - Sociology Instructor
Appendix B: WPA Statement for First Year Composition

WPA Statement for First Year Composition
By the end of first year composition, students should:

- Focus on a purpose
- Respond to the needs of different audiences
- Respond appropriately to different kinds of rhetorical situations
- Use conventions of format and structure appropriate to the rhetorical situation
- Adopt appropriate voice, tone, and level of formality
- Understand how genres shape reading and writing
- Write in several genres

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn:

- The main features of writing in their fields
- The main uses of writing in their fields
- The expectations of readers in their fields
- Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing

By the end of first year composition, students should:

- Use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating
- Understand a writing assignment as a series of tasks, including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing appropriate primary and secondary sources
- Integrate their own ideas with those of others
- Understand the relationships among language, knowledge, and power

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn:

- The uses of writing as a critical thinking method
- The interactions among critical thinking, critical reading, and writing
- The relationships among language, knowledge, and power in their fields

Processes
By the end of first year composition, students should:

- Be aware that it usually takes multiple drafts to create and complete a successful text
- Develop flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proof-reading
- Understand writing as an open process that permits writers to use later invention and re-thinking to revise their work
- Understand the collaborative and social aspects of writing processes
- Learn to critique their own and others’ works
- Learn to balance the advantages of relying on others with the responsibility of doing their part
- Use a variety of technologies to address a range of audiences

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn:

- To build final results in stages
- To review work-in-progress in collaborative peer groups for purposes other than editing
- To save extensive editing for later parts of the writing process
➢ To apply the technologies commonly used to research and communicate within their fields

Knowledge of Conventions
By the end of first year composition, students should:

➢ Learn common formats for different kinds of texts
➢ Develop knowledge of genre conventions ranging from structure and paragraphing to tone and mechanics
➢ Practice appropriate means of documenting their work
➢ Control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn:

➢ The conventions of usage, specialized vocabulary, format, and documentation in their fields
➢ Strategies through which better control of conventions can be achieved

Composing in Electronic Environments
As has become clear over the last twenty years, writing in the 21st-century involves the use of digital technologies for several purposes, from drafting to peer reviewing to editing. Therefore, although the kinds of composing processes and texts expected from students vary across programs and institutions, there are nonetheless common expectations.

By the end of first-year composition, students should:

➢ Use electronic environments for drafting, reviewing, revising, editing, and sharing texts
➢ Locate, evaluate, organize, and use research material collected from electronic sources, including scholarly library databases; other official databases (e.g., federal government databases); and informal electronic networks and internet sources
➢ Understand and exploit the differences in the rhetorical strategies and in the affordances available for both print and electronic composing processes and texts

Faculty in all programs and departments can build on this preparation by helping students learn:

➢ How to engage in the electronic research and composing processes common in their fields
➢ How to disseminate texts in both print and electronic forms in their fields
Appendix C: ENG 090 Cornerstone Essay Assignment

The Cornerstone Essay

The Prompt:

A literary journal is soliciting submissions for publication in an online journal. The magazine's audience is college instructors, students and administrators. The journal is looking for submissions that detail and explore students' perspectives on specific places or significant moments that have influenced their lives. The essay could explore meaningful places, memorable events, or a typical day in a student's life. Writers should use specific words and phrases to help the audience see the details that are being described. The essay does not need to adhere to any specific structure but should be well-organized and focused clearly on the subject.

Submission Requirements:

- Two to five pages
- Typed, double-spaced
- MLA format

“Don’t tell me the moon is shining; show me the glint on broken glass.”

Anton Chekhov
Appendix D: ENG 111 Touchstone Essay Assignment

JCC Touchstone Assignment

The Prompt:

Imagine a literary journal is soliciting submissions for publication in an online journal. The magazine's audience is college instructors, students and administrators. The journal is looking for submissions that detail and explore pivotal moments and/or people in the lives of community college students. The essay could explore personal relationships, memorable events, or a typical day in a student's life. The essay does not need to adhere to any specific structure but should be well-organized and focused clearly on the subject.

Submission Requirements:

- Two to five pages
- Typed, double-spaced
- MLA format

“A narrative is like a room on whose walls a number of false doors have been painted; while within the narrative, we have many apparent choices of exit, but when the author leads us to one particular door, we know it is the right one because it opens.”

John Updike
Appendix E: QEP Logo and Digital Signage

Logo

Digital Signage
Appendix F: QEP Webpage

QEP - JCC's Quality Enhancement Plan

What is the QEP?

The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is an action plan that is required as part of the SACS reaffirmation process. The topic of the plan must address an issue that is related to enhancing the quality of student learning at JCC.

Why is the QEP important to JCC?

The QEP is important because it is required for accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Developing a QEP as a part of the reaffirmation process is an opportunity for JCC to enhance overall institutional quality and effectiveness. For this accreditation process, JCC has chosen "WRITTEN COMMUNICATION" as our topic.

"On the Write Path" will help students discover, sharpen, and employ their writing skills in their academic, professional, and personal lives. In the month of September (2012), the QEP document (roughly about 100 pages) will be completed and critiqued by the SACS team selected for JCC. The team will visit JCC and expect every person on campus to be familiar with the QEP! The QEP stresses "campus wide participation", which is one of the reasons we've chosen to create this website.

Where can I find out more about the QEP?

Visit the QEP Frequently asked questions section of this site.

Please continue to check this site for updates on the QEP. The links on the left contain more detailed information. Should you have any questions, input or concerns - please feel free to contact Nahel Awadallah, Director of the QEP. His office is located in the Health and Sciences building, room 213, or you can e-mail him at: nwawadallah@johnstoncc.edu.
## Appendix G: JCC Writing Assessment Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Emphasis</th>
<th>Assessment Measure</th>
<th>Does Not Currently Meet Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controlling Idea</td>
<td>Essays will not always include a thesis statement, but the main idea should be focused and clear. At the end of the essay, readers should be able to identify the writer's main idea.</td>
<td>1: The essay’s main idea is not evident, unclear, or lacks focus. It is difficult to say exactly what the paper is about. Controlling idea does not clearly relate to the essay's body.</td>
<td>2: The essay’s main idea is somewhat evident but may be too broad, vague, or lacking in development. Controlling idea is mostly related to essay's body.</td>
<td>3: The essay’s main idea is clearly evident and focused. Reader is able to identify the controlling idea and connect it clearly to the essay's body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation, audience and tone</td>
<td>Essay has demonstrated an awareness of situation, audience, and tone.</td>
<td>1: The essay shows lack of awareness of situation, audience, and tone. Student is unable to effectively communicate with intended audiences due to inappropriate, inaccurate or ineffective management of situation, audience or tone.</td>
<td>2: The essay demonstrates adequate awareness of situation, audience, and tone. Student is able to communicate with intended audiences and demonstrates appropriate, accurate, and effective management of situation, audience and tone.</td>
<td>3: The essay demonstrates excellence in awareness of situation, audience, and tone. Student clearly and efficiently communicates with intended audiences and demonstrates mastery in the management of situation, audience and tone. Student writing also displays mastery of subtleties particular to situation, audience and tone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Emphasis</td>
<td>Assessment Measure</td>
<td>Does Not Currently Meet Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Essay is fully developed.</td>
<td>1: The essay's development is incomplete, vague, inaccurate or irrelevant. It is not fully focused on the main idea.</td>
<td>2: The essay's development adequately supports the main idea with clear and specific supporting details.</td>
<td>3: The essay demonstrates excellence in development by providing engaging, creative, and stimulating support of the central idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherency</td>
<td>Essay is unified and coherent.</td>
<td>1: The essay is unorganized, lacks cohesive paragraphs and transitions.</td>
<td>2: The essay is organized; paragraphs and transitions are somewhat cohesive.</td>
<td>3: The essay is well-organized; paragraphs and transitions are cohesive and skillfully woven together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>The essay adheres to guidelines regarding topic and length. Essay adheres to standards of basic English grammar.</td>
<td>1: The essay greatly exceeds or falls short of required minimums; is not reflective of the assigned topic; contains excessive errors in grammar and sentence structure that make reading and comprehension difficult.</td>
<td>2: The essay is appropriate in length and reflects the assigned topic. Essay contains some errors in grammar and sentence structure, but can still be read and comprehended.</td>
<td>3: The essay's length is reflective of a mastery of word choice and organization. The paper is exactly as long as it needs to be to convey its intended message. Essay contains few errors in sentence structure and grammar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Self-Reflection Essay

Self-Reflection Essay

Take a moment to reflect on your growth and progress as a writer over the course of the semester. In what ways have you improved? What areas of your writing still need further development?

Speak specifically to the following prompts:

- What have you learned about your own writing process, or writing as a process in general?
- Have you utilized resources beyond the classroom to improve your writing? If so, have those resources been helpful?
- Are you confident in your ability to write to different audiences, and in varying situations and tones?
- Finally, assess your writing as a whole. How do you feel about your writing today, and is it any different than the way you felt at the beginning of the course?

Submission Requirements:

- Two to five pages
- Typed, double-spaced
- MLA format

“There is only one corner of the universe you can be certain of improving, and that’s your own self.”

Aldous Huxley
# Appendix I: Portfolio Assessment Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Does Not Currently Meet Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student writing has demonstrated an awareness of situation, audience, and tone</td>
<td>Self-Reflection Essay</td>
<td>1: Student writing shows lack of awareness of situation, audience, and tone. Student is unable to effectively communicate with intended audience because of improper tone or failure to meet assignment specific objectives.</td>
<td>2: Student writing demonstrates adequate awareness of situation, audience, and tone. Student is able to communicate with intended audiences, uses appropriate tone, and demonstrates competence in assignment specific objectives.</td>
<td>3: Student writing demonstrates excellence in awareness of situation, audience, and tone. Student clearly and efficiently communicates with intended audiences and demonstrates mastery of tone and assignment specific objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student texts are unified, coherent, and fully developed</td>
<td>Self-Reflection Essay</td>
<td>1: Student essay is unorganized, incomplete, lacks cohesive paragraphs and transitions</td>
<td>2: Student essay shows some organization and level of completeness, paragraphs and transitions are somewhat cohesive</td>
<td>3: Student essays are effectively organized and complete, paragraphs and transitions are cohesive and skillfully threaded together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student has utilized resources beyond the classroom to enhance their writing</td>
<td>Self-Reflection Essay; Portfolio</td>
<td>1: Essay and portfolio documents do not mention use of resources outside the classroom, do not indicate awareness of resources or an understanding of resources’ importance</td>
<td>2: Essay and portfolio documents display appropriate awareness of resources and demonstrate some utilization of resources beyond the classroom</td>
<td>3: Essay and portfolio documents clearly demonstrate awareness of resources and demonstrate how the utilization of resources has greatly impacted growth as a writer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student has demonstrated proficiency with the writing process and recognized improvements in their written work</td>
<td>Self-Reflection Essay</td>
<td>1: Student essay does not convey basic understanding of the writing process, does not recognize or articulate improvements in written work.</td>
<td>2: Student essay conveys understanding of writing as a process, identifies and articulates specific areas of growth.</td>
<td>3: Student essay conveys detailed understanding of writing as a process, identifies and expertly articulates specific areas of growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>