Mary Soliday and Barbara Gleason

FROM REMEDIATION TO ENRICHMENT: EVALUATING A MAINSTREAMING PROJECT

Barbara Gleason and Mary Soliday, both established authors on issues of cultural and language diversity, have for three years overseen a FIPSE-funded alternative to remediation – and at the very school where Mina Shaughnessy oversaw the establishment of basic writing. At the CBW workshop, they showed a compelling videotape containing interviews with students, faculty, and external evaluators and then had participants experience some of the assessment techniques used to evaluate the project's success. The medium of print requires a different approach, and so the authors have given what is at once an account of their project, a detailed description of their means of assessing it, and, perhaps most important, suggestions for how and why similar endeavors might be mounted elsewhere.

In 1993, we secured support for three years from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE) to create a new writing course at the City College of New York (CCNY). The two-semester writing course we envisioned — the *Enrichment* pilot project — substituted for the established sequence of two remedial courses and one college-level course. Throughout the life of this project, we assessed its effectiveness by conducting a two-pronged evaluation. *Formative* evaluation provided ongoing evaluation which we used to enhance the project's effectiveness; *summative* evaluation assessed the project's effectiveness after it was concluded.

In this essay, we want to focus on one aspect of our summative evaluation, an assessment of student writing and learning. The results of this evaluation suggest that this project in mainstreaming basic writers successfully addressed the needs of CCNY student writers. An external reader's assessment of student portfolios demonstrates that remedial-placed students were competitive with college-level placed students at the end of the two-semester course. Our analysis of student self-assessments reveals that students could clearly articulate their own learning experiences and that there was strong student satisfaction with the pilot course.

Although funding from FIPSE was vital to our own ability to conceptualize, implement and evaluate this project, we believe piloting mainstreamed writing courses to be possible without external funding in institutions when there is sufficient internal administrative support. A well-defined curriculum and a careful evaluation are fundamental to the potential success of pilot courses such as this one.[1]

Remediation vs Enrichment

The sequence of courses that the *Enrichment* pilot project replaced has borne the hallmarks of remediation since its inception in 1970. These hallmarks include testing for placement into one of three courses; testing for exit, which serves as an institutional check on teachers and as a gatekeeper for students; and reduced credit or no credit for remedial courses. (Even the possibility of partial credit for basic writing courses ceased after Fall 1995.) In addition, at our College, students enrolled in basic writing courses are restricted from enrolling in five core curriculum courses (World Humanities 101 and 102, World Civilization 101 and 102, and Philosophy 101), a restriction that was extended to students enrolled in Freshman Writing during the life of this project.

Students are placed into remedial writing courses based on their scores on the City University of New York (CUNY) Writing Assessment Test (WAT). This is a fifty-minute impromptu that two readers score holistically using a six-point rubric. Individual colleges use these scores to determine a student's placement in various writing courses which may or may not bear credit. We contest this process of placement, and thus the validity of the CUNY WAT, as the sole measure of potential student success in a writing course (for placement) or as a predictor of success in college courses (when the test is used for exit from remediation).[2]

The traditional remedial sequence is characterized by lack of college credit, limited access to other college courses, and placement or exit via a single essay scored by readers other than the actual teacher of a course. In contrast to this sequence, the writing course we piloted carries full college credit (three credits per semester), no distinctions are made between those who placed into college level writing and remedial writing, and teachers decide whether students should pass their courses. Moreover, all students are allowed to enroll in the college's core courses if they have passed the CUNY Reading Assessment Test (RAT).

Structure of the Pilot Project

The *Enrichment* pilot writing program aims to build community on an urban, commuter campus. Students are allowed two consecutive semesters together with peers, class tutors, and teachers. The increased time spent in class facilitates the formation of relationships conducive to learning. Teachers come to know their students and provide more effective, more individualized instruction, especially during the second semester.

Forming communities is vitally important for students on this urban campus. For many, enrolling full-time in college involves long hours of both study and work, and far fewer hours of recreation than would be the case on a residential campus. One survey of Fall 1994 project students reveals that 99 of 224 — or 44% — work part time or full time. Moreover, CCNY students frequently come from families with low incomes: 70% of all CCNY undergraduates receive financial aid *(City Facts 1995-1996)*. Many students have family responsibilities for younger siblings or for their own children. It is all too easy for such students to be pulled away from the college campus by adult concerns. This project's two-semester writing course creates a space for students to become grounded in college life during the crucial first year.

The pilot project aims also to acknowledge and utilize our students' cultural diversity. A survey of 241 students enrolled in basic writing and college writing courses (Fall 1996) reveals that 47% (115) speak English as a second language, are bilingual, or speak one first language and write English as another "first language"; 62% (151) of these students were born outside of the U.S. This multiplicity of student languages is common to all CUNY colleges: 44.3% of the 58,629 freshman and transfer students admitted to CUNY in Fall 1992 reported English as a second language on their application forms; that figure is expected to increase to over 50% by the year 2000 (*Report of the CUNY ESL Task Force*, Spring 1994, 1).

We conceptualized a writing course curriculum that capitalizes on students' existing linguistic knowledge and literacies. This focus on existing knowledge — rather than on deficits — is a fundamental principle of the curriculum. This and two more essential principles remained in place even though the curriculum evolved over its three-year life. A second principle is that language should be studied from a descriptive perspective (based on observations of actual language use) rather than solely in a prescriptive, handbook and usage frame (which was also used by many project teachers). Involvement in the study of language is key for students who are learning a new grammar (Standard Written English) and new discourse forms (academic structures and conventions). The third principle is that student writers are to be understood developmentally — as students whose language learning and writing abilities are processes and important objects of inquiry for students and teachers alike.

Project teachers developed their own assignments, but each year they also worked collaboratively on a set of projects that everyone taught. Curriculum coherence was further achieved by a generalized focus on language study during the first semester and on researching cultural themes during the second semester. Each semester, teachers assigned one research project whose parts were sequenced over several weeks. The first semester, students wrote literacy narratives, stud-

ied language use in their own communities, and compared their spoken to their written use of English; they then conducted original ethnographic research, often in their communities or workplaces. These various forms of research aimed to encourage heightened awareness of language form and use and attention to language choices.

This first semester research also emphasized analysis and critical thinking. It therefore served as a bridge into critical reading and writing about texts in the second semester, when teachers focused on reading about a cultural theme such as the family, ethnicity, or popular art. In all three years of this project, students in many course sections learned about library research and writing from sources. In the last year, library research and research writing skills became required in all course sections. Both students and faculty strongly advocated the emphasis on library use and essay documentation that became more prominent during the project's third year.

According to project faculty and students, the ethnographic research project proved especially successful. This multifaceted project allows students to work on many different research and writing skills. Samples of student writers' ethnographies can be seen in several handsome classroom publications that teachers and students produced over the years.

In the second year, the faculty voted unanimously to require the teachers in the final year to use portfolios and to assign five common projects. These are the assignments included in our study of student writing, which we describe below.

Participants in the Project

Approximately 1,000 students enrolled in the *Enrichment* project courses, one of which was taught at the Center for Worker Education, an off-campus degree-granting program for working adults. Of these students, 168 placed into the lowest level of remedial English, and 483 into the next level; 365 placed into college-level writing, and 55 have no official placement information.

Twenty-eight teachers, including both project co-directors, taught the pilot course; one instructor taught two sections simultaneously and seven taught in successive years. All teachers met during monthly workshops; they also participated in formative evaluation by assembling portfolios of their work at the year's end. Teacher portfolios generally included a cover letter, samples of class handouts and student writing, a teaching journal, and supplements such as class videos and student writers' class publications.

Forty-one Writing Center tutors were assigned to work with the classes.[3] These students were primarily undergraduates with majors

from a variety of disciplines; a few tutors were enrolled in English Department graduate programs. In one pilot course survey, 61% of the students said they had made between one and several appointments each semester with their tutors; in the established writing courses, which have no classroom tutors, about a quarter of the students meet with a Writing Center tutor at least once. In order to evaluate this component of the project, we interviewed and surveyed tutors each year; in the third year, we videotaped one group interview of tutors and another group interview of teachers.

Finally, five consultants assisted us with this project.[4] These consultants provided formative evaluation (e.g., assessing the quality of the curriculum in the project's first year), advice on developing project evaluation strategies, and summative evaluations. A consultant at CCNY downloaded student records and helped format a database for statistical analysis of student progress and achievement.

A Study of Student Writing and Learning

Our principal aim has been to pilot a college writing program for a highly diverse group of students on an urban, commuter campus. Our evaluation of the pilot course has involved both a statistical analysis of student progress and achievement and assessment of student writing and learning in the course. This second component of the project evaluation provides a more direct form of project evaluation.

In 1995-96 we adapted a curriculum evaluation design from Pepperdine University (Carroll; Novak). Whereas Pepperdine's evaluation encompasses the entire college experience, ours focuses exclusively on the writing course. We created a study in which outside readers, teachers, and students assess a student's performance in the pilot writing course. We describe these components separately in two parts: (1) outside readers' assessment of student writing; and (2) student self-assessments and project teacher assessment of the same students.

Assessment of Student Writing

We selected two students at random from each of the 11 courses offered in 1995-96 to participate in this study. These students assembled portfolios especially for this evaluation: each of the 22 portfolios included five assignments common to all the sections that were taught in the project's third year: a literacy narrative, an ethnographic research project, a library research project, a self-reflective essay, and a piece of the student's choice. Most portfolios did contain all five required pieces, though in a few cases teachers had modified assign-

ments to suit their individual styles. Ten faculty members from the English Department (who had not taught the pilot course) participated in this evaluation. We divided them into groups of five. Meeting separately, each group read half the portfolios, so that each portfolio received five final scores.

In holistic assessment, the aim is to establish consensus among readers, which is usually achieved through norming sessions with a rubric. At Miami University, where portfolios are scored for incoming freshmen to determine placement, a committee achieves consensus in repeated norming sessions with anchor portfolios and a six-point rubric (Daiker). At SUNY Stony Brook, where portfolios are used to determine exit from writing courses, teachers use anchor papers when they calibrate twice each semester (Elbow and Belanoff).

In our case, since we were not making placement or exit decisions, we did not aim to achieve consensus among readers. Instead, we aimed to use portfolio evaluation to assess the pilot project's success at our institution. We had hoped to compare the writing of pilot project students with students' writing from English 110 (the established, one- semester college writing course). However, we could not do so because English 110 teachers emphasize different genres and skills and because there is no common curriculum in established courses that could be used for comparison.

We chose to assess uniform portfolios with a checklist reflecting primary pilot course goals. Instead of norming readers, we sent them an advance letter outlining our evaluation goals and their tasks as portfolio readers. We described the contents of the portfolios, noting cases in which teachers had modified assignments. We asked readers to award final scores to portfolios as if they were awarding final letter grades to their own students' portfolios at the end of an English 110 class at CCNY. Assessment specialists now emphasize the importance of allowing readers to draw upon their personal knowledge of student writers and standards when judging student writing (Huot). In asking readers to use their own criteria rather than ours, we hoped that this portfolio assessment would more closely approximate readers' actual standards as classroom teachers (Elbow).

We prepared a reader's checklist that we had adapted from a Pepperdine University reader's checklist form. The checklist asks readers to score portfolios analytically in eight areas before arriving at an overall score. The eight specific areas readers analyzed include modes of thinking (analysis, description and narration); textual features of essays (development, structure, grammar and mechanics); and goals specific to this project (creativity and risk-taking, research, and self-reflection).

One particular strength of the reader's checklist is that readers can write comments for each area analyzed and also after awarding

the final grade. Eight of the ten readers participating in our study did write (optional) comments, some of them detailed, providing an explanatory reference for their final portfolio grades. These written comments allowed us to gauge whether readers considered every piece or awarded scores based on the first piece they read, as was the case in a study conducted at the University of Michigan (Hamp-Lyons and Condon).

In their written comments, readers often referred to specific essays in the portfolios, indicating that they had read all five pieces. Sometimes they suggested this by describing their impressions of a student's overall growth: "VERY different pieces from [English] 111 to [English] 112," concluded one reader. "This writer went from 'below' average, in my view, to 'above' average, in my view . . . This is dramatic growth—from 'D,' if you will, to 'B.'" Readers frequently indicated, too, that they didn't award a grade based upon the first essay because their judgments changed while they read. One reader commented, "At first the portfolio seemed promising but as I read I was struck by the writer's intellectual immaturity." On other occasions, readers suggested that they judged the whole portfolio within the context of an imagined classroom experience. For example, after awarding a B to a portfolio, one reader concluded: "'Above average' would seem to be a B—but depending on other factors—participation, attendance, work with peer group—I might well give this student an A. Literacy narrative was excellent, ethnography also very good."

These outside readers reflect the diversity of our department and of composition programs nationwide. The ten professors were diverse in rank, ranging from a full professor with long experience at the college to an adjunct instructor relatively new to the institution. These professors were equally diverse in their intellectual backgrounds: literary criticism and theory, composition and rhetoric, linguistics, and creative writing. In their current involvement in teaching and assessing writing, this group also varied: some use portfolios in their classes or are certified readers for the CUNY WAT, while others have never used portfolios or have not taught remedial writing or college writing at CCNY for several years.

Unsurprisingly, this group expressed diverse biases towards particular assignments and writing pedagogies. For instance, one reader concluded,

> The student is somewhere between an outright B and an outright C student. Based on these papers, I'm inclined to award a B rather than a C, but (as with the other students), I miss being able to judge partly on the basis of in-class writing.

For the same portfolio, another reader wrote,

The self-selected paper (essentially literary analysis) is significantly weaker in development and arrangement than the other pieces. The self-reflective piece is impressive. This portfolio, in particular, seems to support the idea that the FIPSE-type assignments inherently lead to better writing than traditional literary criticism topics. The ethnography and research paper, for example, are light years "better" than the literature analysis piece.

Both readers awarded Bs to the same portfolio, but each expressed an opinion of the merits of the portfolio's contents and thus of the experimental curriculum. The first reader's comment suggests that for him as a reader, this and other portfolios present an incomplete portrait of their authors. Because it contains revised, finished pieces, the portfolio could highlight the student's strengths and downplay potential weaknesses (which might show up in first drafts or in-class essay exams). By contrast, the second reader's comment appears to suggest the opposite: that the portfolio's self-selected piece of literary criticism obscures rather than maximizes the student's strengths.

These kinds of differences among readers surfaced often in the written comments but less often in final scores. The overall final scores indicate that our readers agreed more often than they disagreed when awarding final letter grades. Table One, which lists the grades for all 22 portfolios, shows that readers reached consensus on a portfolio's final grade well over half the time. Fifteen portfolios received scores clustered across two grades, for an agreement rate of 68% among readers. This is a very high rate outside the context of normed holistic scoring, where an 80% agreement rate between two readers, not five, is considered reliable. Moreover, as Dispain and Hilgers point out even with norming, achieving consensus with portfolios is more difficult than with single essays, often because readers have trouble awarding single scores to multiple writing samples in different genres.

Table One further indicates that despite readers' sympathies with or antipathies towards this experimental project, they judged the students' writing to be competent and more than competent. Out of 110 readings, the readers awarded 56 As and Bs to the portfolios. Half the time, then, they judged portfolios to be excellent or very good. Thirty-seven times, readers awarded portfolios average grades; in 13 instances readers judged portfolios to be below average or failing. Overall, readers also judged the portfolios to be stronger than weaker, awarding 16 A grades as opposed to 2 F grades.

Table One also organizes the final scores in terms of students' initial placements — remedial or college-level. (Students with unclear placement histories are identified in an explanatory note.) Scores listed

in Table One show that the eight remedial-placed writers in this sample, mainstreamed with college-placed students, produced competent work as a group. The outside readers awarded the remedial-placed students 12 Bs and 23 Cs. None of these students received an A from a reader, but only two of the portfolios received D grades, and there were no failing grades. Thus, a third of the time, readers judged the remedial-placed writers to have produced very good work; most of the time, they judged this group to be good or average (in the B/C range).

Table One shows that the readers awarded more varied scores to the 11 portfolios written by the students who placed into college-level writing. For instance, this group provoked more disagreement among readers, as evidenced by portfolio nine, which earned an A, B, C and D from four readers and a split B/C grade from the fifth. Overall there are also more split grades (1 split score for each letter grade). This group earned more As and Ds--twelve As (Portfolio #13 garnered five of these) and 7 Ds. When compared to the portfolios written by remedial-placements, the college-placement portfolios were stronger, earning more As and fewer Cs. But these portfolios were also weaker than the remedial-placement portfolios, earning twice as many Ds and Fs.

According to ten outside readers, the 22 students in this random sample met the goals of the pilot course. Students who would have taken a non-credit writing course were competitive with students who were eligible for college-level courses. Most students produced very good or good analytical, descriptive, and narrative essays that reflect the standard conventions of college essay writing. And most students demonstrated an ability to evaluate their own writing, to reveal growth over time in a portfolio, and to conduct research inside and outside the college library — all prominent features of the experimental curriculum.

Student Self-Assessments

In addition to the perspectives of ten outside readers, we also surveyed the student authors of these 22 portfolios in order to learn about student perceptions of their learning experiences in the pilot writing course. Student self-assessment and student satisfaction should be seriously considered in an evaluation such as this for two principal reasons: (1) for all college students — and for City College students especially — attending college is a significant investment with important consequences; (2) student satisfaction has been found to be positively associated with retention and undergraduate gpa (Astin, 310) and student self assessment has been found to "have some modest validity when compared against actual pretest-posttest changes in performance" (Astin, 222 [referring to research by Anaya]). Of particular interest to us is a finding in the same research that student satisfaction

with "overall college experience" is positively associated with number of writing skills courses taken, student-student interaction, faculty-student interaction, and institutional diversity emphasis.

For this study, we modified a student self-assessment questionnaire from Pepperdine University.[5] The questionnaire asks students to evaluate their learning by rating perceived change in 17 different abilities and attitudes, e.g., revising, organizing ideas, and motivation to write. Both teachers and students rated a student's learning by checking one of four categories: *significant change, some change, little change,* or *no change.* Teachers also explained why they awarded the student a grade and how they evaluated student performance generally. Students were interviewed by Writing Center staff about their responses to this questionnaire.[6]

As can be seen in Table Two, the 21 students who completed this survey most frequently identify "significant change" or "some change" in six areas: 1. *writing longer essays* (20); 2. *organizing ideas* (19); 3. *critical thinking/ability to analyze* (19); 4. *finding ideas to write about* (18); 5. *relationships with teachers, tutors, peers* (18); (6) *editing for style* (18). On the other hand, only 12 of these 21 students report "significant change" or "some change" in *speaking skills* — a less prominent feature of this curriculum.

Writing longer essays was reported by students most often as an area of "significant change" or "some change." Interestingly, this is one of the three most highly rated areas of change observed by teachers as well. Writing longer essays is an especially important area of improvement for inexperienced, unmotivated, or weak writers. These students often suffer from writer's block, either because of anxiety related to writing or because they lack expertise in invention and revision. Explaining why he noted "significant change" in both *finding ideas to write about* and *writing longer essays,* one student explains that in the past he had "always suffered a writer's block" and that he "always used to be very brief." However, his teacher's comments on his drafts for this course encouraged him to write more and ultimately produce longer essays.

We believe that, in addition to learning specific strategies of invention and revision, students can learn to produce longer essays by breaking down a writing project into manageable units. The *Enrichment* curriculum features sequenced writing projects with interrelated tasks, allowing students to combine shorter pieces of writing into longer essays or research reports. The fact that students and teachers noticed most improvement in this area indicates to us that teachers did in fact introduce this key element of the curriculum into their classrooms and also that many students succeeded in learning this task-specific approach to writing.

Relationship to teacher, tutor, and peers was one of the three

73

categories marked most frequently by students as an area of "significant change." Twelve students report "significant change" in this category and six more marked "some change." Teachers noticed student change in this area somewhat less frequently. Nevertheless, we are encouraged to learn that 18/21 students noted significant or some change in relationships and that teachers noted change in relationships for 16 of 22 students.

This reported growth in the area of classroom relationships suggests to us that teachers succeeded in constructing environments conducive to effective communication. It also suggests that the two-semester course structure contributed to building classroom community — *a principal goal of this pilot project.* As one student puts it, "I think the peer issue is because we were together for a year. That relationship grew faster than any other relationship." A second student confirms this view of the two-semester course: "I felt that being together with the professor for one year was just wonderful. Because you sort of get to know each other and know what to expect and know not only for that class but for other classes."

One might well ask whether or not student self-evaluations even matter for program evaluation. We believe they do. Although people generally do not grasp the full complexity of their experiences, students do know something of whether or not they learned, what they learned, and how well they learned. It is true that students' self-reports do not offer evidence of the degree of proficiency achieved. However, a close reading of the interview transcripts for this study reveals one dominant pattern: all students are able to comment specifically on their development over time as writers, readers, speakers, and researchers. Their vocabularies include terms such as *revision* and *proofreading,* but also *Standard English, works cited, MLA format, microfiche,* and *annotation.* Students are able to articulate what they did and did not learn well, and what they particularly appreciated about the course.

In this study, student self-reports are at least partially validated by our teachers' reports — not on a student by student basis — but in overall responses for each of 17 abilities or attitudes (Table Two). Students and teachers alike find most change overall in four categories: *finding ideas to write about; writing longer essays; organizing ideas;* and *critical thinking.* All of these abilities are key to the *Enrichment* curriculum. Critical thinking, or ability to analyze ideas, is particularly important for this writing course. We theorized the entire curriculum on the premise that consciousness of language and reflection on one's own experience of language and literacy are key to literacy development. The writing projects that anchor this curriculum all require critical thinking and analysis.

In general, the results of this survey questionnaire indicate that

74

students were very satisfied with their own learning in English 111 and English 112. More importantly, the student interviews indicate that students can speak very concretely about what they did learn. The most enthusiastic comment comes from a student who could have enrolled in English 110—the established one-semester college-level course—but chose instead this two-semester experimental course:

> I hated writing like I said before. Now I can sit down and just write write write write write or type type type type type, whatever. That is, like, the best thing that ever happened to me.... This course is ideal. I think it's not only good for people who have problems with English or writing or whatever. It's just a great course. It teaches you the basic things that you didn't even know that you should have known from elementary school. So the value of this course, this course is excellent. I would recommend it to anybody.

Conclusion: The Value of Mainstreaming

We end with this student's comment because she entered her composition course with a passing score on the CUNY WAT and, according to her teacher, strong skills that she then developed over two semesters. Yet, as she remarks to the peer interviewer, the course is "not only good for people who have problems with English or writing," but for "anybody." We agree with this student's assessment: while mainstreaming is a viable alternative for our remedial program at CCNY, it was more urgent to create a pilot project responsive to all students on our urban campus.

The array of positions that scholars have expressed on the subject of mainstreaming remedial students into freshman writing courses (Elbow, "Response"; Grego and Thompson; Hull et al; "Rethinking Basic Writing"; *JBW* Special Issue; White; Rodby) does not settle the issue of whether we ought to abolish remedial courses. Instead, this debate highlights the fact that basic writing courses play distinct historical, curricular, and political roles within their institutions. Rather than continuing to debate whether mainstreaming is effective generally, we need to analyze the roles that these courses play within their institutional contexts and follow that analysis with a careful consideration of alternatives.

What should guide our revision of particular programs is, first, an assessment of remediation's purpose within an institution and its impact upon students and teachers. Such an assessment could include the history of specific writing courses/a writing program and its symbolic role within an institution; forms and uses of institutional testing;

75

teachers' practices and their authority within the writing courses; existing resources; funding; course size; tutorial services; relationships among remedial writing courses, college writing courses, general education/core curriculum requirements, and the courses in departments that students major in; other remedial programs on campus; and the population of students that the course serves. Second, any alternative should have a programmatic emphasis: it should include a coherent approach to curriculum and support for tutoring and faculty development. And third, a thorough documentation of the alternative program's success has to be incorporated into any plan from its inception. Perhaps our greatest insight from this project has been a heightened awareness of our need to document and evaluate our writing courses. Such evaluations are valuable resources for program development, they enhance our ability to be accountable, and they enable us to more effectively represent the interests of our programs.

Though several forms of evaluation suggest that remedial-placed students performed well in our pilot course, we do not recommend that CCNY (or any other college) simply abandon remedial writing courses. In our final report on the project, we recommend that CCNY provide students the option of a two-semester college writing course that bears full college credit and that is supported by faculty development, tutoring, and formative evaluation. We argue that the college should provide the same support for students who placed into college-level writing, a course in which remedial students will eventually enroll. In other words, we should re-imagine courses for basic writing students within the context of a coherent curriculum and a responsible writing program. As Mike Rose pointed out years ago, the language of exclusion encompasses most writing instruction within colleges and universities, not just basic writing programs. Enrichment, then, ultimately means incorporating remedial courses into mainstream, professional ways of thinking about writing instruction, supporting teachers and students, and evaluating writing programs.

Notes

1. The final report for *The City College Writing Program: An Enrichment Approach to Language and Literacy* (1993-1996) can be obtained from the authors (English Department, City College of New York, NYC, NY 10031).

2. See Ricardo Otheguy, *The Condition of Latinos in the City University of New York;* Judith Fishman, "Do You Agree or Disagree: The Epistemology of the CUNY Writing Assessment Test"; and Barbara Gleason, "When the Writing Test Fails: Assessing Assessment at an Urban College."

3. See Mary Soliday, "Shifting Roles in Classroom Tutoring: Cultivating the Art of Boundary Crossing."

4. Three consultants submitted project reports: Suzy Groden (first year report); Keith Gilyard (final report); Matthew Janger (statistical analysis of student progress and achievement). Richard Larson advised us on program evaluation.

5. Lee Carroll designed the Pepperdine questionnaires.

6. We would like to thank Kim Jackson, Soultana Nolan, Chant Andrea Funchess, and Mary Fiero for conducting these interviews.

Works Cited

Anaya, G. *Cognitive Development Among College Undergraduates.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, 1992.

Astin, Alexander W. *What Matters in College? Four Critical Years Revisited.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.

Carroll, Lee Ann. "Fifty Students Writing: A Faculty Perspective of Cross-Disciplinary Portfolio Assessment." Conference on College Composition and Communication, Milwaukee, WI, March 1996.

Daiker, Donald. "Discrepancies in Evaluating Anchor Portfolios.: College Composition and Communication Conference, Phoenix, AZ, March 1997.

Despain, LaRene and Thomas Hilgers. "Readers' Responses to the Rating of Non-Uniform Portfolios: Are There Limits on Portfolios' Utility?" *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 16.1-2 (1992): 24-37.

Elbow, Peter. "Response to Glynda Hull, Mike Rose, Kay Losey Fraser, and Marisa Castellano." *CCC* 44 (1993): 587-88.

---. "Writing Assessment: Do It Better, Do It Less." In *Assessment of Writing: Politics, Policies, Practices.* Eds. Edward White, William D. Lutz, and Sandra Kamusikiri. NY: MLA, 1996. 120-134.

Elbow, Peter and Pat Belanoff. "State University of New York at Stony Brook: Portfolio-based Evaluation Program." In *Portfolios: Process and Product.* Eds. Pat Belanoff and Marcia Dickson. Boynton/Cook: 1991. 3-16.

Fishman, Judith. "Do You Agree or Disagree: The Epistemology of the CUNY Writing Assessment Test." *WPA* 8.1-2 (1984): 17-25.

Gleason, Barbara. "When the Writing Test Fails: Assessing Assessment at an Urban College." In *Writing in Multicultural Settings.* Eds. Carol Severino, Juan C. Guerra, and Johnella E. Butler. New

York: MLA, 1997. 307-324.

Grego, Rhonda and Nancy Thompson. "Repositioning Remediation." *CCC* 47 (1996): 62-84.

Hamp-Lyons, Liz and William Condon. "Questioning Assumptions about Portfolio-Based Assessment." *CCC* 44 (1993): 176-190.

Huot, Brian. "Toward a New Theory of Writing Assessment." *CCC* 47 (1996): 549-566.

Hull, Glynda, Mike Rose, Kay Losey Fraser, and Marisa Castellano. "Reply to Peter Elbow." *CCC* 44 (1993): 588-89.

Journal of Basic Writing. Special Issue: Fourth National Basic Writing Conference Plenaries. 12.1 (Spring 1993): 1-89.

Novak, Cynthia Cornell. "Becoming Colleagues: Undergraduate Writing Center Tutors as Portfolio Research Fellows." Conference on College Composition and Communication, Milwaukee, WI, March 1996.

Otheguy, Ricardo. *The Condition of Latinos in the City University of New York.* A Report to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and to the Puerto Rican Council on Higher Education. June 1990.

"Rethinking Basic Writing." Interchanges *CCC* 47 (Feb. 1996): 101-111.

Rose, Mike. "The Language of Exclusion: Writing Instruction at the University." *CE* (1985): 341-55.

Rodby, Judith. "Revising a First-Year Writing Program: Cultural Studies Workshops Replace Basic Writing." College Composition and Communication Conference, Washington D.C., March 1995.

Soliday, Mary. "Shifting Roles in Classroom Tutoring: Cultivating the Art of Boundary Crossing." *The Writing Center Journal* (Fall 1995): 59-73.

Sommers, Jeffrey, Laurel Block, Donald A. Daiker, and Gail Stygall. "The Challenges of Rating Portfolios: What WPA's Can Expect." *WPA* 17 (1993): 7-29.

White, Edward. "The Importance of Placement and Basic Studies: Helping Students Succeed Under the New Elitism." *JBW* 14.2 (Fall 1995): 75-84.

Table One: Portfolio Evaluation by English Department Faculty
(AB, BC, CD, and DF are split scores)

Portfolio Number	A	A B	B	B C	C	C D	D	DF	F
#1**			2		1		2		
#2*	2		3						
#3**			1		3		1		
#4**			1	1	3				
#5**			2		3				
#6*			3		2				
#7†			1		3		1		
#8**			1	1	3				
#9*	1	1	1	1	1				
#10**			1		4				
#11**			3		2				
#12*	3	1			1				
#13*	5								
#14*			3		2				
#15**			1		4				
#16*	1		4						
#17*			2		2		1		
#18*					1	1	3		
#19*							2	1	2
#20†	1		3		1				
#21*			4		1				
#22†	3		2						
Total	16	2	38	3	37	1	10	1	2
%	14%	3%	34%	3%	33%	0.9%	9%	0.9%	0.9%

*Portfolios of students with freshman English (college level) placement

Subtotal	12A	1AB	20B	1BC	10C	1CD	7D	1DF	2F
%	21.8%	1.8%	36.36%	1.8%	18.1%	1.8%	12.7%	1.8%	3.6%

**Portfolios of students with basic writing (remedial) placement

Subtotal	0A	12B	2BC	23C	3D	0F
%	0%	30%	5%	57.5%	7.5%	0%

† We were unable to determine placements (remedial versus college level) for three students. Their portfolios were # 7, #20, and #22.

21 Students' Self Reports on Learning in 17 Categories[†]
10 Teachers' Ratings of 22 Students in 17 Categories[*]

Question Item	Students Reporting Significant Change[†]	Students Seen to Show Significant Change[*]	Students Reporting Some Change[†]	Students Seen to Show Some Change[*]	Total Students Reporting[†]	Total Teacher Ratings[*]
A. Finding ideas	8	8	10	11	18	19
B. Writing long	12	7	8	13	20	20
C. Revising	12	11	5	9	17	20
D. Edit for Gram	7	7	10	11	17	18
E. Edit for Style	7	6	11	7	18	13
F. Organization	10	8	9	12	19	20
G. Crit. thinking	9	7	10	12	19	19
H. Prob. Solving	7	4	9	12	16	16
I. Relationships	12	7	6	9	18	16
J. Motiv. to write	5	8	9	10	14	18
K. Perceived value	9	8	7	8	16	16
L. Lib. Research	8	8	8	10	16	18
M. Ways Learning	9	6	7	7	16	13
N. Know Unknown	6	6	10	9	16	15
O. Reading skills	6	3	10	15	16	18
P. Speaking skills	7	2	5	10	12	12
Q. Pres. portfolios	9	3	7	10	16	13

[†]Students were randomly selected for this study. Of 22 students participating in this study, 21 completed questionnaires in which they report on their own learning; 18, 19, or 20 rated themselves as having achieved "significant change" or "some change" in six areas: 1. *writing longer essays* (20); 2. *organizing ideas* (19); 3. *critical thinking/analysis* (19); 4. *finding ideas to write about* (18); 5. *relationships with teachers, tutors, peers* (18); 6. *editing for style* (18).

[*]10 project teachers rated 22 students--two each from their own courses (one teacher taught two sections); 19 or 20 students were identified as having made "significant change" or "some change" in five areas: 1. *writing longer essays* (20); 2. *revising* (20); 3. *organizing ideas in essays* (20); 4. *critical thinking/ analysis* (19); 5. *finding ideas to write about* (19).