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# Purpose

To date, more than 90,000 students have completed the Washington State University Writing Portfolio since it was first administered during Spring Semester 1993. The Twelfth Findings, June 2015-May 2017, succeeds previous findings in an ongoing assessment of the effectiveness of the Washington State University Writing Portfolio and examines progress made since 2009. This report describes and evaluates the Writing Portfolio within the Writing Assessment Program, and it highlights strengths and potential weaknesses so as to suggest possible amendments to the assessment process in ways that would best serve the Washington State University community. This report presents data on the Writing Portfolio (i.e., the writing abilities of WSU undergraduates), data that can be used in decision making by current and future administrators of the examination, current and future composition program administrators and participants, university-wide faculty, and others with greater oversight responsibilities.

# Rationale

The Writing Program at Washington State University entails an evolving series of processes based on theory, years of research, and recognized best practices. Studies have been conducted biennially since 1993. Accordingly, readers are encouraged to consult previous biennial Writing Portfolio Findings for additional historical context, especially as this report includes university activities and programs that did not exist or had just begun in the 2011-2013 academic years. Historical comparisons made herein are intended to provide readers with insights into the Writing Portfolio as it has evolved.

Following the 2013-2015 report, Descriptive Findings (Section IV.A) report mean student performance rates rather than totals, insofar as these are more informative measures for comparison among biennia. Similarly, sections in the Descriptive Findings and the Validational Findings (section IV.B) compare performance within and across populations the better to inform analyses.

# Executive Summary

This biennium saw significant changes to the timed writing portion of the portfolio assessment (referred to in the report as Tier I), in that several new prompts were added—including one infographic analysis prompt—and the four rhetorical frames traditionally used in the timed writing prompts have all been revised or rewritten.

Presented below are some of the major findings in this biennium’s data, particularly as such data relate to historical trends. Additionally, this report provides some notes on the implications of these data for future Writing Program activities. Finally, as writing program activities (both at WSU and writ large) have become fruitful areas of research for administrators, instructors, and graduate students, this report notes some areas in which qualitative analysis may yield useful insights into the WSU student population, suggesting ways in which the Writing Program can continue to serve this community.

## III.A Major Findings

### III.A.1 Plateau in Time to Completion

As reported below in sections IV.A.1.a-b, students are completing their writing portfolio at or near the recommended 60 credit-hour mark at increasing rates. However, these rates reaching a plateau. Since 2007, the completion rate prior to 75 credit hours varied between 32% and 40% (see Glossary below for definitions of “portfolio completion”). While these are excellent numbers overall—with over one-third of students, regardless of transfer or language status, are completing the portfolio on time—these numbers are no longer improving over time. Currently, the Writing Program issues several reminders to students in the form of (a) posters and pamphlets around the various campuses describing the writing-portfolio process, (b) automatic billing for portfolio assessment, and (c) registration holds placed on a student’s myWSU account until one or both tiers of the portfolio assessment have been submitted. The plateau in submission rates by credit hours suggests that, while these programs work, outreach efforts may have reached a saturation point among the student body. Students who submit portfolios long after the 60 credit-hour mark may do so for reasons beyond the Writing Program’s control.

### III.A.2 Decline in Tier II Distinction Ratings; Shifts in Tier I Ratings

As the tables in section IV.A.3.a show final ratings (Tier II) have seen a decline in Distinction performances, with those losses spread among Complete and Incomplete ratings (formerly Pass and Needs Work, respectively). This continues the trend reported in the 2011-2013 findings. There are few clues within Writing Program practices to account for this decline. However, although final ratings are declining, Tier I ratings have seen an increase in possible Distinction ratings, with portfolio packets showing an increase in Outstanding ratings. Again, the conclusions in this report suggest that there are few clues in the data to account for these increases or the corresponding decreases in final Distinction ratings, but these trends do suggest some areas for future research.

### III.A.3 Decline in “OK” Rated Packet Submissions

As reported in section IV.A.3.a, paper submissions for the portfolio packet have seen a substantial decrease in OK-rated papers over time. An OK rating is reserved for papers that are deemed acceptable by Writing Program staff but which do not have an instructor’s signature (either because the student submitted work completed at another school, the instructor is no longer at WSU, or other difficulties). Section IV.B.1.b notes that many papers submitted during this biennium received Acceptable or Outstanding ratings from instructors, despite coming from other schools. The overall decline in OK ratings may be partly attributed to more students collecting their work early in their careers (gaining the necessary signatures along the way), which in itself might be partly attributed to the WSU writing portfolio’s reputation, insofar as transfer students are able to receive the same types of ratings as their non-transfer peers.

### III.A.4 Difficulty of New Topics and Rhetorical Frames

Further discussion on the timed-writing’s rhetorical frames and topics can be found in Sections IV.B.2 and IV.B.3. This biennium saw the original four rhetorical frames removed from circulation, replaced by four new rhetorical frames. Section IV.B.2 compares the old rhetorical frames to the new. Additionally, this biennium saw six new topics added to the possible list of topics that students may encounter. Four are similar to topics used since the writing portfolio process was established in 1993 – roughly 200 words of a popular academic essay, followed by the rhetorical frame for the prompt. Two are similar to what students are likely to encounter in other coursework and web-based reading: one is an infographic describing the population of the world represented in 100 people; the other covers the same information in text, though not in paragraph format.

Students responding to more textual prompts using popular subjects generally performed better. The analysis contained in Section IV.B.3 suggests that the more recent topics may more closely mirror the types of arguments, rhetorical forms, or subjects college students encounter in their daily lives through popular media, potentially providing a richer pool of background knowledge and more available argumentative structures on which to draw in a timed writing. Infographic and statistical topics, however, in that they differed from more popular modes of discourse, resulted in significantly poorer performances by students. Insofar as the infographic prompts were taken by very few students during this biennium, no clear conclusions can be drawn.

## III.B Implications for Writing Program Activities

In general, the findings contained in this report suggest that efforts to encourage timely submission of and participation in the writing portfolio have been successful. Further, results of Tier I and Tier II ratings fail to suggest biases based on extra-linguistic social factors. However, insofar as the writing portfolio must rely significantly on instructor ratings on submitted papers, the Writing Program will need to provide more explicit guidelines for what constitutes a rating of Outstanding or Acceptable on student papers.

## III.C Areas for Future Study

The data contained in this report examine many different factors that may affect performance on the writing portfolio, e.g., gender, race, first-generation status, language, major, transfer status and campus, etc. Despite consideration of such data in compiling this report, no attempt was made to examine the effects of overlapping traits, nor was there an attempt to regress such traits so as to determine any causal relationships among factors and performances on either tier of the portfolio. Additional research along these lines will likely provide important insights into possible complications with areas like Tier I, where students frequently report difficulty due to background knowledge or experience with a topic.

Additionally, all of the data collected for this report are quantitative. Although many tables report raters’ ultimate evaluations of student work, none include justifications for those evaluations or an examination of the traits of that work. While the portfolio evaluation process is grounded in the belief that individuals who assign and evaluate writing in upper-division courses can be trusted to evaluate student writing across disciplines, assessing and cataloging the specific qualities of work that students are submitting remains for future study. Such research would yield insights not only into the work that students are producing but also into the traits that instructors (via the initial Acceptable/Outstanding rating) found most important, as well as the traits that trained raters find most important.

Finally, additional research is needed regarding the different rates of completion and performance by college. In the past, it has been assumed that more heavily structured programs provided the impetus for completing the portfolio early, while programs that produced more writing benefitted students more at the Tier I level by providing academic writing practice and, at the Tier II level, by providing a larger bank of works from which to choose in compiling the portfolio packet. These assumptions, however, have only been tested anecdotally and would thereby benefit from further analysis. Such research would benefit programs whose students struggle with the writing portfolio process, as it may provide a set of best practices for departments to adopt.

## III.D Glossary

All terms are defined in their respective portions of this report, but a brief explanation of each is provided at this point for ease of interpretation:

Tier I

Tier I refers to the timed writing portion of the writing portfolio assessment process. Students typically complete this requirement first. The timed writing is a brief examination of a student’s ability to produce impromptu writing in response to a prompt. Prompts consist of two parts: the first is an analytic essay response to a short passage (typically about 200 words) using a particular rhetorical frame (e.g., “How do you approach this problem?”); the second is an essay response to a metacognitive question regarding the student’s evaluation of his or her own writing or the sources of his or her knowledge. Students have two hours to complete Tier I.

Tier II

Tier II refers to the packet of writing that students submit as part of the portfolio. Students must submit three samples of writing that demonstrate the student’s writing abilities. Each sample of writing is endorsed by the instructor or supervisor who originally evaluated it. This endorsement includes a notation as to whether the endorser found the writing “Acceptable” or “Outstanding.”

If a student does not receive a “Simple Pass” at Tier I (see below), then his or her packet is read by portfolio raters to determine the student’s final rating. Approximately half of all students completing the writing portfolio receive a “Simple Pass.”

Transfer

Historically, students have been counted as “transfer” if they entered WSU with post-secondary credits from any other source, including community colleges, other universities, Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate programs, or dual-enrollment programs. That reporting tradition is continued here.

L2

For this report, L2 refers to any student whose admission records indicate that his or her first language is not English (accordingly, L1 indicates a student whose records indicate his or her first language is English). This frequently results in the student’s placement into composition courses designed explicitly for non-native speakers of English. During the writing portfolio assessment process, however, L2 students are not considered as different from their L1 peers. Many of the analyses contained in this report, however, examine L1 and L2 students separately in an effort to determine whether any writing portfolio practices unfairly disadvantage any groups.

Although the Writing Program recognizes that there are more precise designators than “L2” (e.g., “English Language Learners,” “English as a Second Language,” “English as a Foreign Language,” “Limited English Proficiency,” “Generation 1.5,” “Multilingual,” “English-Secondary Learners”), herein the designator “L2” represents a general indicator that English is not the student’s first language, fully recognizing that many L2 students speak several languages and that many L1 students are no less multilingual.

Complete

A Complete rating (formerly, “Pass”) indicates that the student is finished with the writing portfolio assessment.

Complete with Distinction

A Complete with Distinction rating (formerly “Pass with Distinction”) indicates that the student is finished with the writing portfolio assessment, and that she or he has performed exceptionally well on both the timed writing and the packet. Completing with Distinction requires three “Outstanding” rated papers to be submitted in the Tier II packet.

Incomplete

An Incomplete rating indicates that an assessment of both the Tier I and Tier II submissions results in the requirement of additional support, so that the student would be more likely to succeed in an upper-division writing-intensive course. Students with an Incomplete rating must enroll either in a one-credit writing tutorial (typically taken in the same semester as an M-credit bearing course; a course designated as “writing in the major,” typically a disciplinary course featuring at least 10 revised pages of writing assigned during the term) or a three-credit revision course (typically after the student has completed all other writing-intensive courses).

Simple Pass

At Tier II, a student may receive a Simple Pass (i.e., a Complete rating) if his or her timed writing was deemed acceptable, and if his or her writing packet included no OK-rated work and two “Outstanding” works. A Simple Pass indicates that the student shows readiness for M-Course and upper-division writing instruction without additional writing support.

Pass

At Tier II, a student may receive a Complete rating by scoring an overall Pass. An acceptable timed writing may be paired with a writing packet including three “Outstanding” works or at least one OK-rated work. Alternatively, the timed writing may be judged as possibly worthy of distinction or, conversely, in need of additional work (see below). A student receiving a “Pass” at this stage gets a Complete rating overall, indicating that he or she shows readiness for M-Course and upper-division writing instruction without additional writing support.

Possible Distinction

At Tier I, a timed writing may display many signs that the student may be eligible for a Complete with Distinction rating. For this report “Possible Distinction” can termed “Exceptional” or “Possible Distinction” at Tier I.

Needs Work

At Tier I, a timed writing display signs that the student would need additional support in writing-intensive courses. These are termed “Needs Work” in this report.

# Descriptive Findings

The descriptive findings section of this report offers insights into the status of student-writing performance at Washington State University through the Writing Portfolio. The Writing Assessment Office draws the majority of its descriptive findings from an internal database. The internal database includes all recorded performances on writing program assessments, writing placement, and writing center utilization during a student’s academic career. Additional information regarding demographics, first-generation status, primary language, and major were all provided by the Student Data Warehouse (OBIEE or Oracle Business Intelligence Enterprise Edition). Prior, comparisons or analyses involving student majors were based on information provided by students when submitting their writing portfolio. However, inconsistent naming practices among students, students changing majors or not declaring them by 60 hours, and other confusion over majors, minors, and certifications led to inaccurate reporting. Utilizing official institutional data has increased the accuracy of several analyses in this report.

## IV.A.1 Average Time to Exam

During the 2015-2017 biennium, 66.4% of students finished the writing portfolio within the optimal range of 60-90 credit hours, aligning with students’ junior year. Students, however, are encouraged to complete the portfolio as early as possible within that range. Since Fall 2000, the Writing Assessment Office has initiated aggressive steps to remind students to complete the Writing Portfolio at 60 credit hours. Not only do these data suggest the effectiveness of such measures, current trends suggest additional outreach activities are called for. Outreach activities are consistent across all students: transfer, non-transfer, L1, L2, etc..

### IV.A.1.a Average Time to Completion—All Students

The four tables included in this section rely on the number of self-reported credit hours earned by students when they submitted their Writing Portfolio packet. Writing Portfolio completion may be described as “time to exam.” While the Writing Program does attempt to look up credit hour information for students missing it, during periods with many students submitting portfolios (see IV.A.2.c), this is not possible to do for everyone. In the current 2015-2017 reporting period, the percentage of students with unreported credit hours decreased by 3.8%, compared to increases of 10% and 7% in the 2011-2013 and 2013-2015 biennia respectively. As more administrative work is automated through online services like myWSU, these data could be made more accurate (and outreach perhaps more visible) if aspects of the portfolio cover sheet were integrated within WSU’s online tools.

In this period, 36.8% of students completed the writing portfolio before 75 credit hours, a 2.1% increase from the 2013-2015 reporting period. 28.8% of students completed the portfolio within the 61-75 credit hour window, a 1.1% increase from the 2013-2015 reporting period. Most students, 70.5%, completed the portfolio before 90 credit hours; an increase of 3.1% from the previous biennium report. Though students are advised to complete their writing portfolio as early as possible within the 60-90 credit hour range, 18.7% of students in the current 2015-2017 period submitted after 90 credit hours, a 1.2% increase from the 2013-2015 reporting period. Students submitting portfolios have also increased, as they have consistently done for the last several biennia.

Time to Exam for All Students, Academic Period June through May

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Period | 60 hours  or less | 61-75 hours | 76-90 hours | 91-105 hours | 106 or more | Unreported hours | # of students |
| June 2011-May 2012 | 6.5% | 31.3% | 40.8% | 12.7% | 5.3% | 3.5% | 5197 |
| June 2012-May 2013 | 7.9% | 31.7% | 32.0% | 11.1% | 5.7% | 11.6% | 5472 |
| June 2013-May 2014 | 7.1% | 27.4% | 34.7% | 10.6% | 6.1% | 13.6% | 5113 |
| June 2014-May 2015 | 6.5% | 26.9% | 32.1% | 11.2% | 7.4% | 15.7% | 5589 |
| June 2015-May 2016 | 7.1% | 30.3% | 32.8% | 12.2% | 6.8% | 13.5% | 5403 |
| June 2016-May 2017 | 8.9% | 35.6% | 35.0% | 10.9% | 6.9% | 8.1% | 5631 |
| Change 15-16 to 16-17 | +1.8% | +5.3% | +2.2% | -1.3% | +0.1% | -5.4% | +228 |

Time to Exam for All Students, Biennial Reporting Periods

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Biennium | 60 hours or less | 61-75 hours | 76-90 hours | 91-105 hours | 106 or more | Unreported hours | # of students |
| 2009-2011 | 7.6% | 29.6% | 40.7% | 14.3% | 6.5% | 1.3% | 10492 |
| 2011-2013 | 7.2% | 31.5% | 36.3% | 11.9% | 5.5% | 7.6% | 10669 |
| f2013-2015 | 7.0% | 27.7% | 32.7% | 10.7% | 6.8% | 14.6% | 10706 |
| 2015-2017 | 8.0% | 28.8% | 33.7% | 11.6% | 7.1% | 10.8% | 11298 |
| Change 13-15 to 15-17 | +1.0% | +1.1% | +1.0% | +0.9% | +0.3% | -3.8% | +592 |

During the 2015-2017 period, the majority of students submitting the Writing Portfolio self-reported being a transfer student with English as their first language (L1). Transfer students, as in previous reporting periods, tend to submit the writing portfolio later than non-transfer students. While 82.6% of non-transfer students submitted with 90 credit hours or less, only 67.3% of transfer students did. Within the ideal 61-75 credit hour interval, 26.2% of transfer students and 37.47% of non-transfer students completed the writing portfolio. Possible reasons for this might include the following: (1) transfer students enter Washington State University with 60 hours already completed, thereby not been made aware of the portfolio process as early as non-transfer students; (2) transfer students might not be aware of how many credits transferred from their previous institution. Students transferring into Washington State University would benefit from greater advising support in terms of Writing Portfolio submission.

A similar gap exists between students who listed English as L2 and their L1 peers, as is also true for previous biennial reports. Of L1 students, 74.2% finished with 90 credit hours or less, while 66.6% of L2 students finished within this timeframe. However, submitted portfolios during the ideal 61-75 credit-hour timeframe was more equal proportionately during this report period: 30.6% L1 and 28.38% L2.

The self-selected categories included in this report, however, do not accurately represent the diversity of students at WSU. Students who may identify as transgender can only choose between Female and Male. Students who are fluent in English but use another language at home may find difficulty in choosing L1 or L2. Students are given “Transfer” status if they enter WSU with any college credit from another institution, whether a single course in the summer before enrollment or transferring in with an Associate’s Degree. This report only partially take advantage of WSU’s recent move to support students as more than one ethnicity.

Time to Exam—Comparison Between Student Classifications, June 2015-May 2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | 60 hours or less | 61-75 hours | 76-90 hours | 91-105 hours | 106 or more hours | Unreported hours | # of Students |
| Females | 8.3% | 29.1% | 32.8% | 12.1% | 6.5% | 11.3% | 6003 |
| Males | 7.7% | 28.4% | 35.0% | 10.9% | 7.7% | 10.4% | 5187 |
| L1 | 8.1% | 30.6% | 35.5% | 10.4% | 6.8% | 8.6% | 6887 |
| L2 | 8.2% | 28.4% | 30.0% | 14.5% | 8.4% | 10.6% | 1924 |
| Transfer | 7.7% | 26.2% | 33.3% | 12.6% | 9.0% | 11.2% | 7978 |
| Non-Transfer | 9.5% | 37.5% | 35.6% | 7.9% | 1.9% | 7.6% | 2714 |
| Overall | 8.0% | 28.8% | 33.7% | 11.6% | 7.1% | 10.8% | 11298 |

The following table shows the change in time to exam by student classification from 2013-2015 to 2015-2017. While these changes rely exclusively on self-reported data, the data can help with contextualizing the changes occurring between 2013-2015 and 2015-2017. In previous reports, L2 students were increasingly submitting writing portfolios later than L1 students, but this trend appears to have diminished, with a 2.5% increase in L2 student submissions during the ideal interval of 61-75 credit hours, and 2.7% decrease in L2 student submissions after 106 credit hours.

Change in Time to Exam by Student Classifications, 2013-2015 to 2015-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | 0-60 hours | 61-75 hours | 76-90 hours | 91-105 hours | 106 or more | Unreported hours | # of Students |
| Females | +0.1% | 0.0% | -1.3% | +1.1% | 0.0% | +0.5% | +1297 |
| Males | +1.3% | -0.7% | -1.0% | +0.2% | +1.2% | -0.5% | +981 |
| L1 | +1.0% | +1.0% | -1.2% | -0.6% | +0.9% | -0.8% | +472 |
| L2 | +0.6% | +2.5% | -1.4% | +0.8% | -2.7% | +0.6% | +287 |
| Transfer | +1.5% | +1.3% | +0.8% | 0.0% | +0.4% | -3.7% | +741 |
| Non-Transfer | +1.2% | +1.3% | -1.8% | +0.9% | +0.4% | -1.6% | +50 |
| Overall | +1.2% | +1.7% | +0.5% | +0.7% | +0.2% | -3.9% | +592 |

### IV.A.1.b Average Time to Exam—Transfer and Language Status

The next two tables report the time to exam for transfer/non-transfer and L1/L2 students. The tables also indicate changes over time between 2013-2015 and 2015-2017. The first table reports student time to exam by transfer status and displays the time to exam over the last three biennia. A greater proportion of transfer students continue to complete the writing portfolio later than non-transfer, but it is unknown whether this is due to the students delaying the process or the number of credits they have when they enroll. However, in comparison to the 2013-2015 reporting period, the proportion of transfer students’ portfolio submissions increased for under 60 credit hours (by 1.3%), the recommended 61-75 credit-hour window (by 0.8%) and the 76-90 credit-hour window (by 1.2%). There were also slight increases in the proportion of students submitting from 91-105 credit hours (by 0.2%) and 106 or more hours (by 0.5%). This corresponds with more transfer students overall and decreasing proportions of students who left their credit hours underreported (by -3.6%).

Time to Exam—Transfer vs. Non-Transfer Students, Biennial Reporting Period

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 60 hours or less | 61-75 hours | 76-90 hours | 91-105 hours | 106 or more | Unrptd. | # of Students |
| 2011-2013 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer | | 6.0% | 29.7% | 36.2% | 13.6% | 6.8% | 7.7% | 7646 |
| Non-Transfer | | 11.2% | 38.4% | 36.4% | 7.0% | 1.9% | 5.0% | 2650 |
| 2013-2015 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer | | 6.4% | 25.4% | 32.1% | 12.4% | 8.5% | 14.8% | 7455 |
| Non-Transfer | | 8.6% | 37.0% | 36.8% | 6.8% | 1.5% | 9.1% | 2718 |
| 2015-2017 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer | | 7.72% | 26.20% | 33.33% | 12.57% | 8.97% | 11.17% | 7978 |
| Non-Transfer | | 9.54% | 37.47% | 35.59% | 7.89% | 1.92% | 7.59% | 2714 |
| Change 13-15 to 15-17 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Transfer | +1.3% | +0.8% | +1.2% | +0.2% | +0.5% | -3.6% | +523 |
|  | Non-Transfer | +0.9% | +0.5% | -1.2% | +1.1% | +0.4% | -1.5% | -4 |

From 2015-2017, students who reported L1 or L2 submitted writing portfolios at similar credit-hour timeframes. However, as with the previous two biennia displayed in the table below, L2 students in the 2015-2017 biennium still submitted their writing portfolios in greater proportions after 90 credit hours (33.5%) than L1 students (25.8%). In the 60-90 credit-hour range, 66.1% of L1 students and 58.4% of L2 students completed their portfolios. This corresponds to a 0.3% decrease and a 0.9% increase respectively from the previous 2013-2015 biennium.

As was the case during 2015-2017 there were 161 L2 students completing portfolios after 106 credit hours, 148 (92%) of which were also transfer students.

Time to Exam—L1 vs. L2 Students, Biennial Reporting Period

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 60 hours or less | 61-75 hours | 76-90 hours | 91-105 hours | 106 or more | Unreported | # of Students |
| **2011-2013** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **L1** | **7.4%** | **31.8%** | **36.7%** | **11.6%** | **5.5%** | **7.0%** | **8334** |
|  | **L2** | **7.9%** | **33.7%** | **34.7%** | **12.6%** | **4.8%** | **6.3%** | **1612** |
| **2013-2015** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **L1** | **7.3%** | **30.3%** | **36.1%** | **10.8%** | **5.7%** | **9.4%** | **6617** |
|  | **L2** | **8.1%** | **26.6%** | **30.9%** | **13.4%** | **10.9%** | **9.7%** | **1704** |
| **2015-2017** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **L1** | ***8.1%*** | ***30.6%*** | ***35.5%*** | ***10.4%*** | ***6.8%*** | **8.6%** | ***6887*** |
|  | **L2** | ***8.2%*** | ***28.4%*** | ***30.0%*** | ***14.5%*** | ***8.4%*** | **10.6%** | ***1924*** |
| **Change 2011-2013 to 2013-2015** | | | | |  |  |  |  |
|  | **L1** | **+0.8%** | **+0.3%** | **-0.6%** | **-0.4%** | **+1.1%** | **-0.8%** | **+270** |
|  | **L2** | **+0.1%** | **+1.8%** | **-0.9%** | **+1.1%** | **-2.5%** | **0.9%** | **+220** |

### IV.A.1.c Average Time to Exam—Impact on Portfolio Rating

The four tables in this section present data on the impact on rating of the Writing Portfolio in relation to the time to exam between 2011 and 2017. The first table displays combined data from the2011-2013, 2013-2015, and 2015-2017 biennia. The next three tables present separate data for each of the three biennia. At Tier I, timed essays are rated Pass/Complete, Pass/Complete with Distinction, or Needs Work/In Progress. Essays marked as Pass with Distinction or Needs Work progress to Tier II, shown as Final Results, where the entire Portfolio (the timed essay and paper submissions) is rated.

In the 2015-2017 biennium, there were 11,288 students who completed Tier I, timed essays; 62% of students received a “Complete,” 8% received a “Complete with Distinction,” and almost 30% received a “In Progress” classification. For Tier II, there were 11,295 students included in this biennium; 88% of students received a “Complete,” 5% received a “Complete with Distinction,” and almost 7% received a “In Progress” classification. Significantly, compared to the previous 2013-2015 biennium, the 2015-2017 biennium saw a net increase of 6,194 students completing Tier II.

Change in Time to Exam, Impact on Rating, 2013-2015 to 2015-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 60 hours or less | 61-75 hours | 76-90 hours | 91-105 hours | 106 or more | Unreported | | Total |
| Tier I Results | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
|  | Pass | +1.1% | +1.0% | +0.6% | +0.9% | +0.6% | -4.0% | +433 | |
|  | Distinction | +2.3% | +0.4% | +0.7% | +0.3% | +1.4% | -5.0% | -119 | |
|  | Needs Work | +0.5% | +1.1% | +1.6% | +0.8% | -0.8% | -3.1% | +276 | |
| Tier II Results | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
|  | Pass | +0.7% | +2.5% | +1.8% | +1.1% | -0.9% | -5.0% | +6332 | |
|  | Distinction | +2.7% | +2.0% | -2.0% | -1.0% | +4.1% | -5.7% | +185 | |
|  | Needs Work | +1.0% | +1.2% | -1.8% | +1.5% | -2.4% | +0.9% | -323 | |

Time to Exam, Impact on Rating, 2015-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **60 hours or less** | **61-75 hours** | **76-90 hours** | **91-105 hours** | **106 or more** | **Unreported** | | **Total** |
| **Tier I** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| **Pass** | **8.1%** | **29.0%** | **34.1%** | **11.5%** | **6.9%** | **10.3%** | | **7020** |
| **Distinction** | **8.6%** | **25.7%** | **35.3%** | **10.4%** | **9.4%** | **10.6%** | | **941** |
| **Needs Work** | **7.8%** | **29.1%** | **32.4%** | **12.0%** | **6.9%** | **11.9%** | | **3327** |
| **Tier II** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Pass** | **8.0%** | **28.6%** | **34.2%** | **11.5%** | **7.1%** | **10.6%** | | **9942** |
| **Distinction** | **9.5%** | **28.9%** | **32.1%** | **10.3%** | **8.9%** | **10.3%** | | **610** |
| **Needs Work** | **7.9%** | **31.4%** | **28.1%** | **13.7%** | **5.1%** | **13.7%** | | **743** |

Time to Exam, Impact on Rating, 2013-2015

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 60 hours or less | 61-75 hours | 76-90 hours | 91-105 hours | 106 or more | Unreported | Total |
| Tier I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass | 7.0% | 28.0% | 33.5% | 10.7% | 6.3% | 14.3% | 6587 |
| Distinction | 6.3% | 25.3% | 34.6% | 10.1% | 7.9% | 15.7% | 1060 |
| Needs Work | 7.2% | 28.0% | 30.8% | 11.2% | 7.6% | 15.0% | 3051 |
| Tier II |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass | 7.2% | 26.0% | 32.4% | 10.4% | 8.1% | 15.7% | 3610 |
| Distinction | 6.8% | 26.8% | 34.1% | 11.3% | 4.7% | 16.0% | 425 |
| Needs Work | 6.9% | 30.2% | 29.9% | 12.2% | 7.5% | 12.9% | 1066 |

Time to Exam, Impact on Rating, 2011-2013

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **60 hours or less** | **61-75 hours** | **76-90 hours** | **91-105 hours** | **106 or more** | **Unreported** | | **Total** |
| **Tier I** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| **Pass** | **7.2%** | **31.2%** | **36.6%** | **12.2%** | **5.3%** | **7.5%** | | **6647** |
| **Distinction** | **7.1%** | **31.0%** | **36.5%** | **11.9%** | **6.3%** | **7.1%** | | **891** |
| **Needs Work** | **7.4%** | **32.4%** | **35.5%** | **10.8%** | **5.5%** | **8.1%** | | **3105** |
| **Tier II** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| **Pass** | **7.3%** | **31.2%** | **36.3%** | **11.8%** | **5.5%** | **7.6%** | | **8702** |
| **Distinction** | **6.5%** | **34.9%** | **32.0%** | **12.3%** | **6.5%** | **7.7%** | | **587** |
| **Needs Work** | **7.7%** | **31.9%** | **38.4%** | **11.2%** | **3.3%** | **7.6%** | | **1139** |

### IV.A.1.d Average Time to Exam—Self-Reported Gender

The following table is designed to reflect changes in time to exam by self-reported gender since 2009. However, self-reported gender has its limitations, insofar as it continues to reflect a simple male-female binary. The following table shows similar trends experienced by both genders. The most significant changes were a 24.4% increase in females and 19.2% increase in males reporting their credit hours from the 2013-2015 biennium to this 2015-2017 biennium.

Time to Exam by Gender, Biennial Reporting Period

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **60 hours or less** | **61-75 hours** | **76-90 hours** | **91-105 hours** | **106 or more hours** | **Unreported hours** | **# of Students** |
| **2011-2013** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Females** | **8.16%** | **31.07%** | **35.70%** | **11.26%** | **5.93%** | **7.73%** | **5292** |
| **Males** | **6.38%** | **32.20%** | **37.33%** | **12.09%** | **4.70%** | **7.12%** | **5044** |
| **2013-2015** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Females** | **8.37%** | **29.70%** | **33.58%** | **10.74%** | **6.59%** | **10.82%** | **4825** |
| **Males** | **6.64%** | **30.01%** | **35.55%** | **10.64%** | **6.18%** | **10.82%** | **4352** |
| **2015-2017** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Females** | **8.31%** | **29.05%** | **32.75%** | **12.09%** | **6.48%** | **11.26%** | **6003** |
| **Males** | **7.69%** | **28.36%** | **34.97%** | **10.91%** | **7.67%** | **10.39%** | **5187** |
| **Change 13-15 to 15-17** | | | | | | | |
| **Females** | **-0.1%** | **-0.6%** | **-0.8%** | **+1.4%** | **-0.1%** | **+0.4%** | **+1178** |
| **Males** | **+1.1%** | **-1.6%** | **-0.6%** | **+0.3%** | **+1.5%** | **-0.4%** | **+835** |

### IV.A.1.e Departmental Difference in Mean Credit Hours at Exam

The table below examines the average credit hours of students completing their portfolios, sorted by major and its respective college. In the 2015-2017 biennium, 7,978 transfer students averaged just over 83 credit hours at time of portfolio submission, compared to 76.3 credit hours on average for 2,714 non-transfer peers. Due to reporting irregularities, the table below only represents 9,839 of this biennium’s 11,298 students. Students note their current credit hours on their submission cover sheets, so while most are accurate, many fail to report or enter values such as “60+” or “100+.” Those data are not included in this table.

Majors that contain highly-structured programs may have provided students greater guidance and support. As well, majors that attract a high number of transfer students may reflect higher average credit hours toward successful completion of the exam portion of the Writing Portfolio because transfer students may be transferring into WSU with more than 60 credit hours, though, as noted earlier, they do tend to finish within one semester of their non-transfer peers. The following table provides not only the mean but provides for the Standard Deviation (SD). At the all-university level, students finish the Writing Portfolio at 80.2 credit hours on average, with a SD of 16.5, suggesting that most students are taking the exam between 63.7 and 96.7 credit hours. This also suggests that some students complete their portfolio well before the 60 credit hours the Writing Program recommends for beginning the portfolio process. Reasons for early submission vary (e.g., anticipating taking part in a study-abroad program during the 60-hour mark, anticipating transfer from WSU but wishing to do so with the portfolio, planning ahead, etc.). These data are provided to inform further analyses in this report and advising practices for undergraduates.

Average Hours at Portfolio Completion by Major, 2015-2017

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Average Credit Hours (SD) | Count of Students\* |
| All University | | **81.4 (SD 22.7)** | **11298** |
|  | |  |  |
| Carson College of Business | | **80.4 (16.9)** | **2145** |
|  | Accounting | 81.7 (21.8) | 409 |
|  | Accounting and Management Information Systems | 77.8 (13.9) | 5 |
|  | Business Administration | 81.0 (81.6) | 300 |
|  | Business Administration and Management Information Systems | 76.0 | 1 |
|  | Entrepreneurship | 76.2 (10.3) | 28 |
|  | Finance | 77.6 (13.3) | 345 |
|  | Hospitality Business Management | 83.2 (13.8) | 318 |
|  | International Business | 76.9 (17.5) | 89 |
|  | Management and Operations | 80.9 (15.5) | 187 |
|  | Management Information Systems | 80.6 (18.8) | 210 |
|  | Marketing | 79.3 (12.4) | 252 |
|  | Wine Business Management | 74.0 | 1 |
| College of Agricultural, Human and Natural Resource Sciences (CAHNRS) | | **79.35 (26.7)** | **1179** |
|  | Agricultural and Food Business Economics | 78.9 (15.5) | 27 |
|  | Agricultural and Food Systems | 70.0 | 1 |
|  | Agricultural Biotechnology | 78.2 (14.6) | 60 |
|  | Agricultural Technology and Production Management | 64.0 | 1 |
|  | Agriculture and Business Economics | 86.3 (12.9) | 9 |
|  | Agriculture Education | 75.1 (8.6) | 16 |
|  | Animal Sciences | 77.0 (15.4) | 153 |
|  | Apparel, Merchandising, Design and Textiles | 76.2 (16.1) | 125 |
|  | Crop Science | 79.7 (13.5) | 60 |
|  | Ecology | 63.0 | 1 |
|  | Economic Sciences | 79.9 (12.3) | 88 |
|  | Entomology | 85.0 | 1 |
|  | Environmental Sciences | 80.2 (20.3) | 106 |
|  | Food Science | 81.9 (14.2) | 17 |
|  | Food Science and Human Nutrition | 78.0 (18.4) | 2 |
|  | Horticulture | 84.5 (18.9) | 18 |
|  | Human Development | 80.8 (45.3) | 325 |
|  | Interior Design | 82.2 (28.6) | 64 |
|  | Landscape Architecture | 76.8 (7) | 6 |
|  | Natural Resource Sciences | 98.2 (48.6) | 7 |
|  | Organic Agricultural Systems | 72.5 (19.6) | 6 |
|  | Viticulture and Enology | 80.5 (15.7) | 15 |
|  | Wildlife Ecology | 77.0 (13.1) | 71 |
| College of Arts and Sciences | | **80.7 (21.1)** | **3676** |
|  | American Studies | 75.7 (17.7) | 17 |
|  | Anthropology | 81.7 (18.8) | 59 |
|  | Art History | 61.0 | 1 |
|  | Basic Medical Sciences | 79.4 (15.2) | 55 |
|  | Biology | 79.9 (19) | 434 |
|  | Botany | 82.0 | 1 |
|  | Chemistry | 76.8 (13.6) | 31 |
|  | Chinese | 70.5 (.7) | 2 |
|  | Contemporary Ethnic Studies | 77.1 (11.7) | 39 |
|  | Creative Writing (English Option) | 74.0 | 1 |
|  | Criminal Justice | 80.7 (16.9) | 378 |
|  | Digital Technology and Culture | 79.5 (15.9) | 194 |
|  | English | 77.1 (12.9) | 144 |
|  | Fine Arts | 80.0 (11.9) | 31 |
|  | French | 76.5 (16.9) | 4 |
|  | General Studies | 78.6 (14.8) | 138 |
|  | Geology | 78.4 (11.2) | 15 |
|  | German | 101.0 | 1 |
|  | History | 79.2 (16.7) | 125 |
|  | Humanities | 82.8 (21.5) | 131 |
|  | Linguistics (Humanities Option) | 77.0 | 1 |
|  | Mathematics | 82.6 (22) | 74 |
|  | Music | 78.4 (14.1) | 37 |
|  | Music Performance | 89.0 | 1 |
|  | Personnel Psychology/Human Resources | 92.9 (90.4) | 67 |
|  | Philosophy | 77.7 (12.8) | 15 |
|  | Physics | 83.9 (13.3) | 29 |
|  | Political Science | 78.9 (14.6) | 132 |
|  | Pre-Medicine | 84.7 (14) | 3 |
|  | Psychology | 80.0 (16.8) | 791 |
|  | Psychology and Sociology |  | 1 |
|  | Public Affairs | 78.4 (17.8) | 56 |
|  | Social Sciences | 85.6 (19.5) | 365 |
|  | Social Studies | 94.4 (24.5) | 7 |
|  | Sociology | 81.1 (17.6) | 118 |
|  | Spanish | 80.7 (21.5) | 21 |
|  | Women's Studies | 92.8 (19.9) | 8 |
|  | Zoology | 77.4 (15.1) | 149 |
| College of Education | | **79.1 (18.4)** | **772** |
|  | Athletic Training | 75.3 (11.7) | 42 |
|  | Education (Elementary and Secondary) | 82 (22.6) | 305 |
|  | Health and Fitness | 74.7 (12.2) | 3 |
|  | Kinesiology | 78.7 (18.08) | 199 |
|  | Movement Studies | 72.3 (8.3) | 4 |
|  | Sports Management | 76.8 (12.7) | 219 |
| College of Nursing | | **93 (41.6)** | **546** |
|  | Nursing | 93 (41.6) | 546 |
| College of Pharmacy | | **69.7 (15.6)** | **8** |
|  | Pharmacy | 69.7 (15.6) | 8 |
| College of Veterinary Medicine | | **80.9 (SD 18.4)** | **250** |
|  | Biochemisty | 84 (22.2) | 67 |
|  | Biophysics (Biochemistry Option) | 76 | 1 |
|  | Genetics and Cell Biology | 81.1 (11.3) | 17 |
|  | Microbiology | 78.1 (16.8) | 60 |
|  | Neuroscience | 80.2 (17.4) | 101 |
|  | Pre-Veterinary Medicine | 92.7 (29) | 4 |
| Edward R. Murrow College of Communication | | **77.7 (SD 15.6)** | **616** |
|  | Advertising | 67.5 (3.5) | 2 |
|  | Communication Studies | 77.7 (15.7) | 612 |
|  | Journalism and Media Production | 81 (17) | 2 |
| Elson S. Floyd College of Medicine | | **77.25 (24.8)** | 80 |
|  | Nutrition and Exercise Physiology | 87.2 (29.8) | 32 |
|  | Speech and Hearing Sciences | 70.6 (18.3) | 48 |
| Voiland College of Engineering and Architecture | | **84.8 (SD 23.9)** | **1885** |
|  | Architectural Studies | 75.0 (11) | 71 |
|  | Bioengineering | 75.6 (11.5) | 40 |
|  | Chemical Engineering | 86.4 (21.6) | 125 |
|  | Civil Engineering | 79.9 (20.9) | 218 |
|  | Computer Engineering | 79.6 (15.1) | 36 |
|  | Computer Science | 81.9 (20.4) | 343 |
|  | Construction Management | 75.4 (17.9) | 114 |
|  | Electrical Engineering | 88.7 (23.9) | 265 |
|  | Engineering | 90.3 (29.1) | 55 |
|  | Materials Science Engineering | 81.1 (19.2) | 34 |
|  | Mechanical Engineering | 89.8 (28.2) | 584 |
| Undeclared | | **77.8 (SD 15.2)** | **47** |
| Unknown | | **77.7 (SD 14.8)** | **91** |

## IV.A.2 Compliance with the Examination

Since the 2004-2005 academic year (AY), 65,517 students have participated in the Writing Portfolio. The 2015-2017 reporting period showed a greater increase in student participation with 11,298 students. As enrollment continues to grow both on WSU campuses including the Global Campus, student participation should also continue its sustained increases in coming years.

### IV.A.2.a Annual Change in Participation for All Students

The number of portfolio submissions trended upward between 2005 and 2011, reaching its peak during AY 2010-2011. Although AY 2011-2012 shows a 562-student decrease from that peak, the four academic periods leading to this report indicate that participation has grown through cycles. During AY 2014-2015, a peak of 5,787 students participated, and though AY 2015-2016 and AY 2016-2017 did not match this, together they account for more than the 2013-2015 biennium.

Fluctuations between Writing Program participation and the population of students eligible to participate may reflect trends in student participation or in changes in overall enrollment at WSU. Lags between portfolio submission and exam completion might have also played a part in fluctuations, in that students can complete each section of the portfolio process during different academic years. Also, as time to exam decreases, the number of students completing portfolios in a given year should more closely parallel the number of students eligible to complete for a given year. As compliance increases, the extent to which the exam must play “catch-up” decreases.

### **IV.A.2.b Annual Change in Portfolio Assessment Participation for L2 and Transfer Students**

The following table shows the proportion of L2 and transfer students to overall portfolio participation between AY 2007-2008 and AY 2016-2017. The raw numbers and accompanying percentages reflect trends by academic year and show that the number of portfolios assessed from L2 students have followed a general steady rise from AY 2007-2008 to the present. The numbers from the 2011-2012 academic year and the 2015-2016 academic year each dropped slightly. The 2010-2011, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016 academic years each saw slight decreases in L2 students from respective previous years. However, the percentage based on total students has increased overall; in 2007, 8% of all students examined were L2 students but by 2017, 18.7% of students examined were L2 students. The largest single year increase in L2 students occurred from AY 2015-2016 to AY 2016-2017 with 235 more L2 students completing the writing portfolio, representing a 3.6% increase in students examined.

The number of transfer students participating in the Writing Portfolio has, overall, increased since AY 2007-2008. The raw number of transfer student portfolios followed a steady increase until AY 2010-2011, when numbers decreased slightly. From AY 2011-2012 to AY 2013-2014 transfer student portfolios increased, while in AY 2013-2014 there was another dip in raw numbers but an increase in percentage of total students. In AY 2014-2015, there was a gain in the raw number of transfer students but a dip in the percentage of all students examined. The AY 2015-2016 dipped from the previous academic year for the raw number of transfer students, but a slight gain in the percentage of all students examined. Finally, during the current decade, the greatest increase occurred during AY 2016-2017 at 4095, with a 72.7% representing transfer students.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **L2 and Transfer Student Portfolio Completion Percentages, 2007-2017** | | | | |
| Academic Year | L2 Students | Percentage of all Examined | Transfer Students | Percentage of all Examined |
| 2007-2008 | 393 | 8.0% | 3391 | 68.3% |
| 2008-2009 | 552 | 11.1% | 3402 | 68.8% |
| 2009-2010 | 684 | 13.2% | 3608 | 69.7% |
| 2010-2011 | 782 | 14.1% | 3871 | 70.0% |
| 2011-2012 | 756 | 15.2% | 3558 | 71.6% |
| 2012-2013 | 844 | 15.1% | 3995 | 71.5% |
| 2013-2014 | 897 | 17.8% | 3647 | 72.4% |
| 2014-2015  2015-2016  2016-2017 | 820  817  1052 | 14.2%  15.1%  18.7% | 3874  3697  4095 | 67.0%  68.4%  72.7% |

### IV.A.2.c Completion of Portfolio by Month

The breakdown of portfolio completion by month shows the majority of portfolios are submitted during April and November. April consistently remains the busiest month of the year with an average of 32.6% completion throughout the 2007-2017 reporting periods. The second busiest month is November with a 15.7% average submission; this is followed by December with 12% and May with 9.9%. The high percentage of submissions in both April and November coincides with the spring and winter graduation periods. High November submissions also coincide with registration for spring semester classes that require Writing Portfolio registration holds to be cleared and Writing Portfolio prerequisites to be met. Portfolio submissions in May showed an increase from a low of 2.2% in 2008 to an unusually high of 21.2% in 2014.

Percentages for 2017 are calculated based on a six-month period rather than the usual twelve-month period. This also accounts for the fewer number of total students reported (3,402). As a result, the percentages for 2017 should not be compared to the corresponding months from 2007 to 2016. The final column in the graph below reflects the monthly mean.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | Mean |
| Jan | 6.3% | 6.1% | 6.2% | 5.7% | 6.2% | 5.4% | 6.5% | 4.9% | 4.2% | 5.0% | 9.1% | 6.0% | |
| Feb | 1.4% | 1.3% | 1.1% | 0.8% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.8% | 0.7% | 2.6% | 0.9% | 1.2% | 1.1% | |
| Mar | 11.8% | 10.3% | 6.5% | 5.6% | 6.3% | 8.3% | 9.7% | 7.8% | 8.3% | 14.7% | 17.9% | 9.7% | |
| Apr | 24.1% | 31.6% | 30.7% | 36.2% | 30.6% | 33.7% | 37.5% | 21.9% | 29.5% | 28.5% | 53.9% | 32.6% | |
| May | 6.1% | 2.2% | 8.2% | 6.5% | 12.3% | 6.7% | 7.7% | 21.1% | 12.6% | 7.1% | 17.9% | 9.9% | |
| June | 3.7% | 5.3% | 4.5% | 3.6% | 4.2% | 0.5% | 2.8% | 1.1% | 4.8% | 3.6% | - | 3.41% | |
| July | 0.2% | 0.7% | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.2% | 0.5% | 0.4% | 0.7% | 0.6% | 0.5% | - | 0.43% | |
| Aug | 6.0% | 6.6% | 5.7% | 4.2% | 5.8% | 6.9% | 5.0% | 5.6% | 3.9% | 4.5% | - | 5.42% | |
| Sept | 0.9% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.9% | 0.4% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.8% | 0.4% | 0.6% | - | 0.6% | |
| Oct | 10.4% | 8.8% | 6.3% | 9.6% | 9.5% | 4.8% | 4.0% | 4.2% | 6.7% | 7.7% | - | 7.2% | |
| Nov | 20.3% | 15.4% | 15.0% | 10.0% | 18.0% | 20.5% | 16.5% | 12.7% | 12.2% | 16.6% | - | 15.7% | |
| Dec | 8.9% | 10.9% | 15.0% | 16.5% | 6.0% | 11.5% | 8.7% | 18.3% | 14.2% | 10.4% | - | 12.0% | |
| Total | 4672 | 4898 | 4949 | 5234 | 5567 | 4965 | 5191 | 5582 | 5518 | 5535 | 3402 | 55513 |

## 

## IV.A.3 Performance

The following section provides data on student performance on the Writing Portfolio.

### IV.A.3.a Overall Portfolio Performance

Portfolio evaluation uses a “Two-Tiered Expert Rater” system. Expert raters are faculty from across the disciplines who are recruited, trained, and paid. Tier I is comprised of rater evaluations of the timed writing, and Tier II is comprised of individual instructor evaluations of course papers. If the portfolio is not rated as a “Simple Pass” (see IV.B.5), papers are evaluated by the expert raters. After Tier II, students receive a Final Rating: Complete, Complete with Distinction, or Incomplete.

**Course submissions.** Instructor evaluation of course writings submitted for the Writing Portfolio results in two possible ratings: Outstanding or Acceptable. This process, the collection of individual essays from previous coursework, comprises Tier I. Students are strongly encouraged to obtain instructor signatures and ratings. However, when an instructor is not available to rate a paper, the Writing Assessment Office can assign a third category of “Okay” to a paper if it meets the following criteria: (1) the paper was written at a community college or other institution, so that the teacher cannot be easily reached; (2) an increase in the number of transfer students places a burden on a particular instructor at the original institution; (3) the WSU faculty member or graduate student is no longer at WSU.

The following table, “Evaluations of Writing Portfolio Paper Submissions,” shows the breakdown of ratings for portfolio submissions by year. The mean row shows that the majority of papers are rated “acceptable” (50%), followed by “outstanding” (43%). The number of papers without signatures is only 6.9% on average. The raw number of submissions has been consistently rising over the years. The 2016-2017 academic year, for example, had the highest number of paper submissions, with 16,853 total papers.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluations of Writing Portfolio Paper Submissions, 2007-2017** | | | | |
| Academic Year | Outstanding | Acceptable | Okay | Total Submissions |
| 2007-2008 | 38.8% | 49.1% | 12.0% | 14,730 |
| 2008-2009 | 41.4% | 49.1% | 9.4% | 13,528 |
| 2009-2010 | 43.6% | 47.5% | 8.9% | 16,477 |
| 2010-2011 | 42.8% | 48.7% | 8.5% | 14,794 |
| 2011-2012 | 44.0% | 48.6% | 7.4% | 15,393 |
| 2012-2013 | 44.2% | 49.6% | 6.2% | 16,315 |
| 2013-2014 | 44.3% | 49.9% | 5.9% | 15,302 |
| 2014-2015  2015-2016  2016-2017 | 44.3%  42.8%  41.0% | 50.8%  52.5%  54.2% | 4.9%  4.7%  4.8% | 16,684  16,160  16,853 |
| Mean | 43.0% | 50.0% | 6.9% | 156,236 |

The next two tables provide data on ratings for Tier I (the timed writing) and Tier II (complete portfolio evaluation) over the last five biennial reporting periods. Both Tier I and Tier II rating data generally show a leveling in all paper rating categories, although each category reflects particular overall trends.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tier I (Timed Writing) Ratings, 2007-2017** | | | |  |  |
| Academic Year | Outstanding | Acceptable | Needs Work | Total Submissions |
| 2007-2008 | | 10.1% | 65.2% | 24.7% | 4962 |
| 2008-2009 | | 8.4% | 66.3% | 25.3% | 4943 |
| 2009-2010 | | 8.4% | 67.6% | 24.0% | 5174 |
| 2010-2011 | | 9.2% | 69.2% | 21.6% | 5531 |
| 2011-2012 | | 8.0% | 64.8% | 27.2% | 4969 |
| 2012-2013 | | 8.7% | 59.7% | 31.6% | 5584 |
| 2013-2014 | | 10.0% | 59.4% | 30.6% | 5035 |
| 2014-2015  2015-2016  2016-2017 | | 9.8%  8.0%  8.5% | 63.4%  57.8%  67.3% | 26.8%  34.1%  24.1% | 5787  5403  5631 |
| Mean | | 8.9% | 64.1% | 27.0% | 53,019 |

**Tier II (Final Portfolio Review) Ratings, 2007-2017**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Year | Outstanding | Acceptable | Needs Work | Total Submissions |
| 2007-2008 | 6.6% | 83.4% | 9.8% | 4962 |
| 2008-2009 | 7.5% | 83.2% | 9.2% | 4943 |
| 2009-2010 | 7.6% | 83.8% | 8.6% | 5174 |
| 2010-2011 | 7.6% | 83.4% | 9.0% | 5531 |
| 2011-2012 | 5.5% | 84.4% | 10.1% | 4969 |
| 2012-2013 | 5.8% | 82.2% | 11.8% | 5584 |
| 2013-2014 | 4.1% | 84.2% | 11.7% | 5035 |
| 2014-2015 | 5.2% | 83.7% | 11.2% | 5787 |
| 2015-2016 | 5.3% | 86.6% | 8.1% | 5403 |
| 2016-2017 | 5.4% | 89.7% | 5.0% | 5631 |
| Mean | 6.1% | 84.5% | 9.5% | 53,019 |

Timed writing (Tier I) and the Final Portfolio evaluations (Tier II) most commonly receive “Acceptable” ratings. While trends are relatively stable among categories, there are several anomalous years. For the Tier I ratings in the AY 2015-2016, for instance, there was a drop in “Acceptable” ratings to 57.8%, and a rise in ratings of “Needs work” to 34.1%. On average, 64.1% of Tier I ratings are acceptable, 27% are rated as “Needs Work” with 8.9% receiving “Outstanding” ratings.

The Final Portfolio Evaluations (Tier II) have shown an overall decrease in “Outstanding” ratings over time, with the exception of the last three years (AY 2014-2015 to AY 2016-2017) which have slowly and steadily increased, though still below the decade average (6.1%). During this three-year period, as “Outstanding” ratings have increased, “Needs Work” ratings have decreased from 11.2% of Tier II evaluations in AY 2014-2015 to a low of 5% in AY 2016-2017. This corresponds to an increase in “Acceptable” ratings during this time, with a high of 89.7% in AY 2016-2017. From the AY 2007-2008 to AY 2016-2017, there has been high degree of consistency among raters across the years surveyed in these tables.

A comparison between Tier I (Timed Writing) and Tier II (Final Portfolio Evaluation) shows a significant decrease in “Needs Work” ratings between the Timed Writing portion (mean of 27%) and the Final Portfolio Evaluation (mean of 9.5%). This decrease in “Needs Work” ratings is accompanied by an increase in “Acceptable” ratings. While the Timed Writing has a mean of 64.1% “Acceptable” ratings, the Final Portfolio Review has a mean of 84.5%. However, the number of “Outstanding” ratings decreases as we move from the Instructor Evaluations of Paper Submissions (mean of 43%), to Timed Writing (mean of 8.9%), to the Final Portfolio Review (mean of 6.1%). This suggests instructor ratings based on responses to assignments as well as writing, whereas the final portfolio reflects ratings based solely on the quality of the writing.

Tier I and Tier II ratings of “Outstanding” have remained relatively flat during the last five biennia. This is suggestive of effective norming and reliable rating; however. the period of AY 2007-2008 to AY 2011-2012 in Tier II ratings were higher compared to AY 2012-2013 to AY 2016-2017; this could be indicative of a decline in the overall quality of student writing or of a shift in how raters understand the rating scale or some combination of the two. It is also possible that these trends parallel gradual increases in class size, decreases in timed writing instruction in classroom pedagogy, or other systemic factors. This trend should be monitored both in future reports and during the academic year.

IV.A.3.b Performance According to Transfer and L2 Status

In order to facilitate an analysis of portfolio rating data as it corresponds to student demographics, the following tables juxtapose students’ self-reported language and transfer status (Section III.D) with Tier I and Tier II rating data. Data for the previous three reporting periods have been included along with the most recent data to support analysis of change over time.

Performance by Transfer and Language Status: 2015-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Transfer Status** | **Tier I** | | | **Tier II** | | | **Total Students** |
| **Complete** | **Distinction** | **In Progress** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Incomplete** |
| Non-Transfer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1 | 65.7% | 8.1% | 26.2% | 33.8% | 2.4% | 4.4% | 1831 |
| L2 | 53.3% | 4.3% | 42.5% | 34.2% | 1.6% | 14.4% | 445 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1 | 65.4% | 9.6% | 25.0% | 34.9% | 4.2% | 4.6% | 4783 |
| L2 | 55.5% | 5.6% | 38.7% | 38.6% | 2.8% | 22.2% | 1389 |

Performance by Transfer and Language Status: 2013-2015

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Transfer Status** | **Tier I** | | | **Tier II** | | | **Total Students** |
| **Complete** | **Distinction** | **In Progress** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Incomplete** |
| Non-Transfer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1 | 67.0% | 8.7% | 24.3% | 80.7% | 5.4% | 13.9% | 1821 |
| L2 | 47.7% | 6.6% | 45.7% | 69.4% | 3.4% | 27.2% | 440 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1 | 63.7% | 11.2% | 25.1% | 86.9% | 5.3% | 7.8% | 4601 |
| L2 | 45.1% | 7.5% | 47.3% | 73.0% | 3.0% | 24.0% | 1186 |

Performance by Transfer and Language Status 2011-2013

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Transfer Status** | **Tier I** | | | **Tier II** | | | **Total Students** |
| **Acceptable** | **Distinction** | **Needs Work** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Needs Work** |
| Non-Transfer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1 | 67.9% | 8.2% | 23.9% | 88.4% | 4.3% | 7.3% | 2176 |
| L2 | 43.0% | 4.5% | 52.5% | 70.4% | 1.9% | 27.7% | 358 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1 | 66.7% | 9.2% | 25.8% | 85.2% | 6.9% | 7.8% | 5907 |
| L2 | 42.1% | 3.9% | 53.9% | 69.5% | 3.2% | 27.3% | 1204 |

Performance by Transfer and Language Status: 2009-2011

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Transfer Status** | **Tier I** | | | **Tier II** | | | **Total Students** |
| **Acceptable** | **Distinction** | **Needs Work** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Needs Work** |
| Non-Transfer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1 | 71.0% | 7.7% | 21.3% | 87.2% | 6.5% | 6.3% | 2586 |
| L2 | 55.9% | 5.3% | 38.8% | 74.7% | 5.7% | 19.6% | 281 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1 | 68.3% | 9.5% | 22.2% | 85.2% | 8.7% | 6.1% | 6059 |
| L2 | 46.6% | 4.4% | 49.0% | 69.2% | 4.7% | 25.4% | 1145 |

Performance by Transfer and Language Status: 2007-2009

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Transfer Status** | **Tier I** | | | **Tier II** | | | **Total Students** |
| **Acceptable** | **Distinction** | **Needs Work** | **Complete** | **Complete w/ Distinction** | **Needs Work** |
| Non-Transfer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1 | 68.2% | 8.5% | 23.2% | 87.5% | 5.7% | 6.8% | 2564 |
| L2 | 41.2% | 4.0% | 54.7% | 67.7% | 3.9% | 28.3% | 723 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1 | 65.7% | 9.4% | 24.8% | 84.0% | 8.0% | 7.9% | 5471 |
| L2 | 55.1% | 3.8% | 41.0% | 75.1% | 2.2% | 22.7% | 185 |

### IV.A.3.c Performance of WSU Urban Campuses and WSU Extension (2007-2017)

The following tables provide assessment data for WSU’s urban campuses. Each campus has a distinctly different student population with differing needs and differing uses of writing. As a result, assessment data can be misleading and should not be used without considering the particular context for writing on each campus.

Performance of Urban Campus and WSU Extension Students, 2015-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Campus** | **Tier I** | | | **Tier II** | | | **Total Students** |
| **Complete** | **Distinction** | **In Progress** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Incomplete** |
| All Campus | 62.1% | 8.3% | 29.5% | 35.6% | 3.6% | 6.7% | 11,298 |
| Pullman | 61.9% | 7.9% | 30.2% | 34.7% | 3.2% | 7.3% | 7534 |
| DDP | 62.4% | 9.7% | 27.6% | 34.6% | 5.2% | 6.1% | 939 |
| Spokane | 61.8% | 9.7% | 28.1% | 37.8% | 4.6% | 3.7% | 217 |
| Tri-Cities | 63.4% | 7.8% | 28.6% | 36.8% | 2.2% | 6.4% | 549 |
| Vancouver | 64.0% | 9.5% | 26.5% | 38.3% | 5.0% | 4.5% | 1807 |
| ICN-Yakima | 62.5% | 25.0% | 12.5% | 25.0% | 12.5% | No data available | 8 |
| Everett Community College | 55.0% | 10.7% | 34.2% | 44.3% | 0.7% | 7.4% | 149 |
| Cesar Ritz Switzerland | 51.6% | 2.2% | 46.2% | 32.3% | 1.1% | 14.0% | 93 |
| Olympic College BremertonOlympic College Bremerton | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2 |

Performance of Urban Campus Students, 2007-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Campus** | **Tier I** | | | **Tier II** | | | **Total Students** |
| **Acceptable** | **Distinction** | **Needs Work** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Needs Work** |
| All Campus | 60.4% | 8.6% | 31.0% | 42.8% | 4.0% | 9.7% | 53,144 |
| Pullman | 64.3% | 8.6% | 27.0% | 41.7% | 4.4% | 10.0% | 36558 |
| DDP | 63.5% | 10.4% | 26.0% | 41.9% | 6.3% | 6.3% | 4038 |
| Spokane | 61.5% | 7.5% | 31.0% | 44.4% | 5.5% | 7.8% | 877 |
| Tri-Cities | 63.6% | 8.5% | 27.8% | 47.8% | 4.5% | 7.8% | 2954 |
| Vancouver | 64.3% | 9.7% | 25.9% | 46.0% | 6.2% | 6.9% | 8051 |
| ICN-Yakima | 63.1% | 6.0% | 30.8% | 45.3% | 2.4% | 7.3% | 247 |
| Everett Community College | 53.4% | 9.9% | 36.6% | 44.0% | 1.6% | 9.9% | 191 |
| Cesar Ritz Switzerland | 49.6% | 7.9% | 42.5% | 31.6% | 0.9% | 21.9% | 228 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Urban Campus Paper Submissions, 2007-2017   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Campus** | **2007-2015** | | | **2015-2017** | | | | **Acceptable** | **Outstanding** | **Okay** | **Acceptable** | **Outstanding** | **Okay** | | All Campus | 46.8% | 41.4% | 11.8% | 50.4% | 44.3% | 5.4% | | DDP | 46.8% | 41.4% | 11.8% | 53.1% | 44.0% | 2.9% | | Spokane | 48.3% | 44.2% | 40.3% | 60.6% | 38.8% | 0.7% | | Tri-Cities | 44.7% | 44.8% | 10.5% | 54.8% | 44.3% | 0.1% | | Vancouver | 42.8% | 50.0% | 7.1% | 46.4% | 50.4% | 3.1% | | ICN-Yakima | 47.5% | 34.9% | 17.6% | 83.3% | 16.7% | 0.0% | | Everett Community College | 49.2% | 47.1% | 3.6% | 50.8% | 48.3% | 0.9% | | Cesar Ritz Switzerland | 64.6% | 34.7% | 0.7% | 86.1% | 13.5% | 0.4% | | Pullman | 48.6% | 38.9% | 12.5% | 54.5% | 39.7% | 5.8% | |

### IV.A.3.d Performance According to Gender

The following tables examine performance on the Writing Portfolio according to gender in both the previous biennium and the previous four biennia. To provide a more accurate account of the performance of female and male students, both tables provide statistics for the full WSU population in their respective time period. All percentages are referenced by gender categories.

Writing Portfolio Results: 2015-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sex** | **Tier I** | | |  | **Tier II** | | | **Total Students** |
| **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Incomplete** | **Unreported** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Incomplete** |
| Female | 64.4%  (3866) | 9.0%  (541) | 26.45%  (1588) | 0.1%  (8) | 88.7%  (5324) | 5.9%  (355) | 5.4%  (324) | 6003 |
| Male | 59.59%  (3091) | 7.5%  (389) | 32.9%  (1705) | 0.04%  (2) | 87.3%  (4528) | 4.74%  (246) | 7.96%  (413) | 5187 |
| Unreported | 58.3%  (63) | 10.2%  (11) | 31.5%  (34) | 0%  (0) | 83.3%  (90) | 8.3%  (9) | 8.3%  (9) | 108 |
| Total | 7020 | 941 | 3327 | 10 | 9942 | 610 | 746 | 11298 |

Writing Portfolio Results: 2013-2015

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sex** | **Tier I** | | |  | **Tier II** | | | **Total Students** |
| **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Incomplete** | **Unreported** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Incomplete** |
| Female | 63.9%  (3083) | 10.5%  (506) | 25.6%  (1234) | 0.04%  (2) | 84.1%  (4059) | 7.5%  (361) | 8.4%  (405) | 4825 |
| Male | 58.3%  (2536) | 9.0%  (392) | 32.7%  (1423) | 0.02%  (1) | 82.5%  (3590) | 5.2%  (225) | 12.3%  (537) | 4352 |
| Unreported | 63.7%  (969) | 10.4%  (159) | 25.9%  (394) | 0.0%  (0) | 85.9%  (1308) | 6.04%  (92) | 8.1%  (123) | 1523 |
| Total | 6588 | 1057 | 3051 | 3 | 8957 | 678 | 1065 | 10702 |

Writing Portfolio Results: 2007-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sex** | **Tier I** | | |  | **Tier II** | | | **Total Students** |
| **Acceptable** | **Distinction** | **Needs Work** | **Unreported** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Needs Work** |
| Female | 65.5%  (17416) | 9.16%  (2436) | 25.3%  (6740) | 0.04%  (10) | 85.0%  (22615) | 7.5%  (1984) | 7.5%  (2003) | 26602 |
| Male | 62.6%  (15096) | 8.5%  (2052) | 28.9%  (6959) | 0.02%  (3) | 83.8%  (20223) | 5.3%  (1266) | 10.9%  (2621) | 24110 |
| Unreported | 63.4%  (1571) | 10.1%  (250) | 26.5%  (658) | 0.0%  (0) | 83.7%  (2076) | 6.5%  (163) | 9.7%  (240) | 2479 |
| Total | 34083 | 4738 | 14357 | 13 | 44914 | 3413 | 4864 | 53191 |

In the current biennium, female and male students in Tier I and Tier II performed slightly below the five-biennia average as well as the previous 2013-2015 biennium reporting period in the percentage of “Distinction” and “Complete with Distinction” ratings overall. This 2015-2017 biennium also had more students than in the past; these students seem to have been distributed across categories Tier I ratings similar to the previous 2013-2015 biennium and previous five biennial averages. Student numbers in Tier II rating categories in this 2015-2017 biennium, however, appear to have been rated as “Complete” more than in previous years, corresponding with declines in the percentage of students rated as “Complete with Distinction,” “In Progress/Needs Work.”

While the Tier I ratings appear to follow a consistent trend for the past decade, there are changes taking place in the Tier II results that merit further investigation. Additionally, this report does not examine the effect of gender when overlapping with race identification, first-generation status, nor major traits.

### IV.A.3.e Performance According to Race or Ethnicity Description

Since the 2007-2009 Biennial Report, the Writing Program Biennial Report has investigated correlations between portfolio performance and race or ethnicity student self-identification. The findings contained herein continue this practice, using demographic data supplied by OBIEE. In terms of self-identfication, new options and categories have been frequently added since 2012, including the possibility of students identifying with more than two races or ethnicities. Some of these categories are not entirely clear regarding their designations. For instance, “Hispanic” is a category, but so is “White” and “European.” In cases where students identify with multiple races or ethnicities, the available options might send conflicting messages: that race can either be attached to a cultural identity (“Latina/Latino”), to physiognomy (“White”), or to region (“European”). Changes in self-reporting options since 2012 and their related complexities disallow accurate comparisons to earlier data.

Tier I and II Results, 2015-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | Complete | | | | | |
| **Tier II** |  | Simple Complete | Complete | Changed to Complete with Distinction | Changed to In Progress | Total Students |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 60.53%  (46) | 52.63%  (40) | 5.26%  (4) | 2.63%  (2) | 0%  (0) | 76 |
| Asian | 55%  (407) | 46.49%  (344) | 6.62%  (49) | 1.76%  (13) | 0.14%  (1) | 739 |
| Black/African American | 58.09%  (201) | 52.31%  (181) | 4.91%  (17) | 0.87%  (3) | 0%  (0) | 346 |
| Hispanic/Latino/Latina | 61.54%  (797) | 54.90%  (711) | 5.64%  (73) | 0.77%  (10) | 0.23%  (3) | 1295 |
| International | 38.32%  (279) | 34.48%  (251) | 2.47%  (18) | 0.82%  (6) | 0.55%  (4) | 728 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 46.43%  (13) | 35.71%  (10) | 10.71%  (3) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 28 |
| Not Reported | 45.70%  (393) | 38.84%  (334) | 4.88%  (42) | 1.51%  (13) | 0.47%  (4) | 860 |
| Two or More Races | 59.67%  (540) | 46.19%  (418) | 10.83%  (98) | 2.32%  (21) | 0.33%  (3) | 905 |
| White | 65.51%  (4629) | 54.64%  (3861) | 8.65%  (611) | 2.11%  (149) | 0.11%  (8) | 7063 |
| **University Avg.** | 62.09%  (7027) | 52.13%  (5899) | 7.93%  (898) | 1.86%  (211) | 0.17%  (19) | **11313** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | Complete with Distinction | | | | | |
| **Tier II** |  | Simple Complete with Distinction | Changed to Complete | Complete with Distinction | Changed to In Progress | Total Students |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 5.26%  (4) | 0%  (0) | 2.63%  (2) | 2.63%  (2) | 0%  (0) | 76 |
| Asian | 5.95%  (44) | 0.95%  (7) | 4.05%  (30) | 0.95%  (7) | 0%  (0) | 740 |
| Black/African American | 6.07%  (21) | 1.16%  (4) | 4.34%  (15) | 0.58%  (2) | 0%  (0) | 346 |
| Hispanic/Latino/Latina | 6.95%  (90) | 1.39%  (18) | 4.56%  (59) | 0.85%  (11) | 0.15%  (2) | 1295 |
| International | 3.57%  (26) | 0.82%  (6) | 2.47%  (18) | 0.27%  (2) | 0%  (0) | 728 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 3.57%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 3.57%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 28 |
| Not Reported | 4.19%  (36) | 1.16%  (10) | 2.44%  (21) | 0.58%  (5) | 0%  (0) | 860 |
| Two or More Races | 10.28%  (93) | 2.21%  (20) | 5.97%  (54) | 2.1%  (19) | 0%  (0) | 905 |
| White | 9.23%  (652) | 2.18%  (154) | 5.53%  (391) | 1.43%  (101) | 0.08%  (6) | 7066 |
| **University Avg.** | 8.31%  (941) | 1.88%  (213) | 5.06%  (573) | 1.30%  (147) | 0.07%  (8) | **11317** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | In Progress | | | | |
| **Tier II** |  | Complete | Complete with Distinction | In Progress | Total Students |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 34.21%  (26) | 26.32%  (20) | 0%  (0) | 7.89%  (6) | 76 |
| Asian | 38.92%  (288) | 28.92%  (214) | 0.14%  (1) | 9.86%  (73) | 740 |
| Black/African American | 35.84%  (124) | 23.12%  (80) | 0%  (0) | 12.72%  (44) | 346 |
| Hispanic/Latino/Latina | 31.51%  (408) | 24.25%  (314) | 0.39%  (5) | 6.87%  (89) | 1295 |
| International | 58.10%  (423) | 32.42%  (236) | 0.27%  (2) | 25.41%  (185) | 728 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 50%  (14) | 28.57%  (8) | 0%  (0) | 21.43%  (6) | 28 |
| Not Reported | 50.12%  (431) | 29.65%  (255) | 0.47%  (4) | 20%  (172) | 860 |
| Two or More Races | 30.06%  (272) | 24.09%  (218) | 0.66%  (6) | 5.3%  (48) | 905 |
| White | 25.22%  (1782) | 20.63%  (1458) | 0.44%  (31) | 4.15%  (293) | 7066 |
| **University Avg.** | 29.56%  (3345) | 22.68%  (2567) | 0.42%  (47) | 6.46%  (731) | **11317** |

**Tier I and II Results, 2013-2015**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | Acceptable | | | | | Distinction | | | Needs Work | | |  |
| **Tier II** |  | Simple Pass | Complete | Distinction | Incomplete |  | Revert to Complete | Distinction |  | Revert to Complete | Incomplete | Total Students |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 64.15%  (34) | 47.17%  (25) | 13.21%  (7) | 3.77%  (2) | 0%  (0) | 5.66%  (3) | 1.89%  (1) | 3.77%  (2) | 30.19%  (16) | 13.21%  (7) | 15.09%  (8) | 53 |
| Asian | 52.63%  (290) | 44.1%  (243) | 6.35%  (35) | 2%  (11) | 0.18%  (1) | 6.9%  (38) | 3.99%  (22) | 2.9%  (16) | 40.47%  (223) | 26.32%  (145) | 14.16%  (78) | 551 |
| Black/African American | 55.18%  (165) | 47.49%  (142) | 6.69%  (20) | 0.33%  (1) | 0.67%  (2) | 2.01%  (6) | 1.34%  (4) | 0.67%  (2) | 42.81%  (128) | 26.42%  (79) | 16.05%  (48) | 299 |
| Hispanic/Latino/  Latina | 59.57%  (638) | 48.74%  (522) | 9.43%  (101) | 1.12%  (12) | 0.28%  (3) | 8.31%  (89) | 4.39%  (47) | 3.64%  (39) | 32.12%  (344) | 19.79%  (212) | 12.04%  (129) | 1071 |
| International | 31.85%  (172) | 28.52%  (154) | 2.41%  (13) | 0.37%  (2) | 0.56%  (3) | 3.52%  (19) | 2.96%  (16) | 0.56%  (3) | 64.63%  (349) | 21.85%  (118) | 42.78%  (231) | 540 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 65.79%  (25) | 47.37%  (18) | 18.42%  (7) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 7.89%  (3) | 5.26%  (2) | 2.63%  (1) | 26.32%  (10) | 21.05%  (8) | 5.26%  (2) | 38 |
| Not Reported | 53.11%  (222) | 47.61%  (176) | 8.61%  (36) | 1.67%  (7) | 0.72%  (3) | 10.77%  (45) | 5.26%  (22) | 5.26%  (22) | 36.12%  (151) | 18.18%  (76) | 17.94%  (75) | 418 |
| Two or More Races | 64.03%  (477) | 51.01%  (380) | 10.87%  (81) | 2.01%  (15) | 0.13%  (1) | 11.14%  (83) | 6.04%  (45) | 5.1%  (38) | 24.7%  (184) | 18.12%  (135) | 6.58%  (49) | 745 |
| White | 65.28%  (4564) | 52.51%  (3671) | 10.71%  (749) | 1.96%  (137) | 0.13%  (9) | 11.07%  (774) | 6.09%  (426) | 4.91%  (343) | 23.6%  (1650) | 17.32%  (1211) | 5.96%  (417) | 6991 |
| **University Avg.** | 61.53%  (6587) | 49.79%  (5331) | 9.8%  (1049) | 1.75%  (187) | 0.21%  (22) | 9.9%  (1060) | 5.46%  (585) | 4.35%  (466) | 28.54%  (3055) | 18.6%  (1991) | 9.69%  (1037) | **10706** |

As the data suggest, more can still be done to ensure all student groups are being equally supported in their academic careers at WSU. During 2015-2017, “White” students are the only ones not performing above the University average in portfolios designated as “In Progress.” In previous biennia, students with “Two or More Races” and “Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders” also joined “White” students in performing below “In Progress” (previously labeled “Needs Work”) University average. Conversely, “White” students are one of two groups performing above the University average in the “Distinction” category (the other group being students with “Two or More Races”). This is consistent with the previous report, but current data suggest the gap in performance between “White/Two or More Races” and the remainder of the groups has increased. As has been the recommendation in previous reports, the distribution of resources and support services should be directed towards vulnerable student groups who are in the most need of such assistance.

While most of the student groups hold steady performance rates when compared with 2013-2015, there remain areas of concern. For one, “Hispanic” students experienced over a 1% decrease in “Distinction” ratings (8.31% during 2013-2015 to 6.95% during 2015-2017). It is true that the University has experienced an increase in enrollment that has had a positive impacted on demographic diversity (in that there were more than 200 new students identifying as “Hispanic” during 2015-2017 than there were during 2013-2015) which warrants the continued need for resources such as Multicultural Student Services, which are proven to support particular student groups in performance and success in the University and beyond.

The differences in population size might contribute to possible performance rate exaggerations in all groups, not just with “Hispanic” students. When making comparisons between the two reports, the total number of students in a particular category should be referenced. For instance, only one “Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander” scored a “Distinction” rating, but this one student accounts for a percentage that is half the University average. Any conclusions drawn from this report should include both the percentage in relation to the University average as well as the number of students self-reporting in that category. Given this caveat, it is worth noting the similarity of performance rates among each group. With a few exceptions, “Distinction” ratings are confirmed at Tier II in roughly half of each group’s Tier I “Distinction” portfolios. The exceptions to this trend occur in the “Asian,” “Hispanic,” and “Two or More Races” categories. In each of these groups, around half of Tier I “Distinction” ratings were reduced to “Complete” during Tier II.

Ultimately, students identifying as “White” or with “Two or More Races” clearly make up the majority of Tier II “Distinction” portfolios. “White,” as a category, is helped by its large number of identifying students; on the other hand, “Two or More Races” almost has an equal number of students as “Hispanic,” and yet it retains a high percentage of Tier II “Distinction” portfolios. While students identifying as “Asian,” “Black/African American,” or “Hispanic,” along with “International” students and those not reporting an ethnic identification, tended to perform below the university average at Tier I, these differences were less pronounced (though still significant) when examining only the final performance of students:

Tier II Performance by Race, 2015-2017

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Race Identification | Complete | Complete  with Distinction | In Progress |
| White (7066) | 89.57% | 6.09% | 4.34% |
| Hispanic/Latino (1295) | 89.34% | 3.4% | 7.26% |
| Grand Total (11317) | **87.91%** | **5.39%** | **6.70%** |
| Two or More Races (905) | 87.18% | 7.18% | 5.64% |
| American Indian/Alaska Native (76) | 86.84% | 5.26% | 7.89% |
| Asian (740) | 86.35% | 3.65% | 10% |
| Black/African American (346) | 84.68% | 2.6% | 12.72% |
| Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (28) | 78.57% | 0% | 21.43% |
| Not Reported (860) | 75.93% | 3.6% | 20.47% |
| International (728) | 71.84% | 2.2% | 25.96% |

Tier II Performance by Race, 2013-2015

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Race Identification | Complete | Complete  with Distinction | Incomplete |
| Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | 92.11% | 2.63% | 5.26% |
| White | 86.64% | 7.18% | 6.18% |
| Two or More Races | 86.17% | 7.11% | 6.71% |
| Grand Total | **83.66%** | **6.35%** | **9.99%** |
| Hispanic/Latino | 82.35% | 5.04% | 12.61% |
| Black/African American | 81.94% | 1.34% | 16.72% |
| Asian | 80.76% | 4.90% | 14.34% |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 75.47% | 9.43% | 15.09% |
| Not Reported | 75.13% | 8.29% | 16.58% |
| International | 55.74% | 0.93% | 43.33% |

The above tables illustrate the stability of performance rates from the previous biennium to the current one. Yet “International” students can still benefit from educational services that assist in developing crucial communication skills. During the past two biennia, a significant number of “International” students have earned an “In Progress” (“Incomplete” in 2013-2015) rating. Clearly, this group has improved dramatically in 2015-2017, where “In Progress” portfolios now only account for 25.96% of all “International” student portfolios as opposed to 43% in 2013-2015. These same students also increased the amount of “Distinction” ratings in 2015-2017. The other group of importance is “Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander.” With only 28 students reporting in this category, performance rates are easily exaggerated; with that in mind, 21.43% of these students are earning an “In Progress” rating. Combined with the other concerns noted above, it is safe to conclude is that students at WSU will continue to benefit from additional support services reserved for vulnerable and underrepresented student populations.

### IV.A.3.f Performance According to First-Generation College Status

Since the 2015-2016 academic year, over 40% of incoming first-year students self-identify as first-generation,[[1]](#footnote-2) a number similar to rates reported below for writing portfolio completion. First-generation students are more likely to be unfamiliar with academic discourse, institutional processes, and are less likely to be certain about the identities they are expected to construct, especially in relation to faculty, administration, and other students. With these challenges in mind, first-generation students are close to becoming the majority student population at WSU.

The table below presents the performance of students self-identifying as “First Generation” during the 2015-2017 biennium. For easier comparison between a specific group’s performance and the university average, Tier I ratings (in the gray column) and the final Tier II ratings (in the white columns) are each reported as a percentage of the total population in each category. A second table is included that reports “First Generation” student performance during the 2013-2015 biennium so that comparisons from one biennium to the next can be made.

Tier I and II Results, 2015-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | *Tier I* | | | | |
|  |  | ***Tier II – Final Portfolio Results*** | | | | | |
|  |  | Simple Complete | Stay/Change to Complete | Simple Complete With Distinction | Stay/Change to Complete with Distinction | Stay/Change to In Progress | Total Students |
| **First Gen** |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4631 |
| Complete | 62.21%  (2881) | 52.39%  (2429) | 7.96%  (369) | NA | 1.70%  (79) | 0.09%  (4) |  |
| Complete with Distinction | 6.92%  (321) | NA | 4.38%  (203) | 1.57%  (73) | 0.91%  (42) | 0.06%  (3) |  |
| In Progress | 30.82%  (1429) | NA | 23.81%  (1104) | NA | 0.39%  (18) | 6.62%  (307) |  |
| **All Students** |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11317 |
| Complete | 62.09%  (7027) | 52.13%  (5899) | 7.93%  (898) | NA | 1.86%  (211) | 0.17%  (19) |  |
| Complete with Distinction | 8.31%  (941) | NA | 5.06%  (573) | 1.88%  (213) | 1.3%  (147) | 0.07%  (8) |  |
| In Progress | 29.56%  (3345) | NA | 22.68%  (2567) | NA | 0.42%  (47) | 6.46%  (731) |  |

Tier I and II Results, 2013-2015

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | **Acceptable** | | | | | | **Distinction** | | | | **Needs Work** | | | |  | |
| Tier II |  | Simple Pass | Acceptable | Distinction | Needs Work |  | | Revert to Pass | Distinction |  | | Revert to Pass | Needs Work | Total Students | |
| First Generation | 61.36%  (2536) | 49.82%  (2059) | 9.63%  (398) | 1.62%  (67) | 0.29%  (12) | 8.81%  (364) | | 5.01%  (207) | 3.7%  (153) | 29.76%  (1230) | | 19.26%  (796) | 10.23%  (423) | 4133 | |
| **All Students** | **61.53%**  **(6587)** | **49.79%**  **(5331)** | **9.8%**  **(1049)** | **0.63%**  **(184)** | **0.21%**  **(23)** | **9.9%**  **(1060)** | | **5.46%**  **(585)** | **4.35%**  **(466)** | **28.54%**  **(3055)** | | **18.6%**  **(1991)** | **9.69%**  **(1037)** | **10706** | |

The data indicate little change since the 2013-2015 biennium for both First Generation and All Students, despite the percentage of First Generation students nearly doubling during that period. During the last several biennia, First Generation students have performed at rates similar to the general population. The trend remains.

## IV.A.4 Performance by Academic Area

The following analysis of academic areas—colleges and majors—is based on data from 2007-2017. Students are asked to report their current choice of major at the time of Writing Portfolio submission. As noted in other areas, self-reporting can result in data that are difficult to categorize, leading to discrepancies in reported populations. For instance, students reporting a major in “Agriculture” are within the College of Agricultural, Human, and Natural Resource Sciences, but cannot be classified further within a particular major.

The Portfolio reflects the diverse uses of writing that takes place under each academic area. Accordingly, looking at results by major may offer insight into the different disciplines and the opportunities to write within a department. Nevertheless, comparisons across departments or colleges should be made with caution, as each department’s advising structure is unique.

### IV.A.4.a Summary of Overall Performance by College

The table below shows the performance within individual colleges from AY 2007-2008 to AY 2016-2017, and the percentage change from the previous 2013-2015 biennium report range (AY 2007-2008 to AY 2014-2015) that the 2015-2017 biennium represents (2007-2017 minus 2007-2015 divided by the 2007-2015 totals). Each cell reports the number of students within that category, the percentage of students within that category between 2007 and 2017, and the percentage change the current biennium represents. Some majors moved to new colleges as a result of the 2012 reorganization and the founding of the Elson S. Floyd College of Medicine.

Overall Writing Portfolio Performance by College 2007-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **College** | **Language Status** | **Complete** | **Complete with Distinction** | **Incomplete** | **Total**  **N** |
| Carson College of Business | 1 | 5129  (89.0%, +25.9%) | 270  (4.7%, +13.4%) | 363  (6.3%, +20.2%) | 5762 |
| 2 | 1344  (68.1%, +40.1%) | 51  (2.6%, +18.6%) | 578  (29.3%, +20.4%) | 1973 |
| Unreported | 951  (84.9%, +79.1%) | 43  (3.8%, +87%) | 125  (11.2%, +92.3%) | 1119 |
| Total | 1866  (83.8%, +33.6%) | 60  (4.1%, +19.7%) | 219  (12.0%, +25.9%) | 8854 |
| College of Agricultural, Human and Natural Resource Sciences (CAHNRS) | 1 | 2649  (88.3%, +35.8%) | 138  (4.6%, +36.6%) | 213  (7.1%, +17%) | 3000 |
| 2 | 377  (75%, +46.7%) | 15  (3%, +50%) | 111  (22.1%, +23.3%) | 503 |
| Unreported | 461  (87.5%,+107%) | 31  (5.9%,+93.8%) | 35  (6.6%, +59.1%) | 527 |
| Total | 3487  (86.5%, +43.5%) | 184  (4.6%, +44.9%) | 259  (6.4%, +22.1%) | 4030 |
| College of Arts and Sciences | 1 | 8291  (84.4%, +32.6%) | 954  (9.7%, +22.9%) | 581  (5.9%, +23.6%) | 9826 |
| 2 | 1265  (78.1%, +62.8%) | 99  (6%, +32%) | 255  (15.8%, 26.9%) | 1619 |
| Unreported | 1437  (84.7%, +90.1%) | 146  (86.1%, +67.8%) | 113  (6.7%, +59.2%) | 1696 |
| Total | 10993  (83.7%, +41.2%) | 1199  (9.1%, +27.8%) | 949  (7.2%, +27.9%) | 13141 |
| College of Education | 1 | 1893  (89.0%, +34.7%) | 131  (6%,+15.9%) | 104  (4.9%, +25.3%) | 2128 |
| 2 | 184  (82.9%, +73.6%) | 5  (2.3%, +66.7%) | 33  (14.9%, +32%) | 222 |
| Unreported | 251  (86.6%, +134.6%) | 19  (6.6%, +26.7%) | 57  (19.6%, +81.8%) | 290 |
| Total | 2328  (88.2%, +43.9%) | 155  (5.9%, +18.3%) | 194  (7.3%, +31.9%) | 2640 |
| Elson S. Floyd College of Medicine | 1 | 208  (88.9%, +26.8%) | 11  (4.7%, +37.5%) | 15  (6.4%, +25%) | 234 |
| 2 | 35  (85.4%, +25%) | 1  (2.4%, +100%) | 5  (12.2%, +25%) | 41 |
| Unreported | 43  (89.6%, +79.2%) | 3  (6.3%, +50%) | 2  (4.2%, +100%) | 48 |
| Total | 286  (88.5%, +32.4%) | 15  (4.6%, +50%) | 22  (6.8%, +29.4%) | 323 |
| College of Nursing | 1 | 1343  (87.8%, +26.6%) | 143  (9.3%, +30%) | 43  (2.8%, +11.9%) | 1529 |
| 2 | 319  (84.8%, +47%) | 18  (4.7%, +100%) | 39  (10.4%, +2.6%) | 376 |
| Unreported | 237  (86.2%, +75.6%) | 26  (9.5%, +44.4%) | 12  (4.4%, +100%) | 51 |
| Total | 1899  (87.1%, +34.4%) | 187  (8.6%, +36.5%) | 94  (4.3%, +11.9%) | 2180 |
| College of Pharmacy | 1 | 144  (86.2%. +2.9%) | 21  (12.6%, +5.6%) | 4  (2.4%, +0%) | 167 |
| 2 | 40  (81.6%, +2.6%) | 3  (6.1%, +0%) | 6  (12.2%, +0%) | 49 |
| Unreported | 8  (100%, +33.3%) | 0  (0%, +0%) | 0  (0%, +0%) | 8 |
| Total | 192  (85.7%. +3.8%) | 24  (10.7%, +4.8%) | 10  (4.5%, +0%) | 224 |
| College of Veterinary Medicine | 1 | 461  (79.1%, +33.2%) | 106  (18.2%, +24.7%) | 16  (2.7%, +60%) | 583 |
| 2 | 109  (83.8%, +62.7%) | 11  (8.5%, +37.5%) | 10  (7.7%, +25%) | 130 |
| Unreported | 89  (76.5%, +102.3%) | 19  (17%, +217%) | 4  (3.6%, +300%) | 112 |
| Total | 659  (79.9%, +44.2%) | 136  (16.5%, +37.4%) | 30  (3.6%, +57.9%) | 825 |
| Edward R. Murrow College of Communication | 1 | 362  (88.7%, +39.7%) | 18  (4.4%,+20 %) | 28  (6.9%, +27.7%) | 408 |
| 2 | 44  (88%, +76%) | 1  (2%, +0%) | 5  (1%, +25%) | 50 |
| Unreported | 138  (87.3%, +263%) | 5  (3.2%, +66.7%) | 15  (9.5%, +200%) | 158 |
| Total | 544  (88.3%, +69.9%) | 24  (3.9%, +26.3%) | 48  (7.8%, +37.1%) | 616 |
| Voiland College of Engineering and Architecture | 1 | 3735  (87.5%, +36.1%) | 245  (5.7%, +28.9%) | 290  (6.8%, +19.3%) | 4270 |
| 2 | 815  (74.5%, +70.1%) | 30  (2.7%, +50%) | 249  (22.8%, +25.8%) | 1094 |
| Unreported | 721  (85.3%, +90.7%) | 42  (5%, +75%) | 82  (9.7%, +70.1%) | 845 |
| Total | 5271  (84.9%, +46.4%) | 317  (5.1%, +35.5%) | 621  (10%, +27%) | 6209 |
| University College | 1 | 857  (44.8%, +3%) | 46  (2.4%, +4.5%) | 1017  (53%, +0.1%) | 1920 |
| 2 | 187  (30.7%, +2.7%) | 9  (1.5%, +0%) | 413  (67.8%, +0.2%) | 609 |
| Unreported | 242  (3.6%, +4.8%) | 9  (.1%, +0%) | 6501  (96.3%, +0.01%) | 6752 |
| Total | 1286  (13.9%, +3.3%) | 64  (.7%, +3.2%) | 7931  (85.5%, +0.05%) | 9281 |
| Unknown | 1 | 8691  (85.5%, +0.8%) | 629  (0.6%, +0.8%) | 843  (8.3%, +0.4%) | 10163 |
| 2 | 908  (70.7%, +0.6%) | 46  (3.6%, +2.2%) | 331  (25.8%, +0%) | 1285 |
| Unreported | 946  (83.2%, +1.4%) | 71  (6.2%, +0%) | 120  (10.6%, +3.4%) | 1137 |
| Total | 10545  (83.8%,+0.8 %) | 746  (5.9%, +0.8%) | 1294  (10.3%, +0.6%) | 12585 |
| All University | 1 | 33763  (84.4%, +22.4%) | 2710  (6.8%, +17.5%) | 3517  (8.8%, +9.9%) | 39990 |
| 2 | 5627  (70.8%, +40.4%) | 289  (3.6%, +28.4%) | 2035  (25.6%, +13.5%) | 7951 |
| Unreported | 5524  (42.6%, +64%) | 414  (3.2%, +52.8%) | 7029  (54.2%, +2.7%) | 12967 |
| Total | 44914  (73.7%, +28.4%) | 3413  (5.6%, +21.8%) | 12581  (20.7%, +6.3%) | 60908 |

Overall Portfolio Performance by Major, 2015-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Tier II Rating | Complete | Complete with Distinction | Incomplete | Total |
|  | All University | 88.0% (9942) | 5.4% (610) | 6.6% (746) | 11298 |

The tables below show the Tier II performance rates for all university programs. The table above is provided as a quick reference to the performance rates of all students.

Overall Portfolio Performance: Carson College of Business, 2015-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Complete | Complete with Distinction | Incomplete | Total |
| Carson College of Business | | **87.0% (1866)** | **2.8%**  **(60)** | **10.2%**  **(219)** | **2145** |
|  | Accounting | 86.1%  (352) | 4.4%  (18) | 9.5%  (39) | 409 |
|  | Accounting and Management Information Systems | 100%  (5) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 5 |
|  | Business Administration | 87.3%  (262) | 4%  (12) | 8.7%  (26) | 300 |
|  | Business Administration and Management Information Systems | 100%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 1 |
|  | Entrepreneurship | 100%  (28) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 28 |
|  | Finance | 87.5%  (302) | 1.5%  (5) | 11.01%  (38) | 345 |
|  | Hospitality Business Management | 80.2%  (255) | 1.6%  (5) | 18.2%  (58) | 318 |
|  | International Business | 84.3%  (75) | 0%  (0) | 1.7%  (14) | 89 |
|  | Management and Operations | 89.3%  (167) | 3.2%  (6) | 7.5%  (14) | 187 |
|  | Management Information Systems | 92.9%  (195) | 2.9%  (6) | 4.3%  (9) | 210 |
|  | Marketing | 88.5%  (223) | 3.2%  (8) | 8.3%  (21) | 252 |
|  | Wine Business Management | 100%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 1 |

On average, students in the College of Business perform less well than their peers when compared to the university-wide data. The largest program in the college, Accounting, does perform slightly better in general for “Complete with Distinction” ratings than other majors within the college though still below the university average. As reported in Section IV.A.1.e, Carson College of Business students are within the recommended range of the 60-72 credit hours to complete the writing portfolio process. All majors reported during this 2015-2017 biennium complete the portfolio on average after the 60-72 credit hour window (M= 80.4 credit hours, SD= 16.9), which does remain comparable with the university average (M= 81.4, SD= 22.7).

Overall Portfolio Performance: College of Agricultural, Human and Natural Resource Sciences, 2015-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Complete | Complete with Distinction | Incomplete | Total |
| College of Agricultural, Human and Natural Resource Sciences (CAHNRS) | | **89.7%**  **(1057)** | **4.8%**  **(57)** | **5.5%**  **(65)** | **1179** |
|  | Agricultural and Food Business Economics | 88.9%  (24) | 3.7%  (1) | 7.4%  (2) | 27 |
|  | Agricultural and Food Systems | 100%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 1 |
|  | Agricultural Biotechnology | 90%  (54) | 5%  (3) | 5%  (3) | 60 |
|  | Agricultural Technology and Production Management | 100%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 1 |
|  | Agriculture and Business Economics | 100%  (9) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 9 |
|  | Agriculture Education | 93.8%  (15) | 0%  (0) | 6.3%  (1) | 16 |
|  | Animal Sciences | 90.9%  (139) | 5.2%  (8) | 3.9%  (6) | 153 |
|  | Apparel, Merchandising, Design and Textiles | 88.9%  (111) | 3.2%  (4) | 8.0%  (10) | 125 |
|  | Crop Science | 90.0%  (54) | 3.3%  (2) | 6.7%  (4) | 60 |
|  | Ecology | 0%  (0) | 100%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 1 |
|  | Economic Sciences | 87.5%  (77) | 3.4%  (3) | 9.1%  (8) | 88 |
|  | Entomology | 100%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 1 |
|  | Environmental Sciences | 89.6%  (95) | 6.6%  (7) | 3.8%  (4) | 106 |
|  | Food Science | 94.1%  (16) | 5.9%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 17 |
|  | Food Science and Human Nutrition | 50.0%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 50.0%  (1) | 2 |
|  | Horticulture | 88.9%  (16) | 11.1%  (2) | 0%  (0) | 18 |
|  | Human Development | 90.8%  (295) | 3.7%  (12) | 5.5%  (18) | 325 |
|  | Interior Design | 89.1%  (57) | 6.3%  (4) | 4.7%  (3) | 64 |
|  | Landscape Architecture | 66.7%  (4) | 16.7%  (1) | 16.7%  (1) | 6 |
|  | Natural Resource Sciences | 85.7%  (6) | 0%  (0) | 14.29%  (1) | 7 |
|  | Organic Agricultural Systems | 100%  (6) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 6 |
|  | Viticulture and Enology | 93.3%  (14) | 6.7%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 15 |
|  | Wildlife Ecology | 85.9%  (61) | 9.9%  (7) | 4.2%  (3) | 71 |

Students in the College of Agricultural, Human and Natural Resource Sciences (CAHNRS) performed at similar rates to their university-wide peers across each of the three categories. Individual majors likewise performed at rates similar to the university average (M= 81.4, SD= 22.7). Although some majors appear to have performed at rates different from the average, the small numbers exaggerate the effects of small groups of students. However, it is worth noting that as reported in section IV.A.1.e, most students are completing their portfolio process beyond the recommended 60-72 credit hour range.

Overall Portfolio Performance: College of Arts and Sciences, 2015-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Complete | Complete with Distinction | Incomplete | Total |
| College of Arts and Sciences | | **87.3%**  **(3208)** | **7.1%**  **(261)** | **5.6%**  **(207)** | **3676** |
|  | American Studies | 100%  (17) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 17 |
|  | Anthropology | 84.8%  (50) | 11.9%  (7) | 3.4%  (2) | 59 |
|  | Art History | 100%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 1 |
|  | Basic Medical Sciences | 90.9%  (50) | 1.8%  (1) | 7.3%  (4) | 55 |
|  | Biology | 88.9%  (386) | 6.7%  (29) | 4.4%  (19) | 434 |
|  | Botany | 100%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 1 |
|  | Chemistry | 83.9%  (26) | 6.5%  (2) | 9.7%  (3) | 31 |
|  | Chinese | 100%  (2) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 2 |
|  | Contemporary Ethnic Studies | 84.6%  (33) | 7.7%  (3) | 7.7%  (3) | 39 |
|  | Creative Writing (English Option) | 100%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 1 |
|  | Criminal Justice | 85.7%  (324) | 6.9%  (26) | 7.4%  (28) | 378 |
|  | Digital Technology and Culture | 89.2%  (173) | 5.2%  (10) | 5.7%  (11) | 194 |
|  | English | 81.9%  (118) | 14.6%  (21) | 3.5%  (5) | 144 |
|  | Fine Arts | 87.1%  (27) | 0%  (0) | 12.9%  (4) | 31 |
|  | French | 100%  (4) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 4 |
|  | General Studies | 81.9%  (113) | 2.9%  (4) | 15.2%  (21) | 138 |
|  | Geology | 93.3  (14) | 0%  (0) | 6.7%  (1) | 15 |
|  | German | 100%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 1 |
|  | History | 83.2%  (104) | 12.8%  (16) | 4.0%  (5) | 125 |
|  | Humanities | 79.4%  (104) | 9.2%  (12) | 11.5%  (15) | 131 |
|  | Linguistics (Humanities Option) | 100%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 1 |
|  | Mathematics | 90.5%  (67) | 6.8%  (5) | 2.7%  (2) | 74 |
|  | Music | 83.8%  (31) | 10.8%  (4) | 5.4%  (2) | 37 |
|  | Music Performance | 100%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 1 |
|  | Personnel Psychology/Human Resources | 94.03%  (63) | 3.0%  (2) | 3.0%  (2) | 67 |
|  | Philosophy | 73.3%  (11) | 20.0%  (3) | 6.7%  (1) | 15 |
|  | Physics | 86.2%  (25) | 6.9%  (2) | 6.9%  (2) | 29 |
|  | Political Science | 82.6%  (109) | 11.4%  (15) | 6.1%  (8) | 132 |
|  | Pre-Medicine | 100%  (3) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 3 |
|  | Psychology | 88.9%  (703) | 6.7%  (53) | 4.4%  (35) | 791 |
|  | Psychology and Sociology | 100%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 0%  (0) | 1 |
|  | Public Affairs | 83.9%  (47) | 10.7%  (6) | 5.4%  (3) | 56 |
|  | Social Sciences | 88.8%  (324) | 6.6%  (24) | 4.7%  (17) | 365 |
|  | Social Studies | 85.7%  (6) | 0%  (0) | 14.3%  (1) | 7 |
|  | Sociology | 88.1%  (104) | 4.2%  (5) | 7.6%  (9) | 118 |
|  | Spanish | 90.5%  (19) | 9.5%  (2) | 0%  (0) | 21 |
|  | Women's Studies | 87.5%  (7) | 12.5%  (1) | 0%  (0) | 8 |
|  | Zoology | 92.0%  (137) | 5.4%  (8) | 2.7%  (4) | 149 |

Students in the College of Arts and Sciences performed in keeping with peers in the “Completed” category, higher than average in the “Completed with Distinction” category, and lower than average in the “Incomplete” category. The programs significantly above average ratings (evaluated by a combination of number of students in the major and percentage of students receiving the rating) at the “Completed with Distinction” level include the following: Anthropology, Biology, Chemistry, Contemporary Ethnic Studies, Criminal Justice, English, History, Humanities, Mathematics, Music, Philosophy, Physics, Political Science, Psychology, Public Affairs, Social Sciences, Spanish, Women’s Studies, and Zoology. Some programs saw a significantly higher than average percentage of students receiving “Incomplete” ratings with lower than average percentage of students receiving “Completed and Distinction” ratings: Basic Medical Sciences, Fine Arts, General Studies, Geology, Social Studies, and Sociology. Finally, there were some programs whose “Incomplete” ratings were higher than the university average but did not differ substantially in other rating categories: Chemistry, Contemporary Ethnic Studies, Criminal Justice, Humanities, Philosophy, and Physics.

As reported in section IV.A.1.e, overall the College of Arts and Sciences is later on average to completing the writing portfolio than the recommended 60-72 credit hours (M= 80.7, SD= 21.1). This is not substantially different than the university average (M= 81.4, SD= 22.7). On average, students in most programs within the college, are submitting the writing portfolio beyond the desired range.

**Overall Portfolio Performance: College of Education, 2015-2017**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Complete | Complete with Distinction | Incomplete | Total |
| College of Education | | 92.0%  (710) | 3.1%  (24) | 4.9%  (38) | 772 |
|  | Athletic Training (ATH TR BS) | 90.5%  (38) | 2.4%  (1) | 7.1%  (3) | 42 |
|  | Education (Elementary and Secondary) | 90.1% (277) | 5.2%  (16) | 3.9%  (12) | 305 |
|  | Health and Fitness | 66.7%  (2) | 0.0%  (0) | 33.3%  (1) | 3 |
|  | Kinesiology | 95.0%  (189) | 1.5%  (3) | 3.5%  (7) | 199 |
|  | Movement Studies | 100.0%  (4) | 0.0%  (0) | 0.0%  (0) | 4 |
|  | Sport Management | 91.3%  (200) | 1.8%  (4) | 6.9%  (15) | 219 |

Students in the College of Education, overall, are faring above average compared to their all university peers, with “Complete” ratings at almost 4 percentage points above the university average and “Incomplete” ratings 1.68 percentage points below. However, the “Distinction” rating is 2.3 percentage points below the average.

The Athletic Training and Sports Management majors had higher than average “Incomplete” ratings with lower than average “Completed and Distinction” ratings. Some programs also received lower than average “Incomplete” ratings: Education (Elementary and Secondary), Kinesiology, and Movement Studies.

As reported in section IV.A.1.e, the College of Education is later on average in completing the writing portfolio than the recommended 60-72 credit hours (M= 79.1, SD= 18.4). This is not substantially different than the university average (M= 81.4, SD= 22.7). Only students in Elementary Education are submitting the writing portfolio in the desired range, 60-72 credit hours; all other programs are beyond this range on average.

**Overall Portfolio Performance: Elson S. Floyd College Medicine, 2015-2017**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Complete | Complete with Distinction | Incomplete | Total |
| College of Medical Sciences | | **87.5%**  **(70)** | **6.3%**  **(5)** | **6.3%**  **(5)** | **80** |
|  | Speech and Hearing Sciences | 85.4%  (41) | 6.3%  (3) | 8.3%  (4) | 48 |
|  | Nutrition and Exercise Physiology | 90.6%  (29) | 6.2%  (2) | 3.1%  (1) | 32 |

The College of Medical Sciences have made significant changes during this biennium, working toward accreditation and admitting students as of Fall 2017. For the 2015-2017 biennium, there are two undergraduate programs in the College of Medical Sciences. First, the Speech and Hearing Sciences Program, at 2.6 percentage points below the university average for “Complete,” 0.9 percentage points above average for “Distinction,” and 1.7 percentage points above average for “Incomplete.” As reported in section IV.A.1.e, students in the Speech and Hearing Sciences program are completing their portfolio process on average at 70.6 (SD= 18.3) credit hours, which is within the recommended 60-72 credit-hour range.

Students completing the writing portfolio in Nutrition and Exercise Physiology are above the university average at 2.6 percentage points above the average for “Complete,” 0.8 percentage above the average in “Complete with Distinction,” and 3.5 percentage points below the average for “Incomplete.” As reported in section IV.A.1.e, students in the Nutrition and Exercise Physiology program are completing their portfolio process on average at 87.2 (SD= 29.8) credit hours, which is above the university average (M= 81.4, SD= 22.7) and outside the Writing Program’s recommended 60-72 credit hour range.

**Overall Portfolio Performance: College of Nursing, 2015-2017**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Complete | Complete with Distinction | Incomplete | Total |
| College of Nursing | | **89.0%**  **(486)** | **9.2%**  **(50)** | **1.8%**  **(10)** | **546** |
|  | Nursing | 89.0%  (486) | 9.2%  (50) | 1.8%  (10) | 546 |

Students completing the writing portfolio in the Nursing major are above the university average at one percent for “Complete,” 3.8 percentage points above the average in “Complete with Distinction,” and 4.8 percentage points below the average for “Incomplete.”

While it appears that Nursing students are potentially completing their portfolios at the higher end of the credit timeline (M= 93), there are circumstances unique to Nursing. For example, students coming from the Pullman campus to Spokane are encouraged by the Nursing program to complete their writing portfolios prior to moving to the Spokane campus. Other students may transfer in with over 90 credit hours because they are transferring in. Some students are seeking dual Bachelor’s degrees. Therefore, the particular standard deviation (41.6 credits) in section IV.A.1.e is a fairly accurate representation and is not outside of the norm for this particular program.

**Overall Portfolio Performance: College of Pharmacy, 2015-2017**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Complete | Complete with Distinction | Incomplete | Total |
| College of Pharmacy | | **87.5%**  **(7)** | **12.5%**  **(1)** | **0.0%**  **(0)** | **8** |
|  | Pre-Pharmacy | 87.5%  (7) | 12.5%  (1) | 0.0%  (0) | 8 |

Students completing the writing portfolio in the College of Pharmacy’s only undergraduate major, Pre-Pharmacy, are comparable to WSU’s average for “Complete” and 7.1% above the university average for “Complete with Distinction.” No students were recorded as “Incomplete.” Students are completing the portfolio on average inside of the recommended credit range, 60-72 credit hours.

**Overall Portfolio Performance: College of Veterinary Medicine, 2015-2017**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Complete | Complete with Distinction | Incomplete | Total |
| College of Veterinary Medicine | | **80.8%**  **(202)** | **14.8%**  **(37)** | **4.4%**  **(11)** | **250** |
|  | Biochemistry | 82.1%  (55) | 13.4%  (9) | 4.5%  (3) | 67 |
|  | Biophysics (Biochemistry Option) | 0.0%  (0) | 100.0%  (1) | 0.0%  (0) | 1 |
|  | Genetics and Cell Biology | 70.6%  (12) | 17.7%  (3) | 11.8%  (2) | 17 |
|  | Microbiology | 80.0%  (48) | 11.7%  (7) | 8.3%  (5) | 60 |
|  | Neuroscience | 83.2%  (84) | 15.8%  (16) | 1.0%  (1) | 101 |
|  | Pre-Veterinary Medicine | 75.0%  (3) | 25.0%  (1) | 0.0%  (0) | 4 |

While the average for the College of Veterinary Medicine is 7.2 percentage points lower than the university average for “Complete,” 9.4 percentage points are above average for “Complete with Distinction.” Further, each program within the college has above average “Complete with Distinction.” This is coupled with lower than average “Incomplete” ratings for several programs within the college: Biochemistry, Biophysics (Biochemistry Option), Neuroscience, and Pre-Veterinary Medicine. On the other hand, two programs also have higher than average “Incomplete” ratings: Genetics and Cell Biology, and Microbiology.

Overall, students are faring very well in the College of Veterinary Medicine. However, as reported in section IV.A.1.e, students are completing the portfolio outside of the recommended range of 60-72 credit hours. Given the average credit hours of 80.9 for students completing the portfolio process and a standard deviation of 18.4, students on the higher end of the credit spectrum are completing well outside of the optimum spectrum (60-72 credit hours). This suggests further information is needed to explain the credit range in which students complete their Writing portfolio.

**Overall Portfolio Performance: Edward R. Murrow College of Communication, 2015-2017**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Complete | Complete with Distinction | Incomplete | Total |
| Edward R. Murrow College of Communication | | **88.3%**  **(544)** | **3.9%**  **(24)** | **7.8%**  **(48)** | **616** |
|  | Advertising | 50.0%  (1) | 0.0%  (0) | 50.0%  (1) | 2 |
|  | Communication Studies | 88.4%  (541) | 3.9%  (24) | 7.7%  (47) | 612 |
|  | Journalism and Media Production | 100.0%  (2) | 0.0%  (0) | 0.0%  (0) | 2 |

Students in the Edward R. Murrow College of Communication received “Complete” ratings at a rate comparable to the university average, “Complete with Distinction” ratings at a 1.5 percentage point lower, and “Incomplete” ratings at 1.2 percentage points higher. Within this biennium, Communication Studies appeared to be the only program contributing to the “Complete with Distinction” ratings in the college, as well as the major contributor to the high “Incomplete” ratings.

As reported in section IV.A.1.e, students in the college complete the writing portfolio under the university average but not within the recommended 60-72 credit-hour range (M=77.7, SD=15.6).

**Overall Portfolio Performance: Voiland College of Engineering and Architecture, 2015-2017**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Complete | Complete with Distinction | Incomplete | Total |
| Voiland College of Engineering and Architecture | | **87.5%**  **(1,670)** | **4.4%**  **(83)** | **7%**  **(132)** | **1908** |
|  | Architecture | 90.1%  (64) | 2.8%  (2) | 7.0%  (5) | 71 |
|  | Bioengineering | 92.5%  (37) | 2.5%  (1) | 5.0%  (2) | 40 |
|  | Chemical Engineering | 83.2%  (104) | 8.0%  (10) | 8.8%  (11) | 125 |
|  | Civil Engineering | 92.2%  (201) | 1.8%  (4) | 6.0%  (13) | 218 |
|  | Computer Engineering | 94.4%  (34) | 2.8%  (1) | 2.8%  (1) | 36 |
|  | Computer Science | 87.8%  (301) | 6.1%  (21) | 6.1%  (21) | 343 |
|  | Construction Management | 93.0%  (106) | 1.75 %  (2) | 5.3%  (6) | 114 |
|  | Electrical Engineering | 86.0%  (228) | 5.7%  (15) | 8.3%  (22) | 265 |
|  | Engineering | 87.3%  (48) | 3.6%  (2) | 9.1%  (5) | 55 |
|  | Materials Science | 91.2%  (31) | 5.9%  (2) | 2.9%  (1) | 34 |
|  | Mechanical Engineering | 88.4%  (516) | 3.9%  (23) | 7.7%  (45) | 584 |

Writing portfolio ratings for students in the Voiland College of Engineering and Architecture compare closely with university averages. “Complete” ratings are within a percentage point of the average; the “Complete with Distinction” rating is just over a percentage point below the average, and “Incomplete” ratings were half a percentage point above the average. There are several programs above the average for “Complete with Distinction”: Chemical Engineering, Computer Science, Electrical Engineering, and Materials Science. Other programs fall under the university average in this category. Several programs were below the university average for “Incomplete” ratings: Bioengineering, Civil Engineering, Computer Engineering, Computer Science, Construction management, and Materials Science. Other programs were higher than the university average for this category.

As reported in section IV.A.1.e, students in the college complete at a rate comparable to the university average for credit hours yet outside the recommended 60-72 credit-hour range (M=81.7, SD=18.1).

# IV.B Validational Findings

The following section provides information that validates the Writing Portfolio as an assessment of undergraduate writing ability. The Writing Portfolio was designed to provide diagnostic feedback regarding the preparedness of undergraduate students to write in upper-division Writing in the Major courses.

## IV.B.1 Performance by Academic Level of Papers Submitted

The Writing Portfolio requires students to submit three papers initially evaluated by course instructors for one of two categories: Outstanding or Acceptable. Faculty may decline to approve a paper. When the original course instructor is unavailable to rate the paper, the Writing Assessment Office assigns a third category of “Okay,” indicating that the paper appears to be the student’s own work because it contains features to authenticate it. An Okay rating does not evaluate the quality of the writing.

### IV.B.1.a Submitted Papers by Academic Level

The total number of papers submitted by course level was tabulated for the 2015-2017 biennium. The numbers below represent coursework submitted by all WSU students completing the writing portfolio. However, because students may submit work from outside WSU, non-transfer papers have been tabulated separately; the numbers in parentheses represent the total amount of papers submitted, while the other number represents work from WSU. “Total” represents all work submitted by students, which may include papers from below the 100-level or from outside the university (e.g. non-credit bearing community college coursework, high school coursework, or professional documents).

Papers by Academic Level, 2015-2017

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course Level | Papers Submitted1 | Percent of Total | Change from Last Biennium2 |
| 100-level | 10065 (12782) | 30.1% (38.3%) | +1.01% (+0.85%) |
| 200-level | 4798 (6628) | 14.4% (19.8%) | +9.7% (+11.7%) |
| 300-level | 9505 (9764) | 28.5% (28.4%) | +6.9% (+7.0%) |
| 400-level | 4144 (4208) | 12.4% (12.2%) | +8.2% (+7.4%) |
| 500-level | 10 (11) | 0.03% (0.033%) | -23.1%% (-35.3%) |
| Total | 28522 (33393) | 85.4% (100%) | +4.4% (+4.0%) |
| 1 The first number indicates the number of submissions that originate from WSU. The second number indicates the total number of submissions.  2 These percentages indicate the overall change from the number of submissions during the last biennium. They are meant to be compared most directly to the percentage in parentheses in the “Percent of Total” column. | | | |

The 2013-2015 Biennial Report found that over one-third of papers submitted originated outside of WSU. In that 2013-2015 was the first report to examine the origin of papers submitted, the numbers above could suggest that such a great number might have been an anomaly. In the 2015-2017 biennium, roughly one-sixth of papers submitted came from outside WSU. However, while the proportion of non-WSU work is decreasing, the number of papers submitted from outside WSU are increasing with the size of the student body; just over 4000 papers submitted in the last biennium came from outside WSU, while nearly 4900 submitted this biennium did not originate at WSU. The table above indicates that this imbalance comes primarily from 200-level courses (submissions from which increased by an additional 2 percentage points when not looking solely at WSU work), the course level that saw the greatest overall increase in submissions over the last biennium.

### IV.B.1.b Submitted Papers, Academic Level and Instructor Ratings

Percentages given are of the total submitted for that academic level, taken from the total amount submitted per course level in Table IV.B.1.a. As in that table, numbers prior to the parentheses represent the work originating at WSU, while numbers within parentheses represent all submitted work.

Course Paper Ratings by Academic Level, 2009-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Year Rating | **Academic Level of Course** | | | | |
| 100 | 200 | 300 | 400 | 500 |
| 2009-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acceptable | 47.3% (35.6%) | 49.6% (36.2%) | 53.8% (52.5%) | 55.4% (54.4%) | 48.3% (46.7%) |
| Outstanding | 43.3% (32.6%) | 44.4% (32.4%) | 40.1% (39.1%) | 37.1% (36.4%) | 44.8% (43.3%) |
| OK | 9.1% (6.9%) | 5.8% (4.2%) | 5.5% (5.4%) | 7.1% (7%) | 6.9% (6.7%) |
| Total Submitted | 8998 (11941) | 4568 (6259) | 8555 (8763) | 4628 (4715) | 29 (30) |
| 2011-2013 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acceptable | 51.5% (39.4%) | 49% (35.5%) | 53.1% (51.9%) | 55.1% (54%) | 58.3% (50%) |
| Outstanding | 40.8% (31.2%) | 45.9% (33.3%) | 42.6% (41.6%) | 39.4% (38.6%) | 41.7% (35.7%) |
| OK | 7.2% (5.5%) | 4.8% (3.5%) | 3.5% (3.5%) | 4.8% (4.7%) | 0% (0%) |
| Total Submitted | 9604 (12567) | 4445 (6121) | 8340 (8544) | 4099 (4182) | 12 (14) |
| 2013-2015 | | | | | |
| Acceptable | 52.9% (41.6%) | 51.3% (37.8%) | 51.8% (50.5%) | 55.8% (54.6%) | 46.2% (35.3%) |
| Outstanding | 40.2% (31.6%) | 44.6% (32.9%) | 44.6% (43.4%) | 40.7% (39.9%) | 53.8% (41.2%) |
| OK | 6.8% (5.3%) | 4% (2.9%) | 3.5% (3.4%) | 3.3% (3.2%) | 0% (0%) |
| Total Submitted | 9964 (12674) | 4374 (5933) | 8889 (9129) | 3831 (3917) | 13 (17) |
| 2015-2017 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acceptable | 58.1% (45.7%) | 53% (38.3%) | 56.2% (54.7%) | 55.1% (54.3%) | 60% (54.5%) |
| Outstanding | 36.4% (28.6%) | 42.7% (30.9%) | 41.1% (40%) | 41% (40.4%) | 20% (18.2%) |
| OK | 5.4% (4.3%) | 4.2% (3.1%) | 2.6% (2.6%) | 3.7% (3.7%) | 20% (18.2%) |
| Total Submitted | 10065 (12782) | 4798 (6628) | 9505 (9764) | 4144 (4208) | 10 (11) |
| 1 Numbers within parentheses refer to all papers submitted. Numbers preceding the parentheses refer to papers submitted from WSU courses. | | | | | |

Papers submitted from 100-, 200-, and 300-level courses continue to see an increase in Acceptable ratings and a decrease in Outstanding ratings, continuing the trend of the last few biennia, while those from the 400-level have shown little variation from the 2013-2015 reporting period. Graduate-level papers continue to be submitted as part of the writing portfolio at negligible rates. It is noteworthy that the number of OK-rated papers continues to fall, particularly among papers submitted from WSU courses, suggesting that writing portfolio awareness among students (who are submitting fewer non-WSU papers) and faculty (who are signing a greater number of submission sheets) continues to improve.

The table below shows the same data for the last biennium as a percentage of all work submitted from June 2015 through May 2017. Again, the first number represents work from WSU courses, while the number in parentheses represents all work for that level.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rating | 100 | 200 | 300 | 400 | 500 |
| Acceptable | 20.3% (17.2%) | 8.8% (7.5%) | 18.5% (15.8%) | 7.9% (6.7%) | 0.021% (0.018%) |
| Outstanding | 12.7% (10.8%) | 7.1% (6%) | 13.5% (11.5%) | 5.9% (5%) | 0.007% (0.006%) |
| OK | 1.9% (1.6%) | 0.7% (0.6%) | 0.9% (0.7%) | 0.5% (0.5%) | 0.007% (0.006%) |
| Total Submitted | 10065 (12782) | 4798 (6628) | 9505 (9764) | 4144 (4208) | 10 (11) |

As noted in the 2013-2015 reporting period, students are submitting 100- and 300-level writing most often. Combined, 200- and 400-level writing are still submitted less often than 300-level writing. In that students are expected to complete writing portfolios prior to entering disciplinary writing courses (those bearing a UCORE “M” designation), low submission rates for 400-level writing would be expected. The small gap between rates of 100-level and 300-level work (only 3000 papers of over 33,000 papers submitted) suggests that students may be rushing to gather signatures on work completed during their junior year or holding on to work from their first year at WSU, but not both, instead of submitting three documents that show a progression of their writing skill over three years.

To test this assumption, the table below shows the time elapsed between composing the earliest paper submitted in the writing portfolio and the completion of the writing portfolio. Papers completed at schools on a trimester or quarter system are rounded to the nearest equivalent to WSU’s semesters for this calculation. Papers without a listed date of composition (e.g., admissions papers, those composed for a workplace, and other non-school documents) are not included in this calculation.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Time of Composition | 100 | 200 | 300 | 400 | 500 |
| 0-1 Academic Years Prior | **Acceptable: 13.67%** | Acceptable: 7.65% | **Acceptable: 15.53%** | Acceptable: 6.65% | Acceptable: 0.02% |
| **Outstanding: 10.77%** | Outstanding: 7.35% | **Outstanding: 11.35%** | Outstanding: 4.96% | Outstanding: 0.01% |
| OK: 1.27% | OK: 0.61% | OK: 0.72% | OK: 0.43% | OK: 0.01% |
| 1-2 Academic Years | Acceptable: 3.58% | Acceptable: 1.3% | Acceptable: 1.23% | Acceptable: 0.47% | Acceptable: 0% |
|  | Outstanding: 2.53% | Outstanding: 1.6% | Outstanding: 1.08% | Outstanding: 0.36% | Outstanding: 0% |
|  | OK: 0.42% | OK: 0.14% | OK: 0.1% | OK: 0.04% | OK: 0% |
| 2-3 Academic Years | Acceptable: 2.16% | Acceptable: 0.54% | Acceptable: 0.51% | Acceptable: 0.22% | Acceptable: 0% |
|  | Outstanding: 1.32% | Outstanding: 0.63% | Outstanding: 0.37% | Outstanding: 0.11% | Outstanding: 0% |
|  | OK: 0.28% | OK: 0.07% | OK: 0.03% | OK: 0.01% | OK: 0% |
| 3-4 Academic Years | Acceptable: 0.23% | Acceptable: 0.11% | Acceptable: 0.08% | Acceptable: 0.04% | Acceptable: 0% |
|  | Outstanding: 0.26% | Outstanding: 0.09% | Outstanding: 0.06% | Outstanding: 0.03% | Outstanding: 0% |
|  | OK: 0.04% | OK: 0.01% | OK: 0% | OK: 0.01% | OK: 0% |
| 4+ Academic Years | Acceptable: 0.18% | Acceptable: 0.07% | Acceptable: 0.1% | Acceptable: 0.04% | Acceptable: 0% |
|  | Outstanding: 0.2% | Outstanding: 0.08% | Outstanding: 0.06% | Outstanding: 0.01% | Outstanding: 0% |
|  | OK: 0.07% | OK: 0.04% | OK: 0.01% | OK: 0.01% | OK: 0% |
| 1 Percentages above indicate that group’s proportion of the entirety of papers submitted during this reporting period. | | | | | |

As indicated by the previous table, nearly two-thirds of papers submitted come from the 100- and 300-level. However, just over half of all papers submitted during this reporting period were also composed in the academic year immediately preceding the student’s writing portfolio completion, while only one in ten papers was composed two to three years prior (roughly the time of the individual’s first year at WSU). While instructors at all levels are assigning writing and signing writing portfolio submission sheets, it seems that most students are waiting until the year leading up to their writing portfolio to complete the coursework they will submit in their writing packet.

## IV.B.2 Equivalency of the Rhetorical Tasks in the Timed Writing

Equivalency of the rhetorical tasks for gender and language at the Tier I and II levels is provided below. The tasks described are rotated among the timed writing topics and between timed writing examinations. Examinees are asked to respond to one rhetorical task in each timed writing session.

Until 2013, the Writing Program used a single set of four rhetorical tasks. The 2009-2011 and 2011-2013 reports note that Task #3 (“Analyzing issues more accurately or honestly”) was phased out as it resulted in a disproportionate amount of Needs Work ratings. Data from the 2009-2011 and 2011-2013 biennia refer to the following rhetorical tasks:

Rhetorical Tasks, as Reported Between 1993-1995 and 2011-2013 Biennia

**#1 Resolving differences of view:** “Read the following passage carefully. It expresses a point-of-view with which many people may well disagree: [Paragraph inserted here] Clearly, on this complex issue there are other reasonable viewpoints. How do you, personally, resolve the differences among these views?”

**#2 Solving complex problems:** “Read the following passage carefully. It introduces a complex problem that may have many solutions: [Paragraph inserted here]. Clearly, this complex issue involves a number of problems. Center on one of the problems. How would you suggest solving it, in a workable way?”

**#3 Analyzing issues more accurately or honestly:** “Read the passage by [author], printed below, very carefully. It may well give a misleading picture. Clearly, the issue is complex and easy to over-simplify. The topic of your essay: How would you analyze the issue more fully or accurately or honestly?”

**#4 Choosing the best approach to an issue:** “Read the following passage carefully. It deals with an issue that may have more sides to it than just the one presented: [Paragraph inserted here] Clearly, there are other ways to approach this complex issue. Which angle would you argue is the most useful to take?”

As the Tier I writing topics have become more varied and sophisticated, new frames became necessary to match each topic’s demands. While these tasks share many common features with the previous rhetorical tasks, they are not fully equivalent. Part of the reasoning behind this shift is pedagogical. The Writing Program staff recognizes the limits of a timed-writing situation and the complexity of the issues within the excerpts given to students. Further, because these topics are relatively complex, the goal has been to provide multiple points of entry with which to engage wi in constructing an essay while concomitantly adding to students’ education. The resulting tasks now ask students to focus on and support their responses (e.g., taking a stance or setting up an approach to a problem) rather than asking them to solve problems or judge the veracity of an excerpt’s claims.

Rhetorical Tasks, 2013-2015 Biennium Onward

**Take a Stance:** “Clearly, this passage is conveying a complex issue. WHERE DO YOU STAND IN RELATION TO THE EXCERPT?” [Compare with previous Rhetorical Task 1: Resolving Differences of View]

**Significance of the Passage:** “Clearly, this passage is conveying a complex idea. WHAT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PASSAGE AND THE MESSAGE CONVEYED? HOW DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT SIGNIFICANCE?” [Compare with previous Rhetorical Task 2: Solving Complex Problems]

**Choose and Resolve:** “Clearly, this image is conveying many complex issues. Choose one or more of the image sections (data points) to further explore, compare and contrast, or analyze as you develop your essay. HOW DO YOU INTERPRET THIS IMAGE AND THE SECTION(S)/DATA POINTS YOU CHOSE?” [Compare with previous Rhetorical Task 3: Analyzing Issues More Accurately or Honestly]

**Approaching the Problem:** “You might notice a number of problems and solutions related to the issue described above. Center on one of the problems. HOW DO YOU SUGGEST APPROACHING THIS PROBLEM?” [Compare with previous Rhetorical Task 4: Choosing the Best Approach to an Issue]

The “Take a Stance” rhetorical task shares many traits with the former “Resolving Differences of View.” “Take a Stance” simplifies the task by asking students to relate only their own viewpoint.

The “Significance of the Passage” asks the writer to provide a meaningful explanation of a complex set of ideas. However, whereas the old prompt was worded to value a writer’s conclusion (the solution), the new prompt emphasizes the writer’s understanding of what was read.

The “Choose and Resolve” rhetorical task shares traits with the former “Analyzing Issues more Accurately or Honestly.” In this biennium, a task was paired with either an infographic or a set of statistics, thereby starting a kind of dialogue.”

Finally, the “Approaching the Problem” task overlaps with the former “Choosing the Best Approach to an Issue.” Like the new “Take a Stance” task, “Approaching the Problem” does not explicitly ask for many different views or possibilities before the writer engages with the task at hand; rather, the focus is on the writer being inserted into the conversation by providing a personal rather than a “most useful” approach.

### IV.B.2.a Tests of Equivalency of the Rhetorical Tasks for All Students

In an effort to ensure the assessment process does not unfairly advantage or disadvantage any given student populations, the sections below examine each of the rhetorical tasks among different populations.

#### IV.B.2.a.1 Tier I and Tier II Ratings—Equivalency of the Rhetorical Tasks

The tables below show the university-wide performance at Tier I.

Tier I Ratings by Rhetorical Task, 2005-2013, All Students

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | Distinction | Pass | Needs Work |
| #1 Resolving | 7.7% | 63.5% | 28.8% |
| #2 Solving | 8.3% | 64.3% | 27.4% |
| #3 Analyzing | 11.9% | 62.0% | 36.1% |
| #4 Choosing | 8.5% | 63.1% | 28.4% |

Tier I Ratings by Rhetorical Task, 2013-2017, All Students

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | Distinction | Pass | In Progress (formerly Needs Work) |
| 1. Take a Stance | 562 (9.85%) | 3492 (61.23%) | 1649 (28.91%) |
| 1. Significance | 578 (10.03%) | 3554 (61.66%) | 1631 (28.3%) |
| 1. Resolve | 576 (8.46%) | 4289 (63%) | 1941 (28.51%) |
| 1. Approach | 230 (7.31%) | 1917 (60.95%) | 997 (31.7%) |

As noted, the “Analyzing Issues” prompt had been discontinued by the 2011-2013 biennium. Its discontinuance was based heavily on the results above: the Resolving, Solving, and Choosing tasks generally resulted in a 63% pass rate, an 8% possible-distinction rate, and a 28% needs work rate. While these numbers are not the intended result of a timed writing prompt, the fact that the Analyzing task produced such different results (a nearly 50% increase in possible-distinction ratings and a nearly 25% increase in needs work ratings) indicated that it was not performing the same function as the other prompts. Looking only at the Timed Writing ratings, students responding to the new rhetorical tasks are performing at similar rates to the previous tasks. However, in addition to the pedagogical emphasis noted in IV.B.2, the benefits of changing the rhetorical tasks are also found in the new prompts used in the timed writing. Data analysis prompts and visual prompts do not have clear arguments as older, text-based prompts did, and asking students to formulate a response to data or an explanation of what seems most important from a graphic would not be possible under the old framework.

In the following tables prompt A represents students being asked to take a stance, B represents students being asked to identify the significance of the passage, C asked to choose and resolve an issue, and D asked to articulate the writer’s approach to the problem.

Tier I Ratings by Rhetorical Task, 2015-2017, All Students

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | **Acceptable** | | | | | **Possible Distinction** | | | **In Progress** | | | Total | |
| Tier II |  | **Simple Pass** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Incomplete** |  | **Complete** | **Distinction** |  | **Complete** | **Incomplete** |  |
| (A) | 407 (59.4%) | 345 (50.4%) | 45 (6.6%) | 17 (2.5%) | 0 (0%) | 82 (12%) | 53 (7.7%) | 14 (2.0%) | 196 (28.6%) | 142 (20.7%) | 51 (7.5%) | 685 (6.1%) |
| (B) | 506 (60.7%) | 414 (49.7%) | 78 (9.4%) | 14 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) | 80 (10%) | 49 (5.9%) | 14 (1.7%) | 246 (29.5%) | 185 (22.2%) | 52 (6.2%) | 833 (7.4%) |
| (C) | 4051 (63.2%) | 3431 (53.5%) | 498 (7.8%) | 109 (1.7%) | 13 (0.2%) | 534 (8.3%) | 319 (5%) | 78 (1.2%) | 1827 (28.5%) | 1386 (21.6%) | 415 (6.5%) | 6414 (56.8%) |
| (D) | 1771 (60.7%) | 1476 (50.6%) | 233 (8%) | 58 (2%) | 4 (0.1%) | 208 (7.1%) | 134 (4.6%) | 29 (1%) | 940 (32.2%) | 732 (25.1%) | 189 (6.5%) | 2920 (25.9%) |
| **All Tasks** | 7020 (62.1%) | 5666 (52.2%) | 854 (7.9%) | 198 (1.8%) | 17 (0.2%) | 941 (8.3%) | 555 (5.1%) | 135 (1.2%) | 3327 (29.5%) | 2446 (22.5%) | 707 (6.5%) | 10853 |

The 2013-2015 report on the writing portfolio found that task D, “Approaching the Problem,” resulted in slightly fewer Needs Work ratings at Tier I and slightly more Complete ratings at Tier I. It was assumed that these variances were a result of the task’s relatively lower rate of use compared to other prompts. During the 2015-2017 reporting period, task D was administered much more often, resulting in Needs Work ratings more often and Possible Distinction ratings less often than other tasks. Without a longer history of data, it is difficult to say whether this was a result of the task itself, evidence of this cohort’s difficulty with the rhetorical task, or a result of this task’s association with a particular topic or set of topics (see section IV. B. 3).

One notable deviation from past rhetorical tasks is that the timed writings seem to strongly correlate with students’ writing abilities at the Complete level. As section IV. B. 5 discusses, students are receiving a “Simple Pass” at rates similar to the past, but very few students receive an Incomplete or Distinction rating at Tier II following an Acceptable timed writing. This correlation does not hold for Distinction and Incomplete ratings, however, so the timed writing itself is not a strong enough indicator of writing skills for nearly 40% of the student population.

Overall, however, the Tier I results suggest that the timed writing tasks are not inherently easier or more difficult for students. Task A, “Take a Stance,” does bear further scrutiny in the future, as it produced the greatest rate of Possible Distinctions, the fewest Completes, and was nearly tied for the fewest Needs Works. It’s relatively small number of uses during the last biennium, however, may be skewing these numbers.

Tier I Ratings by Rhetorical Task, 2015-2017, Male Students

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | **Acceptable** | | | | | **Possible Distinction** | | | **In Progress** | | | Total |
| Tier II |  | **Simple Pass** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Incomplete** |  | **Complete** | **Distinction** |  | **Complete** | **Incomplete** |  |
| (A) | 140 (54.3%) | 121 (47%) | 14 (5.4%) | 5 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 35 (13.6%) | 19 (7.4%) | 5 (1.9%) | 83 (32.2%) | 63 (24.4%) | 19 (7.4%) | 258 (5%) |
| (B) | 185 (58.5%) | 152 (48.1%) | 26 (8.2%) | 7 (2.2%) | 0 (0%) | 32 (10.1%) | 21 (6.7%) | 7 (2.2%) | 99 (31.3%) | 68 (21.5%) | 26 (8.2%) | 316 (6.1%) |
| (C) | 1895 (61.5%) | 1645 (53.4%) | 201 (6.5%) | 44 (1.4%) | 5 (0.2%) | 218 (7.1%) | 136 (4.4%) | 33 (1.1%) | 970 (31.5%) | 724 (23.5%) | 234 (7.6%) | 3083 (59.4%) |
| (D) | 807 (57%) | 679 (48%) | 99 (7%) | 27 (1.9%) | 2 (0.1%) | 93 (6.6%) | 62 (4.4%) | 12 (0.9%) | 515 (36.4%) | 390 (27.5%) | 117 (8.3%) | 1416 (27.3%) |
| **All Tasks (Male)** | 3027 (60%) | 2597 (51.2%) | 340 (6.7%) | 83 (1.6%) | 7 (0.1%) | 378 (7.5%) | 238 (4.7%) | 57 (1.1%) | 1668 (32.9%) | 1246 (24.6%) | 396 (7.8%) | 5074 (97.8%) |
| **All Tasks (Univ.)** | 7020 (62.1%) | 5666 (52.2%) | 854 (7.9%) | 198 (1.8%) | 17 (0.2%) | 941 (8.3%) | 555 (5.1%) | 135 (1.2%) | 3327 (29.5%) | 2446 (22.5%) | 707 (6.5%) | 10853 (96.1%) |

Tier I Ratings by Rhetorical Task, 2015-2017, Female Students

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | **Acceptable** | | | | | **Possible Distinction** | | | **In Progress** | | | Total | |
| Tier II |  | **Simple Pass** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Incomplete** |  | **Complete** | **Distinction** |  | **Complete** | **Incomplete** |  |
| (A) | 266 (62.7%) | 223 (52.6%) | 31 (7.3%) | 12 (2.8%) | 0 (0%) | 45 (10.6%) | 32 (7.6%) | 9 (2.1%) | 113 (26.7%) | 79 (18.6%) | 32 (7.6%) | 424 (7.1%) |
| (B) | 317 (61.9%) | 259 (50.6%) | 51 (10%) | 7 (1.4%) | 0 (0%) | 48 (9.4%) | 28 (5.5%) | 7 (1.4%) | 146 (28.5%) | 116 (22.7%) | 26 (5.1%) | 512 (8.5%) |
| (C) | 2117 (64.8%) | 1756 (53.8%) | 290 (8.9%) | 64 (2%) | 7 (0.2%) | 309 (9.5%) | 179 (5.5%) | 45 (1.4%) | 837 (25.6%) | 647 (19.8%) | 176 (5.4%) | 3265 (54.4%) |
| (D) | 954 (64.2%) | 788 (53.1%) | 134 (9%) | 30 (2%) | 2 (0.1%) | 114 (7.7%) | 72 (4.9%) | 17 (1.1%) | 417 (28.1%) | 337 (22.7%) | 69 (4.7%) | 1485 (24.7%) |
| **Avg.** | 3654 (64.3%) | 3026 (53.2%) | 506 (9%) | 113 (2%) | 9 (0.2%) | 516 (9.1%) | 311 (5.5%) | 78 (1.4%) | 1513 (26.6%) | 1179 (20.7%) | 303 (5.3%) | 5686 (94.7%) |
| **All Tasks (Univ.)** | 7020 (62.1%) | 5666 (52.2%) | 854 (7.9%) | 198 (1.8%) | 17 (0.2%) | 941 (8.3%) | 555 (5.1%) | 135 (1.2%) | 3327 (29.5%) | 2446 (22.5%) | 707 (6.5%) | 10853 (96.1%) |

In examining Tier I ratings differentiated by gender, the 2015-2017 cohort continued some trends observed in the 2013-2015 report. Female students continue to earn more Acceptable and Possible Distinction ratings than their male counterparts. However, the wider gap found in the 2013-2015 report is not repeated here: with an increased amount of Tasks C and D in use, female students outperformed male students in the Possible Distinction ratings by lesser margins.

### IV.B.2.b Equivalency of Rhetorical Tasks for L2 Writers

Examining the Tier I performance on the new rhetorical tasks among students whose primary language is not English yields similar results to the above tables. Although L2 students tend to earn In Progress ratings at significantly higher percentages than their L1 peers, a primary function of the Tier I timed writing is to identify students who might need additional support in their writing courses during and after the junior year. As these students are not writing in their primary language, it may be reasonable to expect that, as a group, they will not perform as well as L1 on timed-writing tasks and/or that readers are not as effectively trained to evaluate L2 writing.

Tier I Ratings by Rhetorical Task, 2015-2017, L2 Students

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | **Acceptable** | | | | | **Possible Distinction** | | | **In Progress** | | | Total | |
| Tier II |  | **Simple Pass** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Incomplete** |  | **Complete** | **Distinction** |  | **Complete** | **Incomplete** |  |
| (A) | 45 (50%) | 40 (44.4%) | 3 (3.3%) | 2 (2.2%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (7.8%) | 7 (7.8%) | 0 (0%) | 38 (42.2%) | 23 (25.6%) | 15 (16.7%) | 90 (4.7%) |
| (B) | 97 (50.3%) | 82 (42.5%) | 13 (6.7%) | 2 (1%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (4.2%) | 7 (3.6%) | 1 (0.5%) | 87 (45.1%) | 60 (31.1%) | 26 (13.5%) | 193 (10%) |
| (C) | 587 (55.5%) | 504 (47.6%) | 66 (6.2%) | 16 (1.5%) | 1 (0.1%) | 56 (5.3%) | 38 (3.6%) | 10 (1%) | 415 (39.2%) | 270 (25.5%) | 142 (13.4%) | 1058 (55%) |
| (D) | 280 (54.4%) | 230 (44.7%) | 39 (7.6%) | 9 (1.8%) | 2 (0.4%) | 27 (5.2%) | 13 (2.5%) | 5 (1%) | 208 (40.4%) | 155 (30.1%) | 52 (10.1%) | 515 (26.7%) |
| **Avg.** | 1009 (54.4%) | 856 (46.1%) | 121 (6.5%) | 29 (1.6%) | 3 (0.2%) | 98 (5.3%) | 65 (3.5%) | 16 (0.9%) | 748 (40.3%) | 508 (27.4%) | 235 (12.7%) | 1856 (96.5%) |
| **All Tasks (Univ.)** | 7020 (62.1%) | 5666 (52.2%) | 854 (7.9%) | 198 (1.8%) | 17 (0.2%) | 941 (8.3%) | 555 (5.1%) | 135 (1.2%) | 3327 (29.5%) | 2446 (22.5%) | 707 (6.5%) | 10853 (96.1%) |

Historically, L2 students receiving an In Progress at Tier I have been confirmed as Incomplete ratings roughly 50% of the time, a rate similar to the university average. However, in the 2015-2017 cohort, this rate was reduced to just above 25%, while the all-university average sees students confirming Incomplete ratings from an In Progress at Tier I around 20% of the time. While L2 students continue to receive more In Progress ratings on timed writings, the decrease in confirmed Incomplete ratings indicates that writing produced in a classroom setting is similar to that produced by L1 peers.

### IV.B.2.c Stability of Rhetorical Task Use Over Time

Insofar as this is the second biennium that the current tasks have been in use, reported years 2007-2013 are provided only as a reference point. Future reports would omit those references to biennial reports prior to 2013-2015. Further, it is necessary to note that tasks C and D (“Choose and Resolve” and “Approaching the Problem”) were only introduced in the second half of this biennium.

Number of Rhetorical Tasks used by Academic Year: 2013/14 – 2014/15

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Year | Task | | | |
| A) Take a Stance | B) Significance of the Passage | C) Choose and Resolve | D) Approaching the Problem |
| 2013-2014 | 2578 | 2497 | 0 | 0 |
| 2014-2015 | 2441 | 2435 | 394 | 225 |
| 2015-2016 | 488 | 599 | 2794 | 1401 |
| 2016-2017 | 86 | 115 | 3601 | 1505 |

Number of Rhetorical Tasks Used by Academic Year: 2007/8 – 2012/13

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Year | Task | | | |
| #1 Resolving | #2 Solving | #3 Analyzing | #4 Choosing |
| 2007-2008 | 1573 | 1760 | 5 | 1334 |
| 2008-2009 | 1824 | 1526 | 42 | 1334 |
| 2009-2010 | 1932 | 1761 | 109 | 1678 |
| 2010-2011 | 1502 | 1816 | 10 | 1644 |
| 2011-2012 | 1733 | 1960 | 1 | 1476 |
| 2012-2013 | 1787 | 2042 | 2 | 1585 |

## IV.B.3 Equivalency of Topics

At Tier I, each student is presented with a rhetorical task (described above) and a topic. Topics typically take the form of a paragraph or two excerpted from a larger text. Although each discusses a topic appropriate for a narrow range of academic specializations (e.g., global pollution, privacy, population trends), each is chosen to allow the greatest possibility of writers’ intellectual access without being so broad as to be decidedly non-academic. The table below examines the Pass, Possible Distinction, and In Progress rates for the timed writing topics at Tier I. Because there are many topics, the populations represented by each are fewer than in other analyses. The tables in the following sections continue analyses through Tier II the better to understand whether differences in performance by topic, gender, or L1 might prove significant factors.

For readability purposes, a brief description of each topic is provided below, followed by discussions of student performances on each. Topic numbers marked with an asterisk are new for this biennium. In the tables below, a missing topic number indicates that the topic was not represented in this cohort’s data.

Brief Descriptions of Tier I Topics

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Topic Number | Brief Description |
| 2 | The results of schools failing children |
| 3 | Zoos are not necessarily good for animals. |
| 4 | Reading and television are different ways to consume information. |
| 6 | High school wrestling is gender exclusive |
| 7 | Taking photos of private citizens without their consent is unethical. |
| 8 | “Schools for Scandal” |
| 9 | If the American lifestyle was adopted across the globe, it would cause many environmental problems. |
| 10 | The American idea of success is the acquisition of goods. |
| 12 | American employees are overworked and underpaid. |
| 14 | Malls lead to consumerism. |
| 19 | Higher education in the U.S. shows a strong class bias. |
| 30 | The internet makes the research process appear easy. |
| 33 | Video games can be used as a learning tool. |
| 34 | Personal values vary by region. |
| 35 | The U.S. requires a living wage. |
| 36 | Higher education has been “McDonaldized” for efficiency. |
| 37 | The U.S. is a nation of immigrants. |
| 38 | Words and experiences are not equally weighted when discussing climate change. |
| 39 | Multitasking is inefficient. |
| 40 | Search engines and databases reduce the need for humans to remember facts. |
| 41 | Reading hypertext can result in a shorter attention span. |
| 42 | Small actions can help reduce the effects of climate change. |
| 43 | Wide-scale geoengineering may be necessary to reduce the effects of climate change. |
| 44 | Natural evolution of intelligence vs. augmenting intelligence |
| 45 | Reading hypertext is different from reading traditional texts. |
| 46 | Government surveillance is widespread, but its ethics are undetermined. |
| 47 | Family socioeconomic standing is a better predictor of success than test scores. |
| 48 | Cigarette advertising can be unethical. |
| 49 | Shopping malls encourage consumerist culture. |
| 50 | Cell phones have changed the relationships of parents and their children. |
| 51 | If the world’s population demographics were represented by 100 people… (Statistics as infographic) |
| 52 | If the world’s population demographics were represented by 100 people… (Statistics as text) |
| 53 | The results of high stakes testing are not representative of student ability. |
| 54 | The U.S. drug war has resulted in a high incarceration rate, which is disproportionate between racial groups. |
| 55 | The global food system must change to accommodate continued population growth. |
| 56 | Income inequality in the U.S. is growing rapidly. |
| 57\* | The United States imprisons and executes too many people |
| 58\* | Imprisonment in the United States is no longer intended to rehabilitate |
| 59\* | Incarcerating mothers for minor offenses harms families |
| 60\* | A visual depiction of the most common first languages spoken around the world |
| 61\* | There is a correlation between family socioeconomic status, race identification and school district performance (Graph included with text) |
| 62\* | Jihadi ideology in Afghanistan originated with the Soviet invasion and was encouraged by American support |
| 63\* | Drone attacks by the United States have many innocent and unintended victims |
| 64\* | Malala Yousafzai reflects on the importance and danger of recording her story |

Tier I Ratings by Timed Writing Topic, 2015-2017, All Students

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | **Acceptable** | | | | | **Possible Distinction** | | | **In Progress** | | | Total | |
| Tier II |  | **Simple Pass** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Incomplete** |  | **Complete** | **Distinction** |  | **Complete** | **Incomplete** |  |
| Topic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 2 | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (66.7%) | 2 (66.7%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (0%) |
| 3 | 35 (67.3%) | 28 (53.8%) | 6 (11.5%) | 1 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (13.5%) | 5 (9.6%) | 2 (3.8%) | 10 (19.2%) | 6 (11.5%) | 4 (7.7%) | 52 (0.5%) |
| 4 | 2 (25%) | 2 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (75%) | 5 (62.5%) | 1 (12.5%) | 8 (0.1%) |
| 5 | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 6 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 7 | 3 (100%) | 2 (66.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (0%) |
| 8 | 1 (33.3%) | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (66.7%) | 2 (66.7%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (0%) |
| 9 | 147 (69.7%) | 125 (59.2%) | 18 (8.5%) | 4 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 20 (9.5%) | 15 (7.1%) | 2 (0.9%) | 44 (20.9%) | 35 (16.6%) | 9 (4.3%) | 211 (1.9%) |
| 12 | 48 (55.2%) | 36 (41.4%) | 10 (11.5%) | 2 (2.3%) | 0 (0%) | 16 (18.4%) | 9 (10.3%) | 3 (3.4%) | 23 (26.4%) | 19 (21.8%) | 2 (2.3%) | 87 (0.8%) |
| 14 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 21 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 26 | 8 (88.9%) | 6 (66.7%) | 2 (22.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (11.1%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (11.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (0.1%) |
| 27 | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 29 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 30 | 4 (100%) | 3 (75%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (0%) |
| 33 | 67 (63.2%) | 55 (51.9%) | 9 (8.5%) | 3 (2.8%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (9.4%) | 5 (4.7%) | 0 (0%) | 29 (27.4%) | 23 (21.7%) | 6 (5.7%) | 106 (1%) |
| 34 | 6 (85.7%) | 6 (85.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (14.3%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (14.3%) | 7 (0.1%) |
| 35 | 2 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0%) |
| 36 | 3 (100%) | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (0%) |
| 37 | 1 (33.3%) | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (33.3%) | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (33.3%) | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (0%) |
| 38 | 59 (54.6%) | 51 (47.2%) | 7 (6.5%) | 1 (0.9%) | 0 (0%) | 18 (16.7%) | 10 (9.3%) | 3 (2.8%) | 31 (28.7%) | 24 (22.2%) | 7 (6.5%) | 108 (1%) |
| 39 | 66 (63.5%) | 53 (51%) | 10 (9.6%) | 3 (2.9%) | 0 (0%) | 14 (13.5%) | 7 (6.7%) | 2 (1.9%) | 24 (23.1%) | 21 (20.2%) | 3 (2.9%) | 104 (1%) |
| 40 | 61 (58.7%) | 49 (47.1%) | 9 (8.7%) | 3 (2.9%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (10.6%) | 6 (5.8%) | 2 (1.9%) | 32 (30.8%) | 25 (24%) | 5 (4.8%) | 104 (1%) |
| 41 | 38 (53.5%) | 33 (46.5%) | 4 (5.6%) | 1 (1.4%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (12.7%) | 6 (8.5%) | 3 (4.2%) | 24 (33.8%) | 17 (23.9%) | 7 (9.9%) | 71 (0.7%) |
| 42 | 35 (52.2%) | 30 (44.8%) | 4 (6%) | 1 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (14.9%) | 7 (10.4%) | 3 (4.5%) | 22 (32.8%) | 14 (20.9%) | 7 (10.4%) | 67 (0.6%) |
| 43 | 57 (53.8%) | 44 (41.5%) | 11 (10.4%) | 2 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (6.6%) | 3 (2.8%) | 2 (1.9%) | 41 (38.7%) | 23 (21.7%) | 17 (16%) | 106 (1%) |
| 44 | 9 (56.3%) | 6 (37.5%) | 3 (18.8%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (6.3%) | 1 (6.3%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (37.5%) | 3 (18.8%) | 3 (18.8%) | 16 (0.1%) |
| 45 | 145 (59.2%) | 126 (51.4%) | 14 (5.7%) | 5 (2%) | 0 (0%) | 26 (10.6%) | 17 (6.9%) | 3 (1.2%) | 74 (30.2%) | 60 (24.5%) | 12 (4.9%) | 245 (2.3%) |
| 46 | 37 (71.2%) | 34 (65.4%) | 2 (3.8%) | 1 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (7.7%) | 2 (3.8%) | 1 (1.9%) | 11 (21.2%) | 8 (15.4%) | 1 (1.9%) | 52 (0.5%) |
| 47 | 492 (58.5%) | 407 (48.4%) | 69 (8.2%) | 16 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 68 (8.1%) | 44 (5.2%) | 12 (1.4%) | 280 (33.3%) | 211 (25.1%) | 64 (7.6%) | 841 (7.7%) |
| 48 | 35 (71.4%) | 32 (65.3%) | 2 (4.1%) | 1 (2%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (8.2%) | 3 (6.1%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (20.4%) | 10 (20.4%) | 0 (0%) | 49 (0.5%) |
| 49 | 117 (62.6%) | 97 (51.9%) | 16 (8.6%) | 4 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 13 (7%) | 9 (4.8%) | 2 (1.1%) | 57 (30.5%) | 43 (23%) | 12 (6.4%) | 187 (1.7%) |
| 50 | 220 (69.2%) | 187 (58.8%) | 25 (7.9%) | 8 (2.5%) | 0 (0%) | 22 (6.9%) | 18 (5.7%) | 0 (0%) | 76 (23.9%) | 50 (15.7%) | 24 (7.5%) | 318 (2.9%) |
| 51 | 269 (56%) | 233 (48.5%) | 29 (6%) | 6 (1.3%) | 1 (0.2%) | 20 (4.2%) | 10 (2.1%) | 3 (0.6%) | 190 (39.6%) | 145 (30.2%) | 40 (8.3%) | 480 (4.4%) |
| 52 | 295 (61%) | 236 (48.8%) | 40 (8.3%) | 18 (3.7%) | 1 (0.2%) | 28 (5.8%) | 13 (2.7%) | 2 (0.4%) | 161 (33.3%) | 129 (26.7%) | 28 (5.8%) | 484 (4.5%) |
| 53 | 770 (63.2%) | 668 (54.8%) | 84 (6.9%) | 15 (1.2%) | 3 (0.2%) | 102 (8.4%) | 64 (5.3%) | 16 (1.3%) | 346 (28.4%) | 272 (22.3%) | 72 (5.9%) | 1218 (11.2%) |
| 54 | 599 (60.2%) | 486 (48.8%) | 94 (9.4%) | 18 (1.8%) | 1 (0.1%) | 66 (6.6%) | 41 (4.1%) | 9 (0.9%) | 330 (33.2%) | 248 (24.9%) | 76 (7.6%) | 995 (9.2%) |
| 55 | 532 (59%) | 433 (48%) | 78 (8.6%) | 19 (2.1%) | 2 (0.2%) | 99 (11%) | 60 (6.7%) | 14 (1.6%) | 270 (29.9%) | 210 (23.3%) | 56 (6.2%) | 902 (8.3%) |
| 56 | 453 (59.1%) | 373 (48.7%) | 62 (8.1%) | 16 (2.1%) | 2 (0.3%) | 54 (7%) | 29 (3.8%) | 12 (1.6%) | 259 (33.8%) | 196 (25.6%) | 58 (7.6%) | 766 (7.1%) |
| 57 | 380 (60%) | 332 (52.4%) | 41 (6.5%) | 3 (0.5%) | 4 (0.6%) | 42 (6.6%) | 21 (3.3%) | 7 (1.1%) | 211 (33.3%) | 163 (25.8%) | 45 (7.1%) | 633 (5.8%) |
| 58 | 336 (59.1%) | 293 (51.5%) | 37 (6.5%) | 6 (1.1%) | 0 (0%) | 42 (7.4%) | 28 (4.9%) | 4 (0.7%) | 191 (33.6%) | 141 (24.8%) | 47 (8.3%) | 569 (5.2%) |
| 59 | 282 (67%) | 233 (55.3%) | 37 (8.8%) | 11 (2.6%) | 1 (0.2%) | 24 (5.7%) | 12 (2.9%) | 6 (1.4%) | 115 (27.3%) | 84 (20%) | 29 (6.9%) | 421 (3.9%) |
| 60 | 147 (57.6%) | 121 (47.5%) | 20 (7.8%) | 6 (2.4%) | 0 (0%) | 13 (5.1%) | 7 (2.7%) | 5 (2%) | 95 (37.3%) | 71 (27.8%) | 22 (8.6%) | 255 (2.3%) |
| 61 | 354 (73.6%) | 312 (64.9%) | 36 (7.5%) | 4 (0.8%) | 2 (0.4%) | 59 (12.3%) | 41 (8.5%) | 4 (0.8%) | 68 (14.1%) | 52 (10.8%) | 15 (3.1%) | 481 (4.4%) |
| 62 | 262 (65.7%) | 220 (55.1%) | 31 (7.8%) | 11 (2.8%) | 0 (0%) | 55 (13.8%) | 31 (7.8%) | 9 (2.3%) | 82 (20.6%) | 66 (16.5%) | 16 (4%) | 399 (3.7%) |
| 63 | 169 (79%) | 145 (67.8%) | 20 (9.3%) | 4 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (5.1%) | 10 (4.7%) | 0 (0%) | 34 (15.9%) | 26 (12.1%) | 8 (3.7%) | 214 (2%) |
| 64 | 136 (66.3%) | 115 (56.1%) | 18 (8.8%) | 3 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 22 (10.7%) | 16 (7.8%) | 3 (1.5%) | 47 (22.9%) | 38 (18.5%) | 8 (3.9%) | 205 (1.9%) |
| All Students | 7020 (62.1%) | 5893 (52.2%) | 896 (7.9%) | 0 (1.9%) | 20 (0.2%) | 941 (8.3%) | 573 (5.1%) | 147 (1.3%) | 3327 (29.4%) | 2545 (22.5%) | 724 (6.4%) | 11298 (100%) |
| 1 Percentages in the “Total” column indicate this prompt’s proportion of all Tier I exams in this cohort | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Each biennium sees a handful of students completing writing portfolios several years after starting. Although several of the topics in the list above are no longer used, some students finishing during the 2015-2017 reporting period had already taken timed writings responding to earlier prompts.

The prompts administered most often (53, 54, 55, 56, 57 and 58, each representing 5% or more of the timed writing exams submitted) generally showed some deviation from the average performance across all tasks, with more In Progress ratings primarily at the expense of Possible Distinctions. Prompt 61 (a statement about the frequent correlation between school district performance and the race and socioeconomic background of local families, accompanied by a complex graph) produced a greater rate of Acceptable and Possible Distinction ratings. While only one in twenty students responded to this prompt, they may have been primed to respond to this type of prompt by the increase in graphical data representation in textbooks and popular media. Additionally, students on prompts 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, and 61 were almost universally given rhetorical frame C (“Choose and Resolve”) or D (“Approach the Problem”), both of which require the writer to create an argument in response to the text, rather than simply defend or rebut an argument in the text. In that prompt 61 was the only one of these that featured data visualization, future research should investigate whether students are better able to create their own arguments when given graphical data from which to build.

During the 2013-2015 reporting period, prompts 51 and 52 (both presenting statistical data in infographic and table form) were noteworthy for producing significantly fewer Acceptable ratings and more Needs Work ratings. Those were the first prompts that were not strictly text-based, administered to a relatively small population. While they were not among the most often used prompts during this biennium, their rates of Acceptable, Possible Distinction and In Progress (Needs Work) ratings have shifted to those similar to the university average across all tasks.

Tier I Ratings, Ranked by Needs Work, Males Only: 2015-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | **Acceptable** | | | | | | **Possible Distinction** | | | | **Needs Work** | | | Total | |
| Tier II |  | **Simple Pass** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | | **Incomplete** |  | **Complete** | **Distinction** | |  | **Complete** | **Incomplete** |  |
| Topic |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 2 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0%) |
| 3 | 10 (62.5%) | 8 (50%) | 2 (12.5%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 1 (6.3%) | 1 (6.3%) | 0 (0%) | | 5 (31.3%) | 2 (12.5%) | 3 (18.8%) | 16 (0.3%) |
| 4 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (0.1%) |
| 7 | 2 (100%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0%) |
| 8 | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0%) |
| 9 | 74 (74.7%) | 65 (65.7%) | 7 (7.1%) | | 2 (2%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (9.1%) | 6 (6.1%) | | 1 (1%) | 16 (16.2%) | 13 (13.1%) | 3 (3%) | 99 (1.9%) |
| 12 | 14 (41.2%) | 11 (32.4%) | 3 (8.8%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (17.6%) | 3 (8.8%) | | 0 (0%) | 14 (41.2%) | 12 (35.3%) | 1 (2.9%) | 34 (0.7%) |
| 26 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 27 | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 29 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 30 | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 33 | 28 (65.1%) | 22 (51.2%) | 5 (11.6%) | | 1 (2.3%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (7%) | 2 (4.7%) | | 0 (0%) | 12 (27.9%) | 7 (16.3%) | 5 (11.6%) | 43 (0.8%) |
| 34 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 35 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 36 | 2 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0%) |
| 38 | 19 (47.5%) | 17 (42.5%) | 2 (5%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (25%) | 3 (7.5%) | | 2 (5%) | 11 (27.5%) | 6 (15%) | 5 (12.5%) | 40 (0.8%) |
| 39 | 23 (65.7%) | 19 (54.3%) | 2 (5.7%) | | 2 (5.7%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (8.6%) | 1 (2.9%) | | 1 (2.9%) | 9 (25.7%) | 7 (20%) | 2 (5.7%) | 35 (0.7%) |
| 40 | 21 (53.8%) | 19 (48.7%) | 1 (2.6%) | | 1 (2.6%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (12.8%) | 2 (5.1%) | | 1 (2.6%) | 13 (33.3%) | 8 (20.5%) | 4 (10.3%) | 39 (0.8%) |
| 41 | 17 (51.5%) | 16 (48.5%) | 1 (3%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (9.1%) | 1 (3%) | | 2 (6.1%) | 13 (39.4%) | 9 (27.3%) | 4 (12.1%) | 33 (0.6%) |
| 42 | 13 (52%) | 12 (48%) | 1 (4%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (12%) | 2 (8%) | | 1 (4%) | 9 (36%) | 6 (24%) | 2 (8%) | 25 (0.5%) |
| 43 | 26 (57.8%) | 21 (46.7%) | 4 (8.9%) | | 1 (2.2%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (8.9%) | 3 (6.7%) | | 1 (2.2%) | 15 (33.3%) | 8 (17.8%) | 6 (13.3%) | 45 (0.9%) |
| 44 | 4 (50%) | 2 (25%) | 2 (25%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (12.5%) | 1 (12.5%) | | 0 (0%) | 3 (37.5%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (37.5%) | 8 (0.2%) |
| 45 | 74 (54.8%) | 65 (48.1%) | 7 (5.2%) | | 2 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 13 (9.6%) | 11 (8.1%) | | 1 (0.7%) | 48 (35.6%) | 41 (30.4%) | 6 (4.4%) | 135 (2.7%) |
| 46 | 16 (84.2%) | 14 (73.7%) | 1 (5.3%) | | 1 (5.3%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (10.5%) | 1 (5.3%) | | 0 (0%) | 1 (5.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 19 (0.4%) |
| 47 | 241 (57.4%) | 201 (47.9%) | 32 (7.6%) | | 8 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 28 (6.7%) | 21 (5%) | | 3 (0.7%) | 151 (36%) | 112 (26.7%) | 36 (8.6%) | 420 (8.3%) |
| 48 | 9 (60%) | 8 (53.3%) | 0 (0%) | | 1 (6.7%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (20%) | 2 (13.3%) | | 0 (0%) | 3 (20%) | 3 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 15 (0.3%) |
| 49 | 44 (56.4%) | 38 (48.7%) | 5 (6.4%) | | 1 (1.3%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (7.7%) | 5 (6.4%) | | 1 (1.3%) | 28 (35.9%) | 26 (33.3%) | 2 (2.6%) | 78 (1.5%) |
| 50 | 83 (65.9%) | 73 (57.9%) | 6 (4.8%) | | 4 (3.2%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (8.7%) | 7 (5.6%) | | 0 (0%) | 32 (25.4%) | 22 (17.5%) | 9 (7.1%) | 126 (2.5%) |
| 51 | 114 (54%) | 102 (48.3%) | 9 (4.3%) | | 3 (1.4%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (2.4%) | 2 (0.9%) | | 1 (0.5%) | 92 (43.6%) | 69 (32.7%) | 20 (9.5%) | 211 (4.2%) |
| 52 | 136 (58.4%) | 108 (46.4%) | 21 (9%) | | 7 (3%) | 0 (0%) | 14 (6%) | 7 (3%) | | 1 (0.4%) | 83 (35.6%) | 65 (27.9%) | 16 (6.9%) | 233 (4.6%) |
| 53 | 376 (61.2%) | 333 (54.2%) | 35 (5.7%) | | 6 (1%) | 2 (0.3%) | 28 (4.6%) | 20 (3.3%) | | 2 (0.3%) | 210 (34.2%) | 164 (26.7%) | 44 (7.2%) | 614 (12.1%) |
| 54 | 240 (55.2%) | 198 (45.5%) | 35 (8%) | | 6 (1.4%) | 1 (0.2%) | 27 (6.2%) | 15 (3.4%) | | 8 (1.8%) | 168 (38.6%) | 124 (28.5%) | 44 (10.1%) | 435 (8.6%) |
| 55 | 208 (55%) | 176 (46.6%) | 24 (6.3%) | | 7 (1.9%) | 1 (0.3%) | 38 (10.1%) | 24 (6.3%) | | 6 (1.6%) | 131 (34.7%) | 100 (26.5%) | 30 (7.9%) | 378 (7.4%) |
| 56 | 205 (55.1%) | 181 (48.7%) | 18 (4.8%) | | 6 (1.6%) | 0 (0%) | 24 (6.5%) | 14 (3.8%) | | 6 (1.6%) | 143 (38.4%) | 101 (27.2%) | 38 (10.2%) | 372 (7.3%) |
| 57 | 173 (56%) | 154 (49.8%) | 16 (5.2%) | | 2 (0.6%) | 1 (0.3%) | 23 (7.4%) | 11 (3.6%) | | 5 (1.6%) | 113 (36.6%) | 86 (27.8%) | 27 (8.7%) | 309 (6.1%) |
| 58 | 163 (58.2%) | 141 (50.4%) | 18 (6.4%) | | 4 (1.4%) | 0 (0%) | 21 (7.5%) | 17 (6.1%) | | 2 (0.7%) | 96 (34.3%) | 67 (23.9%) | 27 (9.6%) | 280 (5.5%) |
| 59 | 130 (63.1%) | 108 (52.4%) | 16 (7.8%) | | 5 (2.4%) | 1 (0.5%) | 13 (6.3%) | 6 (2.9%) | | 4 (1.9%) | 63 (30.6%) | 47 (22.8%) | 15 (7.3%) | 206 (4.1%) |
| 60 | 70 (53.4%) | 55 (42%) | 14 (10.7%) | | 1 (0.8%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (7.6%) | 6 (4.6%) | | 4 (3.1%) | 51 (38.9%) | 35 (26.7%) | 16 (12.2%) | 131 (2.6%) |
| 61 | 177 (73.4%) | 159 (66%) | 14 (5.8%) | | 3 (1.2%) | 1 (0.4%) | 25 (10.4%) | 15 (6.2%) | | 2 (0.8%) | 39 (16.2%) | 30 (12.4%) | 9 (3.7%) | 241 (4.7%) |
| 62 | 129 (67.2%) | 111 (57.8%) | 14 (7.3%) | | 4 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 21 (10.9%) | 12 (6.3%) | | 2 (1%) | 42 (21.9%) | 35 (18.2%) | 7 (3.6%) | 192 (3.8%) |
| 63 | 86 (81.1%) | 72 (67.9%) | 11 (10.4%) | | 3 (2.8%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (5.7%) | 6 (5.7%) | | 0 (0%) | 14 (13.2%) | 9 (8.5%) | 5 (4.7%) | 106 (2.1%) |
| 64 | 80 (65%) | 68 (55.3%) | 11 (8.9%) | | 1 (0.8%) | 0 (0%) | 12 (9.8%) | 11 (8.9%) | | 0 (0%) | 31 (25.2%) | 23 (18.7%) | 7 (5.7%) | 123 (2.4%) |
| 65 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| All Topics (Male Students) | 3091 (59.6%) | 2651 (51.1%) | 347 (6.7%) | | 85 (1.6%) | 8 (0.2%) | 389 (7.5%) | 244 (4.7%) | | 60 (1.2%) | 1705 (32.9%) | 1276 (24.6%) | 403 (7.8%) | 5187 (45.9%) |
| All Topics (All Students) | 7020 (62.1%) | 5893 (52.2%) | 896 (7.9%) | | 0 (1.9%) | 20 (0.2%) | 941 (8.3%) | 573 (5.1%) | | 147 (1.3%) | 3327 (29.4%) | 2545 (22.5%) | 724 (6.4%) | 11298 (100%) |

Historically, male students have performed below the university average on the timed writing portion, though not to a great degree. The performance gap in the 2015-2017 reporting period is largely attributed to 3% more In Progress ratings and nearly 3% fewer Acceptable ratings. Of the prompts used most often, male students received the greatest rate of In Progress ratings on prompts 54 and 56, each of which offer statistics regarding a social problem (unequal incarceration rates between racial groups and the growing income gap, respectively) without an explicit argument.

Tier I Ratings, Ranked by Needs Work, Females Only, 2015-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | **Acceptable** | | | | | | **Possible Distinction** | | | **In Progress** | | | Total | |
| Tier II |  | **Simple Pass** | | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Incomplete** |  | **Complete** | **Distinction** |  | **Complete** | **Incomplete** |  |
| Topic |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 3 | 25 (69.4%) | 20 (55.6%) | | 4 (11.1%) | 1 (2.8%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (16.7%) | 4 (11.1%) | 2 (5.6%) | 5 (13.9%) | 4 (11.1%) | 1 (2.8%) | 36 (0.6%) |
| 4 | 2 (50%) | 2 (50%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (50%) | 1 (25%) | 1 (25%) | 4 (0.1%) |
| 5 | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 6 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 7 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 8 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 9 | 73 (65.2%) | 60 (53.6%) | | 11 (9.8%) | 2 (1.8%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (9.8%) | 9 (8%) | 1 (0.9%) | 28 (25%) | 22 (19.6%) | 6 (5.4%) | 112 (2%) |
| 12 | 34 (64.2%) | 25 (47.2%) | | 7 (13.2%) | 2 (3.8%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (18.9%) | 6 (11.3%) | 3 (5.7%) | 9 (17%) | 7 (13.2%) | 1 (1.9%) | 53 (0.9%) |
| 14 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 21 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 26 | 6 (85.7%) | 5 (71.4%) | | 1 (14.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (14.3%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (14.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (0.1%) |
| 30 | 3 (100%) | 3 (100%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (0.1%) |
| 33 | 38 (61.3%) | 32 (51.6%) | | 4 (6.5%) | 2 (3.2%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (11.3%) | 3 (4.8%) | 0 (0%) | 17 (27.4%) | 16 (25.8%) | 1 (1.6%) | 62 (1.1%) |
| 34 | 5 (83.3%) | 5 (83.3%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (16.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (16.7%) | 6 (0.1%) |
| 35 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 36 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0%) |
| 37 | 1 (33.3%) | 1 (33.3%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (33.3%) | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (33.3%) | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (0.1%) |
| 38 | 40 (58.8%) | 34 (50%) | | 5 (7.4%) | 1 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (11.8%) | 7 (10.3%) | 1 (1.5%) | 20 (29.4%) | 18 (26.5%) | 2 (2.9%) | 68 (1.2%) |
| 39 | 42 (61.8%) | 34 (50%) | 7 (10.3%) | | 1 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (16.2%) | 6 (8.8%) | 1 (1.5%) | 15 (22.1%) | 14 (20.6%) | 1 (1.5%) | 68 (1.2%) |
| 40 | 40 (61.5%) | 30 (46.2%) | 8 (12.3%) | | 2 (3.1%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (9.2%) | 4 (6.2%) | 1 (1.5%) | 19 (29.2%) | 17 (26.2%) | 1 (1.5%) | 65 (1.1%) |
| 41 | 21 (56.8%) | 17 (45.9%) | 3 (8.1%) | | 1 (2.7%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (13.5%) | 4 (10.8%) | 1 (2.7%) | 11 (29.7%) | 8 (21.6%) | 3 (8.1%) | 37 (0.7%) |
| 42 | 21 (52.5%) | 17 (42.5%) | 3 (7.5%) | | 1 (2.5%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (15%) | 4 (10%) | 2 (5%) | 13 (32.5%) | 8 (20%) | 5 (12.5%) | 40 (0.7%) |
| 43 | 31 (50.8%) | 23 (37.7%) | 7 (11.5%) | | 1 (1.6%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (4.9%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.6%) | 26 (42.6%) | 15 (24.6%) | 11 (18%) | 61 (1.1%) |
| 44 | 5 (62.5%) | 4 (50%) | 1 (12.5%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (37.5%) | 3 (37.5%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (0.1%) |
| 45 | 71 (64.5%) | 61 (55.5%) | 7 (6.4%) | | 3 (2.7%) | 0 (0%) | 13 (11.8%) | 6 (5.5%) | 2 (1.8%) | 26 (23.6%) | 19 (17.3%) | 6 (5.5%) | 110 (1.9%) |
| 46 | 21 (63.6%) | 20 (60.6%) | 1 (3%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (6.1%) | 1 (3%) | 1 (3%) | 10 (30.3%) | 8 (24.2%) | 1 (3%) | 33 (0.6%) |
| 47 | 250 (60%) | 206 (49.4%) | 36 (8.6%) | | 8 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 40 (9.6%) | 23 (5.5%) | 9 (2.2%) | 126 (30.2%) | 97 (23.3%) | 27 (6.5%) | 417 (7.3%) |
| 48 | 26 (76.5%) | 24 (70.6%) | 2 (5.9%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (2.9%) | 1 (2.9%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (20.6%) | 7 (20.6%) | 0 (0%) | 34 (0.6%) |
| 49 | 73 (67.6%) | 59 (54.6%) | 11 (10.2%) | | 3 (2.8%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (6.5%) | 4 (3.7%) | 1 (0.9%) | 28 (25.9%) | 16 (14.8%) | 10 (9.3%) | 108 (1.9%) |
| 50 | 136 (71.2%) | 113 (59.2%) | 19 (9.9%) | | 4 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (5.8%) | 11 (5.8%) | 0 (0%) | 44 (23%) | 28 (14.7%) | 15 (7.9%) | 191 (3.4%) |
| 51 | 151 (57.6%) | 130 (49.6%) | 19 (7.3%) | | 2 (0.8%) | 0 (0%) | 14 (5.3%) | 8 (3.1%) | 2 (0.8%) | 96 (36.6%) | 74 (28.2%) | 20 (7.6%) | 262 (4.6%) |
| 52 | 158 (63.7%) | 127 (51.2%) | 19 (7.7%) | | 11 (4.4%) | 1 (0.4%) | 14 (5.6%) | 6 (2.4%) | 1 (0.4%) | 76 (30.6%) | 63 (25.4%) | 11 (4.4%) | 248 (4.4%) |
| 53 | 390 (65.3%) | 331 (55.4%) | 49 (8.2%) | | 9 (1.5%) | 1 (0.2%) | 73 (12.2%) | 43 (7.2%) | 14 (2.3%) | 134 (22.4%) | 107 (17.9%) | 27 (4.5%) | 597 (10.5%) |
| 54 | 353 (64.4%) | 282 (51.5%) | 59 (10.8%) | | 12 (2.2%) | 0 (0%) | 38 (6.9%) | 25 (4.6%) | 1 (0.2%) | 157 (28.6%) | 120 (21.9%) | 31 (5.7%) | 548 (9.6%) |
| 55 | 321 (62.1%) | 255 (49.3%) | 53 (10.3%) | | 12 (2.3%) | 1 (0.2%) | 61 (11.8%) | 36 (7%) | 8 (1.5%) | 135 (26.1%) | 108 (20.9%) | 24 (4.6%) | 517 (9.1%) |
| 56 | 246 (62.9%) | 190 (48.6%) | 44 (11.3%) | | 10 (2.6%) | 2 (0.5%) | 30 (7.7%) | 15 (3.8%) | 6 (1.5%) | 115 (29.4%) | 94 (24%) | 20 (5.1%) | 391 (6.9%) |
| 57 | 206 (64.2%) | 177 (55.1%) | 25 (7.8%) | | 1 (0.3%) | 3 (0.9%) | 19 (5.9%) | 10 (3.1%) | 2 (0.6%) | 96 (29.9%) | 76 (23.7%) | 17 (5.3%) | 321 (5.6%) |
| 58 | 170 (59.9%) | 150 (52.8%) | 18 (6.3%) | | 2 (0.7%) | 0 (0%) | 21 (7.4%) | 11 (3.9%) | 2 (0.7%) | 93 (32.7%) | 72 (25.4%) | 20 (7%) | 284 (5%) |
| 59 | 147 (70.3%) | 121 (57.9%) | 20 (9.6%) | | 6 (2.9%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (4.8%) | 6 (2.9%) | 2 (1%) | 52 (24.9%) | 37 (17.7%) | 14 (6.7%) | 209 (3.7%) |
| 60 | 76 (61.8%) | 65 (52.8%) | 6 (4.9%) | | 5 (4.1%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (2.4%) | 1 (0.8%) | 1 (0.8%) | 44 (35.8%) | 36 (29.3%) | 6 (4.9%) | 123 (2.2%) |
| 61 | 173 (73.6%) | 149 (63.4%) | 22 (9.4%) | | 1 (0.4%) | 1 (0.4%) | 34 (14.5%) | 26 (11.1%) | 2 (0.9%) | 28 (11.9%) | 21 (8.9%) | 6 (2.6%) | 235 (4.1%) |
| 62 | 125 (64.1%) | 102 (52.3%) | 16 (8.2%) | | 7 (3.6%) | 0 (0%) | 31 (15.9%) | 18 (9.2%) | 7 (3.6%) | 39 (20%) | 30 (15.4%) | 9 (4.6%) | 195 (3.4%) |
| 63 | 83 (78.3%) | 73 (68.9%) | 9 (8.5%) | | 1 (0.9%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (3.8%) | 3 (2.8%) | 0 (0%) | 19 (17.9%) | 16 (15.1%) | 3 (2.8%) | 106 (1.9%) |
| 64 | 51 (68%) | 43 (57.3%) | 7 (9.3%) | | 1 (1.3%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (13.3%) | 5 (6.7%) | 3 (4%) | 14 (18.7%) | 14 (18.7%) | 0 (0%) | 75 (1.3%) |
| 65 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| All Topics (Female Students) | 3866 (64.4%) | 3195 (53.2%) | 538 (9%) | | 122 (2%) | 11 (0.2%) | 541 (9%) | 323 (5.4%) | 86 (1.4%) | 1588 (26.5%) | 1243 (20.7%) | 313 (5.2%) | 6003 (53.1%) |
| All Topics (All Students) | 7020 (62.1%) | 5893 (52.2%) | 896 (7.9%) | | 0 (1.9%) | 20 (0.2%) | 941 (8.3%) | 573 (5.1%) | 147 (1.3%) | 3327 (29.4%) | 2545 (22.5%) | 724 (6.4%) | 11298 (100%) |

### IV.B.3.a Multilingual Students Performance by Topic

The table below shows the performance of L2 on Tier I by the topics administered during the reporting period. As with the previous tables, this report adds the total number of students responding to each prompt in order the better to understand prompts that look to be problematic. Historically, L2 students have received fewer Pass ratings and more In Progress ratings at Tier I than their L1 peers due to the constraints of a timed writing exam.

Tier I Ratings, Ranked by Needs Work: L2 Students Only, 2005-2013

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | **Acceptable** | | | | | **Possible Distinction** | | | **Needs Work** | | | Total | |
| Tier II |  | **Simple Pass** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Incomplete** |  | **Complete** | **Distinction** |  | **Complete** | **Incomplete** |  |
| Topic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.1%) |
| 3 | 4 (57.1%) | 4 (57.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (14.3%) | 1 (14.3%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (28.6%) | 1 (14.3%) | 1 (14.3%) | 7 (0.4%) |
| 4 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.1%) |
| 5 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 6 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 7 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 8 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 9 | 19 (51.4%) | 15 (40.5%) | 3 (8.1%) | 1 (2.7%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (8.1%) | 2 (5.4%) | 0 (0%) | 15 (40.5%) | 11 (29.7%) | 4 (10.8%) | 37 (2%) |
| 10 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 11 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 12 | 4 (40%) | 1 (10%) | 2 (20%) | 1 (10%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (20%) | 1 (10%) | 1 (10%) | 4 (40%) | 4 (40%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (0.5%) |
| 13 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 14 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 15 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 16 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 17 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 18 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 19 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 20 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 21 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 22 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 23 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 24 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 25 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 26 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 27 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 28 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 29 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 30 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.1%) |
| 31 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 32 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 33 | 13 (61.9%) | 11 (52.4%) | 2 (9.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (4.8%) | 1 (4.8%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (33.3%) | 5 (23.8%) | 2 (9.5%) | 21 (1.1%) |
| 34 | 3 (75%) | 3 (75%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) | 4 (0.2%) |
| 35 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.1%) |
| 36 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 37 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.1%) |
| 38 | 7 (53.8%) | 7 (53.8%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (7.7%) | 1 (7.7%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (38.5%) | 5 (38.5%) | 0 (0%) | 13 (0.7%) |
| 39 | 7 (53.8%) | 4 (30.8%) | 3 (23.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (7.7%) | 1 (7.7%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (38.5%) | 4 (30.8%) | 1 (7.7%) | 13 (0.7%) |
| 40 | 5 (45.5%) | 3 (27.3%) | 2 (18.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (54.5%) | 4 (36.4%) | 2 (18.2%) | 11 (0.6%) |
| 41 | 3 (30%) | 3 (30%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (10%) | 1 (10%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (60%) | 4 (40%) | 2 (20%) | 10 (0.5%) |
| 42 | 4 (57.1%) | 3 (42.9%) | 1 (14.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (14.3%) | 1 (14.3%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (28.6%) | 1 (14.3%) | 1 (14.3%) | 7 (0.4%) |
| 43 | 5 (20.8%) | 5 (20.8%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 18 (75%) | 7 (29.2%) | 10 (41.7%) | 24 (1.3%) |
| 44 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (100%) | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 2 (0.1%) |
| 45 | 21 (56.8%) | 19 (51.4%) | 1 (2.7%) | 1 (2.7%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (5.4%) | 2 (5.4%) | 0 (0%) | 14 (37.8%) | 10 (27%) | 4 (10.8%) | 37 (2%) |
| 46 | 5 (83.3%) | 3 (50%) | 1 (16.7%) | 1 (16.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (16.7%) | 1 (16.7%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (0.3%) |
| 47 | 77 (56.6%) | 60 (44.1%) | 15 (11%) | 2 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (4.4%) | 3 (2.2%) | 3 (2.2%) | 53 (39%) | 35 (25.7%) | 18 (13.2%) | 136 (7.3%) |
| 48 | 6 (54.5%) | 6 (54.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (45.5%) | 5 (45.5%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (0.6%) |
| 49 | 18 (45%) | 14 (35%) | 3 (7.5%) | 1 (2.5%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (5%) | 2 (5%) | 0 (0%) | 20 (50%) | 16 (40%) | 4 (10%) | 40 (2.2%) |
| 50 | 52 (52.5%) | 48 (48.5%) | 1 (1%) | 3 (3%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (5.1%) | 3 (3%) | 0 (0%) | 42 (42.4%) | 27 (27.3%) | 15 (15.2%) | 99 (5.3%) |
| 51 | 31 (52.5%) | 28 (47.5%) | 2 (3.4%) | 1 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.7%) | 1 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) | 27 (45.8%) | 21 (35.6%) | 6 (10.2%) | 59 (3.2%) |
| 52 | 39 (52%) | 33 (44%) | 6 (8%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 35 (46.7%) | 24 (32%) | 10 (13.3%) | 75 (4%) |
| 53 | 100 (52.1%) | 87 (45.3%) | 12 (6.3%) | 1 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 14 (7.3%) | 10 (5.2%) | 3 (1.6%) | 78 (40.6%) | 52 (27.1%) | 26 (13.5%) | 192 (10.3%) |
| 54 | 70 (44.9%) | 54 (34.6%) | 11 (7.1%) | 5 (3.2%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (3.2%) | 1 (0.6%) | 1 (0.6%) | 81 (51.9%) | 58 (37.2%) | 23 (14.7%) | 156 (8.4%) |
| 55 | 79 (53.7%) | 65 (44.2%) | 11 (7.5%) | 3 (2%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (6.1%) | 5 (3.4%) | 2 (1.4%) | 59 (40.1%) | 39 (26.5%) | 20 (13.6%) | 147 (7.9%) |
| 56 | 62 (51.7%) | 51 (42.5%) | 8 (6.7%) | 2 (1.7%) | 1 (0.8%) | 4 (3.3%) | 3 (2.5%) | 1 (0.8%) | 54 (45%) | 38 (31.7%) | 15 (12.5%) | 120 (6.5%) |
| 57 | 62 (54.9%) | 56 (49.6%) | 4 (3.5%) | 1 (0.9%) | 1 (0.9%) | 5 (4.4%) | 3 (2.7%) | 1 (0.9%) | 46 (40.7%) | 34 (30.1%) | 11 (9.7%) | 113 (6.1%) |
| 58 | 49 (53.8%) | 41 (45.1%) | 8 (8.8%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (6.6%) | 2 (2.2%) | 1 (1.1%) | 36 (39.6%) | 18 (19.8%) | 18 (19.8%) | 91 (4.9%) |
| 59 | 43 (63.2%) | 33 (48.5%) | 6 (8.8%) | 3 (4.4%) | 1 (1.5%) | 2 (2.9%) | 2 (2.9%) | 0 (0%) | 23 (33.8%) | 14 (20.6%) | 9 (13.2%) | 68 (3.7%) |
| 60 | 13 (40.6%) | 10 (31.3%) | 3 (9.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (6.3%) | 1 (3.1%) | 1 (3.1%) | 17 (53.1%) | 9 (28.1%) | 8 (25%) | 32 (1.7%) |
| 61 | 66 (68.8%) | 62 (64.6%) | 4 (4.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (7.3%) | 6 (6.3%) | 0 (0%) | 23 (24%) | 15 (15.6%) | 8 (8.3%) | 96 (5.2%) |
| 62 | 51 (56.7%) | 43 (47.8%) | 6 (6.7%) | 2 (2.2%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (10%) | 6 (6.7%) | 2 (2.2%) | 30 (33.3%) | 22 (24.4%) | 8 (8.9%) | 90 (4.8%) |
| 63 | 42 (77.8%) | 37 (68.5%) | 4 (7.4%) | 1 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (3.7%) | 2 (3.7%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (18.5%) | 7 (13%) | 3 (5.6%) | 54 (2.9%) |
| 64 | 37 (62.7%) | 35 (59.3%) | 2 (3.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (8.5%) | 4 (6.8%) | 0 (0%) | 17 (28.8%) | 13 (22%) | 3 (5.1%) | 59 (3.2%) |
| All Topics (L2 Students) | 1048 (54.5%) | 890 (46.3%) | 123 (6.4%) | 30 (1.6%) | 5 (0.3%) | 99 (5.1%) | 66 (3.4%) | 16 (0.8%) | 774 (40.2%) | 529 (27.5%) | 240 (12.5%) | 1924 (17%) |
| All Topics (All Students) | 7020 (62.1%) | 5893 (52.2%) | 896 (7.9%) | 0 (1.9%) | 20 (0.2%) | 941 (8.3%) | 573 (5.1%) | 147 (1.3%) | 3327 (29.4%) | 2545 (22.5%) | 724 (6.4%) | 11298 (100%) |

L2 students received more formerly “Needs Work” ratings than their L1 peers, largely at the expense of Pass ratings. L2 students did receive Possible Distinction ratings at just over 5% of the time, which is only 3% lower than the university average. While this is a lower rate than previous biennium, that drop is similar to the all-university drop in Possible Distinction ratings. L2 students receive an overall Complete rating at similar rates to their L1 peers; though, significantly more L2 students ultimately receive an Incomplete, at nearly one-third of the Incompletes recorded this biennium. This gap might be partly attributable to the overall decrease in Incomplete ratings from previous biennium. The 2015-2017 reporting period saw 6.6% of all portfolios receiving an Incomplete rating (12.6% among L2 students), while the 2013-2015 period saw nearly 10% of all portfolios receive an Incomplete rating (about 25% among L2 students). As previously noted, the Incomplete rating is meant to provide greater support to students who need it in their disciplinary writing courses.

## IV.B.4 Cross-Disciplinarity of the Rating Corps

Forty-four (44) raters from 20 departments, offices, or centers participated in the Writing Portfolio Rating Corps in 2015-2017. This represents a significant decrease from one hundred and nine raters and thirty-five departments between 2013 and 2015. This decrease can be attributed to a number of factors such as competing demands for reader time. However, the greatest contributing factor is that more than twenty readers from the 2013-2015 biennium are no longer affiliated with WSU, and the time and experience necessary to train readers at both the Tier I and Tier II levels are significant barriers to replacement. Further, as noted in earlier sections, some students complete their portfolio tiers with a significant time gap, resulting in some readers being represented in biennia in which they did not work at WSU. As the Writing Program’s initiatives continue to close that gap, representation of raters is likewise diminishing.

Appendix A lists each participating rater by affiliation. For comparison between rating corps disciplinarity and the courses represented in Tier II, Appendix C lists the number of papers submitted during this biennium for each WSU course.

During this reporting period, papers came from just over 2,000 different WSU courses and were read and signed off by instructional faculty prior to student submission. Appendix C provides a list of courses and departments from which papers were submitted.

Tier I and II Rating Corps

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | English or Writing Program | Other | Total |
| 2015-2017 | 15 (34.1%) | 29 (65.9%) | 44 |

In previous biennia, recruitment efforts across campus have been successful in drawing a greater variety of disciplines. Students are the ultimate beneficiaries of faculty members’ investment and diversity in the writing assessment program, as timed writings and paper submissions can be more accurately judged within the context of the discipline they were produced.

## IV.B.5 Rating Sequences from Tier I to Tier II

Writing Portfolios pass through two sequences of evaluation and have the possibility of eight different rating combinations:

1. **Tier I Pass / Not Read:** The timed-writing essays are obviously passable and given that the three course writings have been judged acceptable by the instructors, the entire Portfolio is rated “Pass” without further reading. This is a “Simple Pass.”
2. **Tier I Pass/Tier II Pass:** The timed writing is judged an obvious “Pass,” but all three of the courses writings have been rated Outstanding; Tier II reading of the entire Portfolio rates it “Pass.” Or the timed writing is judged “Pass,” but all three course papers were marked OK by the Writing Assessment Office;i.e., the papers had not been rated by the course instructor; Tier II reading of the entire portfolio rates it “Pass.”
3. **Tier I Pass / Tier II Distinction:** The timed writing is judged no better or worse than an obvious “Pass,” but all three of the courses writings have been rated Outstanding; Tier II reading of the entire Portfolio rates it “Pass with Distinction.”
4. **Tier I Pass / Tier II Needs Work:** The timed writing is judged no better or worse than an obvious “Pass,” but upon consideration of the course writings, Tier II raters judge the entire Portfolio as “In Progress.” The Portfolio is rated at the Tier II level because none of the course papers was evaluated by the original instructors, resulting in an “Okay” designation by the Writing Assessment Office.
5. **Tier I Distinction? / Tier II Pass:** The timed writing is judged as especially distinguished, but upon consideration of the course writings, Tier II raters judge the entire Portfolio as “Pass.”
6. **Tier I Distinction? / Tier II Distinction:** The timed writing is judged as especially distinguished, and after consideration of the course writings, Tier II raters judge the entire Portfolio as “Pass with Distinction.”
7. **Tier I In Progress? / Tier II Pass:** The timed writing indicates that the writer may possibly be in need of additional coursework in writing, but upon consideration of the course papers, Tier II raters judge the entire Portfolio as “Pass.”
8. **Tier I In Progress? / Tier II In Progress:** The timed writing indicates that the writer may possibly be in need of additional coursework in writing, and upon consideration of the course papers, Tier II raters judge the entire Portfolio as “In Progress.”

### IV.B.5.a Rating Sequences from Tier I to Tier II Over Time

In general, students completing portfolios in the last biennium performed at similar rates to averages over the last four biennia. The growing increase of students receiving a Simple Pass rating each biennium has flatlined, suggesting that more students are using work signed by their instructors (rather than work with an OK rating from the Writing Program) and that such work is generally marked Acceptable more often than Outstanding (since several Outstanding ratings would prompt readers to read the packet for a possible Complete with Distinction rating).

Additionally, while a greater percentage of students are receiving a final Incomplete rating on their writing portfolio (which creates an additional graduation requirement for the student in the form of a one-credit writing tutorial, typically taken in support of a course bearing M [Writing in the Major] credit or a 3-credit instructional writing course), it is unclear from these numbers whether such a trend is the result of a decline in student writing quality or an increase in rater (and, thereby, M-course) expectations. This biennium’s students did not earn significantly more In Progress ratings at Tier I than the eight-year average; in fact, this biennium saw a slight decrease in the number of Tier I In Progress ratings since the 2013-2015 reporting period. In general, while one in five students each biennium has traditionally reverted to a Complete rating after an initial In Progress (or Needs Work), one in ten now receives an Incomplete overall, compared to roughly one in thirty in the last eight years. That Tier I ratings have remained fairly consistent and OK ratings have decreased heavily in that time does suggest that many students are submitting coursework marked “Acceptable” that does not demonstrate the strengths of writing that raters believe are necessary for upper-division coursework.

As final Incomplete ratings are increasing, so are final Distinction ratings following possible Distinction ratings at Tier I. Again, Tier I possible Distinction ratings have held fairly consistent over time, suggesting that more students are submitting “Outstanding” coursework, and that these writing skills translate well into the timed writing environment. That the rates of students receiving an initial Pass rating and a final Distinction rating are decreasing may support that suggestion, as the continued increase in Simple Pass ratings implies writing packets performing at the same range of acceptability as the timed writing.

Rating Sequences Over Time, All Students, 2007-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | **Acceptable** | | | | | **Possible Distinction** | | | **In Progress** | | | | Total |
| Tier II |  | **Simple Pass** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Incomplete** |  | **Complete** | **Distinction** |  | **Complete** | **Incomplete** |  | |
| 2007-2009 | 65.7%  (6477) | 13.37%  (1318) | 43.23%  (4361) | 3.34%  (329) | 5.77%  (569) | 9.3%  (917) | 7.36%  (726) | 1.21%  (119) | 24.99%  (2464) | 20.41%  (2012) | 3.05%  (301) | 9858 | |
| 2009-2011 | 68.71%  (7430) | 38.59%  (4173) | 21.34%  (2308) | 2.96%  (320) | 4.61%  (498) | 8.71%  (942) | 5.84%  (632) | 2.4%  (260) | 22.58%  (2442) | 17.3%  (1871) | 3.84%  (415) | 10814 | |
| 2011-2013 | 62.27%  (6660) | 49.86%  (5333) | 9.96%  (1065) | 2.17%  (232) | 2.11%  (226) | 8.34%  (892) | 5.16%  (552) | 2.82%  (302) | 29.39%  (3144) | 19.89%  (2127) | 8.92%  (954) | 10696 | |
| 2013-2015 | 61.53%  (6587) | 49.79%  (5331) | 9.8%  (1049) | 1.75%  (187) | 0.21%  (22) | 9.9%  (1060) | 5.46%  (585) | 4.35%  (466) | 28.54%  (3055) | 18.6%  (1991) | 9.69%  (1037) | 10706 | |
| 2015-2017 | 62.1% (7020) | 52.2% (5893) | 7.9% (896) | 1.9% (211) | 0.2% (20) | 8.3% (941) | 5.1% (573) | 1.3% (147) | 29.4% (3327) | 22.5% (2545) | 6.4% (724) | 11298 | |
| Overall | 64.1% (34082) | 35.9% (19069) | 23.4% (12433) | 2.4% (1268) | 2.5% (1312) | 8.9% (4738) | 4.1% (2188) | 1.7% (920) | 27% (14357) | 15.2% (8094) | 6.3% (3354) | 11298 | |

### IV.B.5.b Rating Sequences from Tier I to Tier II—Multilingual Writers

Although L2 writers have expressed concern that a rater’s knowledge of the writer’s primary-language status might affect Tier I results, raters are advised to read and rate timed writing exams without looking at the writer’s cover sheet. Raters use the cover sheet information when an exam shows signs that a student’s primary difficulty in writing is English-language famiiarity, rather than critical thinking, argument formation, or any other criteria. As a result, exams are rated based solely on the writing produced, maintaining the primary concern of whether or not the student is ready for upper-division writing in English.

L2 writers share few trends with their peers. Tier I performance rates over the last eight years are inconsistent from biennium to biennium. In that many L2 writers are also international students (23.1% during this reporting period), this wide variance may be the result of changing population traits over time. However, since the 2009-2011 reporting period, Tier II ratings have largely stabilized near the eight-year average. While that trend may be partially skewed by the fact that this reporting period saw more multilingual writers than any period in reporting history, it does suggest that multilingual writers are able to demonstrate their writing skills in contexts other than the timed writing. Further research will be necessary to determine whether writing center use, specific coursework, or major contributes at all to trend.

Rating Sequences Over Time, Multilingual Writers (L2), 2007-2017

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | **Acceptable** | | | | | **Possible Distinction** | | | **In Progress** | | | Total |
| Tier II |  | **Simple Pass** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Incomplete** |  | **Complete** | **Distinction** |  | **Complete** | **Incomplete** |  |
| 2007-2009 | 65.7%  (609) | 26.1%  (242) | 20.7%  (192) | 1.7%  (16) | 17.2%  (159) | 7.6%  (70) | 3.3%  (31) | 0.2%  (2) | 26.8%  (248) | 8.3%  (77) | 9.3%  (86) | 927 |
| 2009-2011 | 62.3%  (910) | 27.2%  (397) | 22.5%  (329) | 2.1%  (30) | 10.5%  (154) | 7.7%  (112) | 1.7%  (25) | 1%  (15) | 30%  (438) | 7.6%  (111) | 12.8%  (187) | 1460 |
| 2011-2013 | 48.3%  (775) | 0.6%  (10) | 41.6%  (667) | 1.1%  (18) | 5%  (80) | 5%  (81) | 3.3%  (53) | 1.2%  (19) | 46.7%  (749) | 24.5%  (393) | 21.4%  (344) | 1605 |
| 2013-2015 | 45.6%  (777) | 37.5%  (639) | 6.2%  (106) | 1.4%  (24) | 0.5%  (8) | 7.4%  (126) | 4.3%  (73) | 1.3%  (22) | 46.9%  (800) | 23.7%  (403) | 23.2%  (395) | 1704 |
| 2015-2017 | 54.5%  (1048) | 46.3%  (890) | 6.4%  (123) | 1.6%  (30) | 0.3%  (5) | 5.1%  (99) | 3.4%  (66) | 0.8%  (16) | 40.2%  (774) | 27.5%  (529) | 12.5%  (240) | 1924 |
| Overall | 54.1%  (4119) | 28.6%  (2178) | 18.6%  (1417) | 1.5%  (118) | 5.3%  (406) | 6.4%  (488) | 3.3%  (248) | 1%  (74) | 39.5%  (3009) | 19.9%  (1513) | 16.4%  (1252) | 7620 |

# Appendix A: 2015-2017 Portfolio Readers Listed by Department or Affiliation

Animal Sciences

Nelson, Mark

Anthropology

Baksi, Shila

Fisher, Philip

Monroe, Cara

Placek, Caitlyn

Snyder, Charles

Apparel, Merchandising, Design and Textiles

Salusso, Carol

Architecture

Micheletti, Steven

Rahmani, Ayad

Communication

Chalich, Linda

Critucal Culture, Gender, and Race Studies

Gaskin, Shirleigh

Johnson, Michael Jr.

Education

Ferry, Nicole

Lash, Johnna

Torres, Jonathan

English

Boyd, Ashley

Butler, Todd

Cady, Patty

Coleman, Elijah

Gowdy-Burke, Tomie

Herriot, Samantha

Moeggenberg, Zarah

Plemons, Anna

Sanchez, Rachel

Stawn, April

Thaller, Sarah

Watts, Kate

Wittstock, Stacy

Fine Arts

Lee, Pamela

First Year Programs

Sena, Leslie Jo

History

Chan, Roger

Gerber, Lydia

Thigpen, Jennifer

Horticulture

Fellman, John

Libraries

Vetter, Susan

Physics and Astronomy

Khan, Enamul

Political Science

Stehr, Steven

Politics, Philosophy, and Public Affairs

Salamone, Michael

Sociology

Gertseva, Arina

Kmec, Julie

Spanish

Manzo-Robledo, Francisco

Teaching and Learning

Ward, Barbara

Writing Programs

Neider, Xyan

Walter, Brooklyn

# **Appendix B: Portfolio Performance by Major and Language Status, 2015-2017**

The following information is listed by college and major. L1 indicates English as the self-reported primary language. L2 indicates that the student is multi-lingual. Students who reported neither are listed as Unreported. Students declaring multiple majors are counted within each major.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tier I | **Acceptable** | | | | | **Possible Distinction** | | | **In Progress** | | | Total |
| Tier II |  | **Simple Pass** | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Incomplete** |  | **Complete** | **Distinction** | **Distinction** | **Complete** | **Incomplete** |  |
| **Carson College of Business** | 1293 (60.3%) | 1119 (52.2%) | 148 (6.9%) | 19 (0.9%) | 7 (0.3%) | 138 (6.4%) | 98 (4.6%) | 15 (0.7%) | 713 (33.2%) | 493 (23%) | 213 (9.9%) | 2145 |
| **Accounting** | 257 (62.1%) | 215 (51.9%) | 34 (8.2%) | 7 (1.7%) | 1 (0.2%) | 31 (7.5%) | 22 (5.3%) | 6 (1.4%) | 126 (30.4%) | 86 (20.8%) | 38 (9.2%) | 414 |
| 1 | 159 (67.7%) | 134 (57%) | 23 (9.8%) | 1 (0.4%) | 1 (0.4%) | 22 (9.4%) | 18 (7.7%) | 3 (1.3%) | 54 (23%) | 41 (17.4%) | 12 (5.1%) | 235 |
| 2 | 39 (48.8%) | 32 (40%) | 5 (6.3%) | 2 (2.5%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (2.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 39 (48.8%) | 26 (32.5%) | 13 (16.3%) | 80 |
| (blank) | 59 (59.6%) | 49 (49.5%) | 6 (6.1%) | 4 (4%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (7.1%) | 4 (4%) | 3 (3%) | 33 (33.3%) | 19 (19.2%) | 13 (13.1%) | 99 |
| **Business Administration** | 190 (63.1%) | 151 (50.2%) | 32 (10.6%) | 6 (2%) | 1 (0.3%) | 22 (7.3%) | 16 (5.3%) | 1 (0.3%) | 89 (29.6%) | 64 (21.3%) | 25 (8.3%) | 301 |
| 1 | 105 (64.4%) | 83 (50.9%) | 16 (9.8%) | 5 (3.1%) | 1 (0.6%) | 9 (5.5%) | 6 (3.7%) | 0 (0%) | 49 (30.1%) | 41 (25.2%) | 8 (4.9%) | 163 |
| 2 | 36 (63.2%) | 31 (54.4%) | 5 (8.8%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (7%) | 4 (7%) | 0 (0%) | 17 (29.8%) | 9 (15.8%) | 8 (14%) | 57 |
| (blank) | 49 (60.5%) | 37 (45.7%) | 11 (13.6%) | 1 (1.2%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (11.1%) | 6 (7.4%) | 1 (1.2%) | 23 (28.4%) | 14 (17.3%) | 9 (11.1%) | 81 |
| **Entrepreneurship** | 21 (75%) | 19 (67.9%) | 2 (7.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (3.6%) | 1 (3.6%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (21.4%) | 6 (21.4%) | 0 (0%) | 28 |
| 1 | 17 (77.3%) | 15 (68.2%) | 2 (9.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (4.5%) | 1 (4.5%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (18.2%) | 4 (18.2%) | 0 (0%) | 22 |
| 2 | 3 (100%) | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |
| (blank) | 1 (33.3%) | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (66.7%) | 2 (66.7%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |
| **Finance** | 199 (57.7%) | 179 (51.9%) | 18 (5.2%) | 1 (0.3%) | 1 (0.3%) | 24 (7%) | 20 (5.8%) | 2 (0.6%) | 122 (35.4%) | 84 (24.3%) | 38 (11%) | 345 |
| 1 | 134 (69.4%) | 120 (62.2%) | 13 (6.7%) | 1 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 17 (8.8%) | 14 (7.3%) | 1 (0.5%) | 42 (21.8%) | 35 (18.1%) | 7 (3.6%) | 193 |
| 2 | 35 (43.2%) | 31 (38.3%) | 3 (3.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.2%) | 4 (4.9%) | 3 (3.7%) | 1 (1.2%) | 42 (51.9%) | 25 (30.9%) | 17 (21%) | 81 |
| (blank) | 30 (42.3%) | 28 (39.4%) | 2 (2.8%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (4.2%) | 3 (4.2%) | 0 (0%) | 38 (53.5%) | 24 (33.8%) | 14 (19.7%) | 71 |
| **Hospitality Business Management** | 169 (53.1%) | 152 (47.8%) | 16 (5%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.3%) | 13 (4.1%) | 10 (3.1%) | 0 (0%) | 135 (42.5%) | 73 (23%) | 58 (18.2%) | 318 |
| 1 | 77 (70.6%) | 68 (62.4%) | 9 (8.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (8.3%) | 8 (7.3%) | 0 (0%) | 22 (20.2%) | 15 (13.8%) | 6 (5.5%) | 109 |
| 2 | 61 (41.8%) | 60 (41.1%) | 1 (0.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (1.4%) | 2 (1.4%) | 0 (0%) | 83 (56.8%) | 41 (28.1%) | 40 (27.4%) | 146 |
| (blank) | 31 (49.2%) | 24 (38.1%) | 6 (9.5%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.6%) | 2 (3.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 30 (47.6%) | 17 (27%) | 12 (19%) | 63 |
| **International Business** | 53 (59.6%) | 47 (52.8%) | 6 (6.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (3.4%) | 2 (2.2%) | 0 (0%) | 33 (37.1%) | 19 (21.3%) | 14 (15.7%) | 89 |
| 1 | 27 (75%) | 23 (63.9%) | 4 (11.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (2.8%) | 1 (2.8%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (22.2%) | 6 (16.7%) | 2 (5.6%) | 36 |
| 2 | 17 (48.6%) | 16 (45.7%) | 1 (2.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (2.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 17 (48.6%) | 7 (20%) | 10 (28.6%) | 35 |
| (blank) | 9 (50%) | 8 (44.4%) | 1 (5.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (5.6%) | 1 (5.6%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (44.4%) | 6 (33.3%) | 2 (11.1%) | 18 |
| **Management and Operations** | 106 (56.7%) | 92 (49.2%) | 12 (6.4%) | 2 (1.1%) | 0 (0%) | 14 (7.5%) | 8 (4.3%) | 1 (0.5%) | 67 (35.8%) | 53 (28.3%) | 13 (7%) | 187 |
| 1 | 63 (59.4%) | 57 (53.8%) | 4 (3.8%) | 2 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (8.5%) | 4 (3.8%) | 1 (0.9%) | 34 (32.1%) | 27 (25.5%) | 7 (6.6%) | 106 |
| 2 | 10 (45.5%) | 7 (31.8%) | 3 (13.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (4.5%) | 1 (4.5%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (50%) | 8 (36.4%) | 3 (13.6%) | 22 |
| (blank) | 33 (55.9%) | 28 (47.5%) | 5 (8.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (6.8%) | 3 (5.1%) | 0 (0%) | 22 (37.3%) | 18 (30.5%) | 3 (5.1%) | 59 |
| **Management Information Systems** | 146 (67.6%) | 131 (60.6%) | 13 (6%) | 1 (0.5%) | 1 (0.5%) | 12 (5.6%) | 7 (3.2%) | 2 (0.9%) | 58 (26.9%) | 50 (23.1%) | 8 (3.7%) | 216 |
| 1 | 84 (71.2%) | 77 (65.3%) | 7 (5.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (5.1%) | 3 (2.5%) | 1 (0.8%) | 28 (23.7%) | 26 (22%) | 2 (1.7%) | 118 |
| 2 | 28 (59.6%) | 24 (51.1%) | 3 (6.4%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (2.1%) | 3 (6.4%) | 3 (6.4%) | 0 (0%) | 16 (34%) | 12 (25.5%) | 4 (8.5%) | 47 |
| (blank) | 34 (66.7%) | 30 (58.8%) | 3 (5.9%) | 1 (2%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (5.9%) | 1 (2%) | 1 (2%) | 14 (27.5%) | 12 (23.5%) | 2 (3.9%) | 51 |
| **Marketing** | 156 (61.9%) | 135 (53.6%) | 17 (6.7%) | 2 (0.8%) | 2 (0.8%) | 19 (7.5%) | 13 (5.2%) | 3 (1.2%) | 77 (30.6%) | 58 (23%) | 19 (7.5%) | 252 |
| 1 | 107 (62.9%) | 91 (53.5%) | 14 (8.2%) | 1 (0.6%) | 1 (0.6%) | 12 (7.1%) | 9 (5.3%) | 1 (0.6%) | 51 (30%) | 39 (22.9%) | 12 (7.1%) | 170 |
| 2 | 17 (63%) | 15 (55.6%) | 1 (3.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (3.7%) | 2 (7.4%) | 1 (3.7%) | 1 (3.7%) | 8 (29.6%) | 6 (22.2%) | 2 (7.4%) | 27 |
| (blank) | 32 (58.2%) | 29 (52.7%) | 2 (3.6%) | 1 (1.8%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (9.1%) | 3 (5.5%) | 1 (1.8%) | 18 (32.7%) | 13 (23.6%) | 5 (9.1%) | 55 |
| **Wine Business Management** | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 1 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **College of Agricultural, Human and Natural Resource Sciences (CAHNRS)** | 656 (62.2%) | 572 (54.3%) | 66 (6.3%) | 18 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) | 76 (7.2%) | 46 (4.4%) | 15 (1.4%) | 322 (30.6%) | 260 (24.7%) | 54 (5.1%) | 1054 |
| **Agricultural and Food Business Economics** | 18 (66.7%) | 15 (55.6%) | 3 (11.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (7.4%) | 1 (3.7%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (25.9%) | 5 (18.5%) | 2 (7.4%) | 27 |
| 1 | 12 (66.7%) | 11 (61.1%) | 1 (5.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (11.1%) | 1 (5.6%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (22.2%) | 3 (16.7%) | 1 (5.6%) | 18 |
| 2 | 2 (50%) | 2 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (50%) | 1 (25%) | 1 (25%) | 4 |
| (blank) | 4 (80%) | 2 (40%) | 2 (40%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (20%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 5 |
| **Agricultural and Food Systems** | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 1 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Agricultural Biotechnology** | 41 (68.3%) | 33 (55%) | 6 (10%) | 2 (3.3%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (5%) | 2 (3.3%) | 0 (0%) | 16 (26.7%) | 13 (21.7%) | 2 (3.3%) | 60 |
| 1 | 24 (66.7%) | 19 (52.8%) | 3 (8.3%) | 2 (5.6%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (5.6%) | 2 (5.6%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (27.8%) | 9 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 36 |
| 2 | 3 (37.5%) | 1 (12.5%) | 2 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (62.5%) | 3 (37.5%) | 2 (25%) | 8 |
| (blank) | 14 (87.5%) | 13 (81.3%) | 1 (6.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (6.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (6.3%) | 1 (6.3%) | 0 (0%) | 16 |
| **Agricultural Education** | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Agricultural Technology and Production Management** | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| **Agriculture and Business Economics** | 6 (66.7%) | 5 (55.6%) | 1 (11.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (11.1%) | 1 (11.1%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (22.2%) | 2 (22.2%) | 0 (0%) | 9 |
| 1 | 4 (57.1%) | 3 (42.9%) | 1 (14.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (14.3%) | 1 (14.3%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (28.6%) | 2 (28.6%) | 0 (0%) | 7 |
| 2 | 2 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Agriculture Education** | 12 (75%) | 11 (68.8%) | 1 (6.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (25%) | 3 (18.8%) | 1 (6.3%) | 16 |
| 1 | 12 (80%) | 11 (73.3%) | 1 (6.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (20%) | 2 (13.3%) | 1 (6.7%) | 15 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Animal Sciences** | 99 (64.7%) | 83 (54.2%) | 13 (8.5%) | 3 (2%) | 0 (0%) | 13 (8.5%) | 9 (5.9%) | 1 (0.7%) | 41 (26.8%) | 34 (22.2%) | 6 (3.9%) | 153 |
| 1 | 66 (68.8%) | 56 (58.3%) | 8 (8.3%) | 2 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (8.3%) | 7 (7.3%) | 1 (1%) | 22 (22.9%) | 18 (18.8%) | 3 (3.1%) | 96 |
| 2 | 6 (66.7%) | 4 (44.4%) | 1 (11.1%) | 1 (11.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (33.3%) | 2 (22.2%) | 1 (11.1%) | 9 |
| (blank) | 27 (56.3%) | 23 (47.9%) | 4 (8.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (10.4%) | 2 (4.2%) | 0 (0%) | 16 (33.3%) | 14 (29.2%) | 2 (4.2%) | 48 |
| **Crop Science** | 37 (61.7%) | 30 (50%) | 7 (11.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (5%) | 2 (3.3%) | 0 (0%) | 20 (33.3%) | 15 (25%) | 4 (6.7%) | 60 |
| 1 | 18 (62.1%) | 14 (48.3%) | 4 (13.8%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (3.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (34.5%) | 8 (27.6%) | 2 (6.9%) | 29 |
| 2 | 4 (50%) | 4 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (50%) | 2 (25%) | 1 (12.5%) | 8 |
| (blank) | 15 (65.2%) | 12 (52.2%) | 3 (13%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (8.7%) | 2 (8.7%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (26.1%) | 5 (21.7%) | 1 (4.3%) | 23 |
| **Ecology** | 51 (70.8%) | 42 (58.3%) | 4 (5.6%) | 5 (6.9%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (5.6%) | 1 (1.4%) | 2 (2.8%) | 17 (23.6%) | 14 (19.4%) | 3 (4.2%) | 72 |
| 1 | 38 (73.1%) | 33 (63.5%) | 1 (1.9%) | 4 (7.7%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (5.8%) | 1 (1.9%) | 2 (3.8%) | 11 (21.2%) | 9 (17.3%) | 2 (3.8%) | 52 |
| 2 | 2 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| (blank) | 11 (61.1%) | 7 (38.9%) | 3 (16.7%) | 1 (5.6%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (5.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (33.3%) | 5 (27.8%) | 1 (5.6%) | 18 |
| **Economic Sciences** | 54 (61.4%) | 52 (59.1%) | 1 (1.1%) | 1 (1.1%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (6.8%) | 4 (4.5%) | 2 (2.3%) | 28 (31.8%) | 20 (22.7%) | 8 (9.1%) | 88 |
| 1 | 33 (70.2%) | 32 (68.1%) | 1 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (4.3%) | 2 (4.3%) | 0 (0%) | 12 (25.5%) | 10 (21.3%) | 2 (4.3%) | 47 |
| 2 | 5 (45.5%) | 5 (45.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (54.5%) | 2 (18.2%) | 4 (36.4%) | 11 |
| (blank) | 16 (53.3%) | 15 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (3.3%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (13.3%) | 2 (6.7%) | 2 (6.7%) | 10 (33.3%) | 8 (26.7%) | 2 (6.7%) | 30 |
| **Entomology** | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| **Environmental Sciences** | 67 (63.2%) | 58 (54.7%) | 7 (6.6%) | 2 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (5.7%) | 2 (1.9%) | 2 (1.9%) | 33 (31.1%) | 28 (26.4%) | 4 (3.8%) | 106 |
| 1 | 48 (63.2%) | 43 (56.6%) | 3 (3.9%) | 2 (2.6%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (6.6%) | 2 (2.6%) | 2 (2.6%) | 23 (30.3%) | 20 (26.3%) | 3 (3.9%) | 76 |
| 2 | 5 (45.5%) | 3 (27.3%) | 2 (18.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (54.5%) | 4 (36.4%) | 1 (9.1%) | 11 |
| (blank) | 14 (73.7%) | 12 (63.2%) | 2 (10.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (5.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (21.1%) | 4 (21.1%) | 0 (0%) | 19 |
| **Food Science** | 9 (47.4%) | 9 (47.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (52.6%) | 8 (42.1%) | 1 (5.3%) | 19 |
| 1 | 2 (28.6%) | 2 (28.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (71.4%) | 4 (57.1%) | 0 (0%) | 7 |
| 2 | 1 (25%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (75%) | 2 (50%) | 1 (25%) | 4 |
| (blank) | 6 (75%) | 6 (75%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (25%) | 2 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 8 |
| **Food Science and Human Nutrition** | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (100%) | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 2 |
| 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Horticulture** | 10 (55.6%) | 6 (33.3%) | 3 (16.7%) | 1 (5.6%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (5.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (38.9%) | 7 (38.9%) | 0 (0%) | 18 |
| 1 | 8 (57.1%) | 5 (35.7%) | 2 (14.3%) | 1 (7.1%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (7.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (35.7%) | 5 (35.7%) | 0 (0%) | 14 |
| 2 | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| (blank) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| **Human Development** | 197 (60.6%) | 180 (55.4%) | 14 (4.3%) | 3 (0.9%) | 0 (0%) | 28 (8.6%) | 19 (5.8%) | 5 (1.5%) | 100 (30.8%) | 81 (24.9%) | 18 (5.5%) | 325 |
| 1 | 139 (63.8%) | 128 (58.7%) | 10 (4.6%) | 1 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 20 (9.2%) | 14 (6.4%) | 3 (1.4%) | 59 (27.1%) | 53 (24.3%) | 6 (2.8%) | 218 |
| 2 | 28 (51.9%) | 26 (48.1%) | 1 (1.9%) | 1 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (3.7%) | 1 (1.9%) | 1 (1.9%) | 24 (44.4%) | 16 (29.6%) | 8 (14.8%) | 54 |
| (blank) | 30 (56.6%) | 26 (49.1%) | 3 (5.7%) | 1 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (11.3%) | 4 (7.5%) | 1 (1.9%) | 17 (32.1%) | 12 (22.6%) | 4 (7.5%) | 53 |
| **Interior Design** | 33 (51.6%) | 32 (50%) | 1 (1.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (10.9%) | 4 (6.3%) | 2 (3.1%) | 24 (37.5%) | 19 (29.7%) | 3 (4.7%) | 64 |
| 1 | 21 (47.7%) | 20 (45.5%) | 1 (2.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (13.6%) | 4 (9.1%) | 1 (2.3%) | 17 (38.6%) | 12 (27.3%) | 3 (6.8%) | 44 |
| 2 | 4 (66.7%) | 4 (66.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (33.3%) | 2 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 6 |
| (blank) | 8 (57.1%) | 8 (57.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (7.1%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (7.1%) | 5 (35.7%) | 5 (35.7%) | 0 (0%) | 14 |
| **Landscape Architecture** | 4 (66.7%) | 4 (66.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (16.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (16.7%) | 1 (16.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (16.7%) | 6 |
| 1 | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| 2 | 3 (75%) | 3 (75%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) | 4 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Natural Resource Sciences** | 4 (57.1%) | 2 (28.6%) | 2 (28.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (42.9%) | 2 (28.6%) | 1 (14.3%) | 7 |
| 1 | 3 (60%) | 2 (40%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (40%) | 1 (20%) | 1 (20%) | 5 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| **Organic Agricultural Systems** | 3 (50%) | 1 (16.7%) | 2 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (50%) | 3 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 6 |
| 1 | 3 (75%) | 1 (25%) | 2 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 4 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Plant Pathology** | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Soil Science** | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Viticulture and Enology** | 10 (66.7%) | 8 (53.3%) | 1 (6.7%) | 1 (6.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (33.3%) | 5 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 15 |
| 1 | 7 (63.6%) | 6 (54.5%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (9.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (36.4%) | 4 (36.4%) | 0 (0%) | 11 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| (blank) | 3 (100%) | 2 (66.7%) | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |
| **Wildlife Ecology** | 51 (71.8%) | 42 (59.2%) | 4 (5.6%) | 5 (7%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (4.2%) | 1 (1.4%) | 1 (1.4%) | 17 (23.9%) | 14 (19.7%) | 3 (4.2%) | 71 |
| 1 | 38 (74.5%) | 33 (64.7%) | 1 (2%) | 4 (7.8%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (3.9%) | 1 (2%) | 1 (2%) | 11 (21.6%) | 9 (17.6%) | 2 (3.9%) | 51 |
| 2 | 2 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| (blank) | 11 (61.1%) | 7 (38.9%) | 3 (16.7%) | 1 (5.6%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (5.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (33.3%) | 5 (27.8%) | 1 (5.6%) | 18 |
| **College of Arts and Sciences** | 2338 (63.6%) | 1927 (52.4%) | 313 (8.5%) | 91 (2.5%) | 7 (0.2%) | 343 (9.3%) | 184 (5%) | 66 (1.8%) | 991 (27%) | 770 (20.9%) | 199 (5.4%) | 3676 |
| **American Studies** | 11 (64.7%) | 11 (64.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (35.3%) | 6 (35.3%) | 0 (0%) | 17 |
| 1 | 5 (45.5%) | 5 (45.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (54.5%) | 6 (54.5%) | 0 (0%) | 11 |
| 2 | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 |
| (blank) | 2 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| **Anthropology** | 46 (78%) | 35 (59.3%) | 7 (11.9%) | 3 (5.1%) | 1 (1.7%) | 4 (6.8%) | 1 (1.7%) | 3 (5.1%) | 9 (15.3%) | 7 (11.9%) | 1 (1.7%) | 59 |
| 1 | 30 (75%) | 24 (60%) | 4 (10%) | 2 (5%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (5%) | 1 (2.5%) | 1 (2.5%) | 8 (20%) | 6 (15%) | 1 (2.5%) | 40 |
| 2 | 3 (100%) | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |
| (blank) | 13 (81.3%) | 8 (50%) | 3 (18.8%) | 1 (6.3%) | 1 (6.3%) | 2 (12.5%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (12.5%) | 1 (6.3%) | 1 (6.3%) | 0 (0%) | 16 |
| **Art History** | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 1 | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Asian Studies** | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Basic Medical Sciences** | 38 (69.1%) | 32 (58.2%) | 6 (10.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (7.3%) | 3 (5.5%) | 0 (0%) | 13 (23.6%) | 9 (16.4%) | 4 (7.3%) | 55 |
| 1 | 24 (75%) | 19 (59.4%) | 5 (15.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (12.5%) | 3 (9.4%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (12.5%) | 2 (6.3%) | 2 (6.3%) | 32 |
| 2 | 9 (69.2%) | 8 (61.5%) | 1 (7.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (30.8%) | 3 (23.1%) | 1 (7.7%) | 13 |
| (blank) | 5 (50%) | 5 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (50%) | 4 (40%) | 1 (10%) | 10 |
| **Biology** | 324 (63.4%) | 235 (46%) | 74 (14.5%) | 13 (2.5%) | 2 (0.4%) | 58 (11.4%) | 33 (6.5%) | 7 (1.4%) | 127 (24.9%) | 101 (19.8%) | 24 (4.7%) | 511 |
| 1 | 192 (63.4%) | 142 (46.9%) | 42 (13.9%) | 7 (2.3%) | 1 (0.3%) | 38 (12.5%) | 22 (7.3%) | 3 (1%) | 72 (23.8%) | 57 (18.8%) | 13 (4.3%) | 303 |
| 2 | 65 (58%) | 45 (40.2%) | 18 (16.1%) | 2 (1.8%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (9.8%) | 7 (6.3%) | 2 (1.8%) | 36 (32.1%) | 28 (25%) | 8 (7.1%) | 112 |
| (blank) | 67 (69.8%) | 48 (50%) | 14 (14.6%) | 4 (4.2%) | 1 (1%) | 9 (9.4%) | 4 (4.2%) | 2 (2.1%) | 19 (19.8%) | 16 (16.7%) | 3 (3.1%) | 96 |
| **Botany** | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 1 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Chemistry** | 20 (62.5%) | 14 (43.8%) | 4 (12.5%) | 2 (6.3%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (3.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (34.4%) | 8 (25%) | 3 (9.4%) | 32 |
| 1 | 11 (64.7%) | 8 (47.1%) | 2 (11.8%) | 1 (5.9%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (5.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (29.4%) | 4 (23.5%) | 1 (5.9%) | 17 |
| 2 | 3 (60%) | 3 (60%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (40%) | 2 (40%) | 0 (0%) | 5 |
| (blank) | 6 (60%) | 3 (30%) | 2 (20%) | 1 (10%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (40%) | 2 (20%) | 2 (20%) | 10 |
| **Chinese** | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 2 | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Contemporary Ethnic Studies** | 21 (53.8%) | 18 (46.2%) | 2 (5.1%) | 1 (2.6%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (10.3%) | 2 (5.1%) | 1 (2.6%) | 14 (35.9%) | 11 (28.2%) | 3 (7.7%) | 39 |
| 1 | 16 (69.6%) | 15 (65.2%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (4.3%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (8.7%) | 1 (4.3%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (21.7%) | 3 (13%) | 2 (8.7%) | 23 |
| 2 | 1 (16.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (16.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (16.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (16.7%) | 4 (66.7%) | 4 (66.7%) | 0 (0%) | 6 |
| (blank) | 4 (40%) | 3 (30%) | 1 (10%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (10%) | 1 (10%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (50%) | 4 (40%) | 1 (10%) | 10 |
| **Creative Writing (English Option)** | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| **Criminal Justice** | 224 (59.3%) | 175 (46.3%) | 43 (11.4%) | 5 (1.3%) | 1 (0.3%) | 36 (9.5%) | 15 (4%) | 9 (2.4%) | 118 (31.2%) | 89 (23.5%) | 26 (6.9%) | 378 |
| 1 | 153 (61.2%) | 121 (48.4%) | 27 (10.8%) | 4 (1.6%) | 1 (0.4%) | 27 (10.8%) | 12 (4.8%) | 6 (2.4%) | 70 (28%) | 54 (21.6%) | 13 (5.2%) | 250 |
| 2 | 26 (43.3%) | 17 (28.3%) | 9 (15%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (8.3%) | 2 (3.3%) | 2 (3.3%) | 29 (48.3%) | 22 (36.7%) | 7 (11.7%) | 60 |
| (blank) | 45 (66.2%) | 37 (54.4%) | 7 (10.3%) | 1 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (5.9%) | 1 (1.5%) | 1 (1.5%) | 19 (27.9%) | 13 (19.1%) | 6 (8.8%) | 68 |
| **Digital Technology and Culture** | 122 (62.9%) | 103 (53.1%) | 12 (6.2%) | 7 (3.6%) | 0 (0%) | 13 (6.7%) | 11 (5.7%) | 2 (1%) | 59 (30.4%) | 47 (24.2%) | 11 (5.7%) | 194 |
| 1 | 92 (64.3%) | 79 (55.2%) | 10 (7%) | 3 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 12 (8.4%) | 10 (7%) | 2 (1.4%) | 39 (27.3%) | 30 (21%) | 8 (5.6%) | 143 |
| 2 | 14 (48.3%) | 13 (44.8%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (3.4%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (3.4%) | 1 (3.4%) | 0 (0%) | 14 (48.3%) | 12 (41.4%) | 2 (6.9%) | 29 |
| (blank) | 16 (72.7%) | 11 (50%) | 2 (9.1%) | 3 (13.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (27.3%) | 5 (22.7%) | 1 (4.5%) | 22 |
| **English** | 106 (73.1%) | 87 (60%) | 10 (6.9%) | 9 (6.2%) | 0 (0%) | 16 (11%) | 5 (3.4%) | 3 (2.1%) | 23 (15.9%) | 17 (11.7%) | 5 (3.4%) | 145 |
| 1 | 75 (74.3%) | 62 (61.4%) | 5 (5%) | 8 (7.9%) | 0 (0%) | 13 (12.9%) | 5 (5%) | 3 (3%) | 13 (12.9%) | 10 (9.9%) | 2 (2%) | 101 |
| 2 | 17 (81%) | 15 (71.4%) | 2 (9.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (19%) | 3 (14.3%) | 1 (4.8%) | 21 |
| (blank) | 14 (60.9%) | 10 (43.5%) | 3 (13%) | 1 (4.3%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (13%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (26.1%) | 4 (17.4%) | 2 (8.7%) | 23 |
| **Fine Arts** | 16 (51.6%) | 16 (51.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (3.2%) | 1 (3.2%) | 0 (0%) | 14 (45.2%) | 10 (32.3%) | 4 (12.9%) | 31 |
| 1 | 8 (57.1%) | 8 (57.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (42.9%) | 5 (35.7%) | 1 (7.1%) | 14 |
| 2 | 4 (40%) | 4 (40%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (10%) | 1 (10%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (50%) | 3 (30%) | 2 (20%) | 10 |
| (blank) | 4 (57.1%) | 4 (57.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (42.9%) | 2 (28.6%) | 1 (14.3%) | 7 |
| **French** | 4 (100%) | 4 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 |
| 1 | 2 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| 2 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| (blank) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| **General Studies** | 70 (50.7%) | 63 (45.7%) | 6 (4.3%) | 1 (0.7%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (5.8%) | 4 (2.9%) | 2 (1.4%) | 60 (43.5%) | 39 (28.3%) | 20 (14.5%) | 138 |
| 1 | 36 (50%) | 33 (45.8%) | 2 (2.8%) | 1 (1.4%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (8.3%) | 3 (4.2%) | 1 (1.4%) | 30 (41.7%) | 20 (27.8%) | 10 (13.9%) | 72 |
| 2 | 9 (42.9%) | 7 (33.3%) | 2 (9.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 12 (57.1%) | 7 (33.3%) | 5 (23.8%) | 21 |
| (blank) | 25 (55.6%) | 23 (51.1%) | 2 (4.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (4.4%) | 1 (2.2%) | 1 (2.2%) | 18 (40%) | 12 (26.7%) | 5 (11.1%) | 45 |
| **Geology** | 8 (53.3%) | 8 (53.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (6.7%) | 1 (6.7%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (40%) | 5 (33.3%) | 1 (6.7%) | 15 |
| 1 | 3 (33.3%) | 3 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (11.1%) | 1 (11.1%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (55.6%) | 4 (44.4%) | 1 (11.1%) | 9 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| (blank) | 5 (100%) | 5 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 |
| **German** | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **History** | 79 (62.7%) | 59 (46.8%) | 12 (9.5%) | 7 (5.6%) | 1 (0.8%) | 14 (11.1%) | 4 (3.2%) | 3 (2.4%) | 33 (26.2%) | 27 (21.4%) | 4 (3.2%) | 126 |
| 1 | 63 (62.4%) | 47 (46.5%) | 10 (9.9%) | 6 (5.9%) | 0 (0%) | 12 (11.9%) | 3 (3%) | 3 (3%) | 26 (25.7%) | 24 (23.8%) | 0 (0%) | 101 |
| 2 | 4 (44.4%) | 3 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (11.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (55.6%) | 2 (22.2%) | 3 (33.3%) | 9 |
| (blank) | 12 (75%) | 9 (56.3%) | 2 (12.5%) | 1 (6.3%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (12.5%) | 1 (6.3%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (12.5%) | 1 (6.3%) | 1 (6.3%) | 16 |
| **Humanities** | 79 (59.8%) | 71 (53.8%) | 6 (4.5%) | 2 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (6.8%) | 2 (1.5%) | 3 (2.3%) | 44 (33.3%) | 27 (20.5%) | 14 (10.6%) | 132 |
| 1 | 45 (58.4%) | 39 (50.6%) | 4 (5.2%) | 2 (2.6%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (10.4%) | 2 (2.6%) | 2 (2.6%) | 24 (31.2%) | 13 (16.9%) | 10 (13%) | 77 |
| 2 | 4 (36.4%) | 4 (36.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (63.6%) | 4 (36.4%) | 3 (27.3%) | 11 |
| (blank) | 30 (68.2%) | 28 (63.6%) | 2 (4.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (2.3%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (2.3%) | 13 (29.5%) | 10 (22.7%) | 1 (2.3%) | 44 |
| **Linguistics (Humanities Option)** | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 2 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Mathematics** | 48 (64.9%) | 35 (47.3%) | 11 (14.9%) | 2 (2.7%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (6.8%) | 2 (2.7%) | 0 (0%) | 21 (28.4%) | 19 (25.7%) | 2 (2.7%) | 74 |
| 1 | 26 (70.3%) | 17 (45.9%) | 8 (21.6%) | 1 (2.7%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (8.1%) | 2 (5.4%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (21.6%) | 8 (21.6%) | 0 (0%) | 37 |
| 2 | 10 (66.7%) | 7 (46.7%) | 2 (13.3%) | 1 (6.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (33.3%) | 3 (20%) | 2 (13.3%) | 15 |
| (blank) | 12 (54.5%) | 11 (50%) | 1 (4.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (9.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (36.4%) | 8 (36.4%) | 0 (0%) | 22 |
| **Music** | 21 (55.3%) | 17 (44.7%) | 3 (7.9%) | 1 (2.6%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (15.8%) | 3 (7.9%) | 1 (2.6%) | 11 (28.9%) | 9 (23.7%) | 2 (5.3%) | 38 |
| 1 | 13 (61.9%) | 10 (47.6%) | 2 (9.5%) | 1 (4.8%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (14.3%) | 2 (9.5%) | 1 (4.8%) | 5 (23.8%) | 3 (14.3%) | 2 (9.5%) | 21 |
| 2 | 4 (50%) | 4 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (50%) | 4 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 8 |
| (blank) | 4 (44.4%) | 3 (33.3%) | 1 (11.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (33.3%) | 1 (11.1%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (22.2%) | 2 (22.2%) | 0 (0%) | 9 |
| **Music Performance** | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Personnel Psychology/Human Resources** | 39 (58.2%) | 33 (49.3%) | 5 (7.5%) | 1 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (11.9%) | 7 (10.4%) | 0 (0%) | 20 (29.9%) | 18 (26.9%) | 2 (3%) | 67 |
| 1 | 29 (61.7%) | 26 (55.3%) | 3 (6.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (14.9%) | 6 (12.8%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (23.4%) | 10 (21.3%) | 1 (2.1%) | 47 |
| 2 | 7 (58.3%) | 4 (33.3%) | 2 (16.7%) | 1 (8.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (41.7%) | 5 (41.7%) | 0 (0%) | 12 |
| (blank) | 3 (37.5%) | 3 (37.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (12.5%) | 1 (12.5%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (50%) | 3 (37.5%) | 1 (12.5%) | 8 |
| **Philosophy** | 12 (80%) | 8 (53.3%) | 2 (13.3%) | 2 (13.3%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (6.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (6.7%) | 2 (13.3%) | 1 (6.7%) | 1 (6.7%) | 15 |
| 1 | 9 (90%) | 5 (50%) | 2 (20%) | 2 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (10%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (10%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 10 |
| 2 | 2 (66.7%) | 2 (66.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (33.3%) | 3 |
| (blank) | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| **Physics** | 23 (76.7%) | 19 (63.3%) | 2 (6.7%) | 1 (3.3%) | 1 (3.3%) | 3 (10%) | 1 (3.3%) | 1 (3.3%) | 4 (13.3%) | 3 (10%) | 1 (3.3%) | 30 |
| 1 | 15 (78.9%) | 12 (63.2%) | 1 (5.3%) | 1 (5.3%) | 1 (5.3%) | 1 (5.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (15.8%) | 2 (10.5%) | 1 (5.3%) | 19 |
| 2 | 2 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| (blank) | 6 (66.7%) | 5 (55.6%) | 1 (11.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (22.2%) | 1 (11.1%) | 1 (11.1%) | 1 (11.1%) | 1 (11.1%) | 0 (0%) | 9 |
| **Political Science** | 91 (68.9%) | 68 (51.5%) | 15 (11.4%) | 8 (6.1%) | 0 (0%) | 14 (10.6%) | 7 (5.3%) | 2 (1.5%) | 27 (20.5%) | 19 (14.4%) | 7 (5.3%) | 132 |
| 1 | 62 (72.9%) | 47 (55.3%) | 10 (11.8%) | 5 (5.9%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (8.2%) | 2 (2.4%) | 2 (2.4%) | 16 (18.8%) | 11 (12.9%) | 4 (4.7%) | 85 |
| 2 | 10 (58.8%) | 7 (41.2%) | 1 (5.9%) | 2 (11.8%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (23.5%) | 3 (17.6%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (17.6%) | 2 (11.8%) | 1 (5.9%) | 17 |
| (blank) | 19 (63.3%) | 14 (46.7%) | 4 (13.3%) | 1 (3.3%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (10%) | 2 (6.7%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (26.7%) | 6 (20%) | 2 (6.7%) | 30 |
| **Pre-Medicine** | 3 (100%) | 2 (66.7%) | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |
| 1 | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 2 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| **Psychology** | 548 (63.8%) | 478 (55.6%) | 58 (6.8%) | 10 (1.2%) | 2 (0.2%) | 102 (11.9%) | 59 (6.9%) | 21 (2.4%) | 209 (24.3%) | 170 (19.8%) | 36 (4.2%) | 859 |
| 1 | 355 (64.2%) | 307 (55.5%) | 41 (7.4%) | 6 (1.1%) | 1 (0.2%) | 68 (12.3%) | 40 (7.2%) | 13 (2.4%) | 130 (23.5%) | 110 (19.9%) | 19 (3.4%) | 553 |
| 2 | 85 (66.4%) | 73 (57%) | 9 (7%) | 2 (1.6%) | 1 (0.8%) | 11 (8.6%) | 6 (4.7%) | 2 (1.6%) | 32 (25%) | 24 (18.8%) | 8 (6.3%) | 128 |
| (blank) | 108 (60.7%) | 98 (55.1%) | 8 (4.5%) | 2 (1.1%) | 0 (0%) | 23 (12.9%) | 13 (7.3%) | 6 (3.4%) | 47 (26.4%) | 36 (20.2%) | 9 (5.1%) | 178 |
| **Psychology and Sociology** | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 1 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Public Affairs** | 35 (62.5%) | 31 (55.4%) | 4 (7.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (16.1%) | 3 (5.4%) | 1 (1.8%) | 12 (21.4%) | 9 (16.1%) | 3 (5.4%) | 56 |
| 1 | 28 (70%) | 24 (60%) | 4 (10%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (17.5%) | 2 (5%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (12.5%) | 5 (12.5%) | 0 (0%) | 40 |
| 2 | 3 (33.3%) | 3 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (11.1%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (11.1%) | 5 (55.6%) | 3 (33.3%) | 2 (22.2%) | 9 |
| (blank) | 4 (57.1%) | 4 (57.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (14.3%) | 1 (14.3%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (28.6%) | 1 (14.3%) | 1 (14.3%) | 7 |
| **Social Sciences** | 241 (66%) | 209 (57.3%) | 19 (5.2%) | 13 (3.6%) | 0 (0%) | 24 (6.6%) | 17 (4.7%) | 2 (0.5%) | 98 (26.8%) | 77 (21.1%) | 17 (4.7%) | 365 |
| 1 | 144 (65.8%) | 124 (56.6%) | 13 (5.9%) | 7 (3.2%) | 0 (0%) | 13 (5.9%) | 10 (4.6%) | 1 (0.5%) | 62 (28.3%) | 48 (21.9%) | 11 (5%) | 219 |
| 2 | 30 (65.2%) | 26 (56.5%) | 3 (6.5%) | 1 (2.2%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (4.3%) | 1 (2.2%) | 0 (0%) | 12 (26.1%) | 9 (19.6%) | 3 (6.5%) | 46 |
| (blank) | 67 (67%) | 59 (59%) | 3 (3%) | 5 (5%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (9%) | 6 (6%) | 1 (1%) | 24 (24%) | 20 (20%) | 3 (3%) | 100 |
| **Social Studies** | 5 (71.4%) | 5 (71.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (28.6%) | 1 (14.3%) | 1 (14.3%) | 7 |
| 1 | 3 (75%) | 3 (75%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) | 4 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| (blank) | 2 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| **Sociology** | 68 (57.1%) | 61 (51.3%) | 5 (4.2%) | 2 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (8.4%) | 7 (5.9%) | 3 (2.5%) | 41 (34.5%) | 31 (26.1%) | 10 (8.4%) | 119 |
| 1 | 51 (60%) | 46 (54.1%) | 4 (4.7%) | 1 (1.2%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (7.1%) | 4 (4.7%) | 2 (2.4%) | 28 (32.9%) | 23 (27.1%) | 5 (5.9%) | 85 |
| 2 | 7 (43.8%) | 7 (43.8%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (6.3%) | 1 (6.3%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (50%) | 4 (25%) | 4 (25%) | 16 |
| (blank) | 10 (55.6%) | 8 (44.4%) | 1 (5.6%) | 1 (5.6%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (16.7%) | 2 (11.1%) | 1 (5.6%) | 5 (27.8%) | 4 (22.2%) | 1 (5.6%) | 18 |
| **Spanish** | 14 (66.7%) | 12 (57.1%) | 1 (4.8%) | 1 (4.8%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (4.8%) | 1 (4.8%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (28.6%) | 5 (23.8%) | 0 (0%) | 21 |
| 1 | 6 (60%) | 4 (40%) | 1 (10%) | 1 (10%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (40%) | 4 (40%) | 0 (0%) | 10 |
| 2 | 6 (100%) | 6 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 |
| (blank) | 2 (40%) | 2 (40%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (20%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (40%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 5 |
| **Women's Studies** | 7 (87.5%) | 5 (62.5%) | 1 (12.5%) | 1 (12.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (12.5%) | 1 (12.5%) | 0 (0%) | 8 |
| 1 | 4 (100%) | 3 (75%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 |
| 2 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| (blank) | 2 (66.7%) | 1 (33.3%) | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (33.3%) | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |
| **Zoology** | 102 (68.5%) | 77 (51.7%) | 23 (15.4%) | 2 (1.3%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (6%) | 3 (2%) | 3 (2%) | 38 (25.5%) | 33 (22.1%) | 4 (2.7%) | 149 |
| 1 | 62 (67.4%) | 44 (47.8%) | 16 (17.4%) | 2 (2.2%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (7.6%) | 3 (3.3%) | 2 (2.2%) | 23 (25%) | 19 (20.7%) | 3 (3.3%) | 92 |
| 2 | 11 (64.7%) | 8 (47.1%) | 3 (17.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (11.8%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (5.9%) | 4 (23.5%) | 3 (17.6%) | 1 (5.9%) | 17 |
| (blank) | 29 (72.5%) | 25 (62.5%) | 4 (10%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (27.5%) | 11 (27.5%) | 0 (0%) | 40 |
| **College of Education** | 504 (65.3%) | 434 (56.2%) | 60 (7.8%) | 9 (1.2%) | 1 (0.1%) | 63 (8.2%) | 48 (6.2%) | 7 (0.9%) | 205 (26.6%) | 166 (21.5%) | 36 (4.7%) | 772 |
| **Athletic Training** | 29 (69%) | 29 (69%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (7.1%) | 2 (4.8%) | 1 (2.4%) | 10 (23.8%) | 7 (16.7%) | 3 (7.1%) | 42 |
| 1 | 23 (79.3%) | 23 (79.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (6.9%) | 1 (3.4%) | 1 (3.4%) | 4 (13.8%) | 4 (13.8%) | 0 (0%) | 29 |
| 2 | 1 (20%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (20%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (60%) | 2 (40%) | 1 (20%) | 5 |
| (blank) | 5 (62.5%) | 5 (62.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (37.5%) | 1 (12.5%) | 2 (25%) | 8 |
| **Education** | 219 (68.2%) | 170 (53%) | 43 (13.4%) | 6 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 24 (7.5%) | 14 (4.4%) | 4 (1.2%) | 78 (24.3%) | 64 (19.9%) | 12 (3.7%) | 321 |
| 1 | 160 (67.8%) | 122 (51.7%) | 36 (15.3%) | 2 (0.8%) | 0 (0%) | 23 (9.7%) | 14 (5.9%) | 3 (1.3%) | 53 (22.5%) | 44 (18.6%) | 9 (3.8%) | 236 |
| 2 | 21 (65.6%) | 15 (46.9%) | 4 (12.5%) | 2 (6.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (34.4%) | 9 (28.1%) | 2 (6.3%) | 32 |
| (blank) | 38 (71.7%) | 33 (62.3%) | 3 (5.7%) | 2 (3.8%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.9%) | 14 (26.4%) | 11 (20.8%) | 1 (1.9%) | 53 |
| **Elementary Education** | 3 (100%) | 2 (66.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |
| 1 | 3 (100%) | 2 (66.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Health and Fitness** | 2 (66.7%) | 2 (66.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (33.3%) | 3 |
| 1 | 2 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 |
| **Kinesiology** | 127 (63.8%) | 121 (60.8%) | 5 (2.5%) | 1 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 18 (9%) | 16 (8%) | 2 (1%) | 54 (27.1%) | 46 (23.1%) | 7 (3.5%) | 199 |
| 1 | 79 (61.7%) | 75 (58.6%) | 3 (2.3%) | 1 (0.8%) | 0 (0%) | 12 (9.4%) | 10 (7.8%) | 2 (1.6%) | 37 (28.9%) | 32 (25%) | 4 (3.1%) | 128 |
| 2 | 23 (82.1%) | 22 (78.6%) | 1 (3.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (17.9%) | 4 (14.3%) | 1 (3.6%) | 28 |
| (blank) | 25 (58.1%) | 24 (55.8%) | 1 (2.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (14%) | 6 (14%) | 0 (0%) | 12 (27.9%) | 10 (23.3%) | 2 (4.7%) | 43 |
| **Movement Studies** | 3 (75%) | 2 (50%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 4 |
| 1 | 2 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| 2 | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Sports Management** | 136 (62.1%) | 121 (55.3%) | 12 (5.5%) | 2 (0.9%) | 1 (0.5%) | 18 (8.2%) | 16 (7.3%) | 0 (0%) | 65 (29.7%) | 51 (23.3%) | 14 (6.4%) | 219 |
| 1 | 97 (66.9%) | 85 (58.6%) | 10 (6.9%) | 1 (0.7%) | 1 (0.7%) | 10 (6.9%) | 8 (5.5%) | 0 (0%) | 38 (26.2%) | 30 (20.7%) | 8 (5.5%) | 145 |
| 2 | 11 (50%) | 10 (45.5%) | 1 (4.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (9.1%) | 2 (9.1%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (40.9%) | 5 (22.7%) | 4 (18.2%) | 22 |
| (blank) | 28 (53.8%) | 26 (50%) | 1 (1.9%) | 1 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (11.5%) | 6 (11.5%) | 0 (0%) | 18 (34.6%) | 16 (30.8%) | 2 (3.8%) | 52 |
| **College of Medical Sciences** | 31 (64.6%) | 28 (58.3%) | 2 (4.2%) | 1 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (8.3%) | 2 (4.2%) | 1 (2.1%) | 13 (27.1%) | 9 (18.8%) | 4 (8.3%) | 48 |
| **Speech and Hearing Sciences** | 31 (64.6%) | 28 (58.3%) | 2 (4.2%) | 1 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (8.3%) | 2 (4.2%) | 1 (2.1%) | 13 (27.1%) | 9 (18.8%) | 4 (8.3%) | 48 |
| 1 | 20 (71.4%) | 19 (67.9%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (3.6%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (10.7%) | 1 (3.6%) | 1 (3.6%) | 5 (17.9%) | 2 (7.1%) | 3 (10.7%) | 28 |
| 2 | 3 (60%) | 3 (60%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (40%) | 2 (40%) | 0 (0%) | 5 |
| (blank) | 8 (53.3%) | 6 (40%) | 2 (13.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (6.7%) | 1 (6.7%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (40%) | 5 (33.3%) | 1 (6.7%) | 15 |
| **College of Nursing** | 356 (65.2%) | 278 (50.9%) | 54 (9.9%) | 24 (4.4%) | 0 (0%) | 57 (10.4%) | 34 (6.2%) | 7 (1.3%) | 132 (24.2%) | 119 (21.8%) | 10 (1.8%) | 546 |
| **Nursing** | 356 (65.2%) | 278 (50.9%) | 54 (9.9%) | 24 (4.4%) | 0 (0%) | 57 (10.4%) | 34 (6.2%) | 7 (1.3%) | 132 (24.2%) | 119 (21.8%) | 10 (1.8%) | 546 |
| 1 | 215 (67.6%) | 170 (53.5%) | 32 (10.1%) | 13 (4.1%) | 0 (0%) | 37 (11.6%) | 18 (5.7%) | 5 (1.6%) | 65 (20.4%) | 61 (19.2%) | 3 (0.9%) | 318 |
| 2 | 73 (65.2%) | 56 (50%) | 9 (8%) | 8 (7.1%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (8%) | 8 (7.1%) | 1 (0.9%) | 30 (26.8%) | 29 (25.9%) | 1 (0.9%) | 112 |
| (blank) | 68 (58.6%) | 52 (44.8%) | 13 (11.2%) | 3 (2.6%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (9.5%) | 8 (6.9%) | 1 (0.9%) | 37 (31.9%) | 29 (25%) | 6 (5.2%) | 116 |
| **College of Pharmacy** | 19 (59.4%) | 16 (50%) | 1 (3.1%) | 2 (6.3%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (18.8%) | 5 (15.6%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (21.9%) | 6 (18.8%) | 1 (3.1%) | 32 |
| **Nutrition and Exercise Physiology** | 19 (59.4%) | 16 (50%) | 1 (3.1%) | 2 (6.3%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (18.8%) | 5 (15.6%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (21.9%) | 6 (18.8%) | 1 (3.1%) | 32 |
| 1 | 13 (59.1%) | 13 (59.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (27.3%) | 5 (22.7%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (13.6%) | 3 (13.6%) | 0 (0%) | 22 |
| 2 | 2 (50%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (50%) | 1 (25%) | 1 (25%) | 4 |
| (blank) | 4 (66.7%) | 2 (33.3%) | 1 (16.7%) | 1 (16.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (33.3%) | 2 (33.3%) | 0 (0%) | 6 |
| **College of Veterinary Medicine** | 168 (65.1%) | 124 (48.1%) | 33 (12.8%) | 10 (3.9%) | 1 (0.4%) | 36 (14%) | 13 (5%) | 7 (2.7%) | 54 (20.9%) | 39 (15.1%) | 9 (3.5%) | 258 |
| **Biochemistry** | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Biochemisty** | 41 (61.2%) | 31 (46.3%) | 8 (11.9%) | 2 (3%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (10.4%) | 3 (4.5%) | 2 (3%) | 19 (28.4%) | 14 (20.9%) | 3 (4.5%) | 67 |
| 1 | 24 (64.9%) | 18 (48.6%) | 5 (13.5%) | 1 (2.7%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (16.2%) | 3 (8.1%) | 1 (2.7%) | 7 (18.9%) | 5 (13.5%) | 1 (2.7%) | 37 |
| 2 | 8 (57.1%) | 7 (50%) | 1 (7.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (42.9%) | 5 (35.7%) | 0 (0%) | 14 |
| (blank) | 9 (56.3%) | 6 (37.5%) | 2 (12.5%) | 1 (6.3%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (6.3%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (6.3%) | 6 (37.5%) | 4 (25%) | 2 (12.5%) | 16 |
| **Biophysics (Biochemistry Option)** | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Genetics and Cell Biology** | 10 (58.8%) | 8 (47.1%) | 2 (11.8%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (17.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (23.5%) | 2 (11.8%) | 1 (5.9%) | 17 |
| 1 | 7 (58.3%) | 5 (41.7%) | 2 (16.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (16.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (8.3%) | 12 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| (blank) | 3 (75%) | 3 (75%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 4 |
| **Microbiology** | 39 (65%) | 24 (40%) | 12 (20%) | 2 (3.3%) | 1 (1.7%) | 5 (8.3%) | 1 (1.7%) | 2 (3.3%) | 16 (26.7%) | 11 (18.3%) | 4 (6.7%) | 60 |
| 1 | 23 (69.7%) | 14 (42.4%) | 9 (27.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (27.3%) | 5 (15.2%) | 3 (9.1%) | 33 |
| 2 | 4 (36.4%) | 4 (36.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (18.2%) | 1 (9.1%) | 1 (9.1%) | 5 (45.5%) | 4 (36.4%) | 1 (9.1%) | 11 |
| (blank) | 12 (75%) | 6 (37.5%) | 3 (18.8%) | 2 (12.5%) | 1 (6.3%) | 2 (12.5%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (6.3%) | 2 (12.5%) | 2 (12.5%) | 0 (0%) | 16 |
| **Neuroscience** | 70 (69.3%) | 54 (53.5%) | 10 (9.9%) | 6 (5.9%) | 0 (0%) | 18 (17.8%) | 9 (8.9%) | 3 (3%) | 13 (12.9%) | 10 (9.9%) | 1 (1%) | 101 |
| 1 | 38 (66.7%) | 32 (56.1%) | 4 (7%) | 2 (3.5%) | 0 (0%) | 12 (21.1%) | 6 (10.5%) | 2 (3.5%) | 7 (12.3%) | 6 (10.5%) | 0 (0%) | 57 |
| 2 | 17 (81%) | 13 (61.9%) | 3 (14.3%) | 1 (4.8%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (9.5%) | 1 (4.8%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (9.5%) | 1 (4.8%) | 1 (4.8%) | 21 |
| (blank) | 15 (65.2%) | 9 (39.1%) | 3 (13%) | 3 (13%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (17.4%) | 2 (8.7%) | 1 (4.3%) | 4 (17.4%) | 3 (13%) | 0 (0%) | 23 |
| **Pharmacy** | 6 (75%) | 6 (75%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (12.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (12.5%) | 1 (12.5%) | 0 (0%) | 8 |
| 1 | 3 (60%) | 3 (60%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (20%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 5 |
| 2 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 |
| (blank) | 2 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| **Pre-Veterinary Medicine** | 2 (50%) | 1 (25%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 4 |
| 1 | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| **Veterinary Medicine** | 2 (50%) | 1 (25%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 4 |
| 1 | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| **Edward R. Murrow College of Communication** | 387 (62.8%) | 341 (55.4%) | 39 (6.3%) | 6 (1%) | 1 (0.2%) | 55 (8.9%) | 39 (6.3%) | 8 (1.3%) | 173 (28.1%) | 124 (20.1%) | 47 (7.6%) | 616 |
| **Advertising** | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 2 |
| 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 2 |
| **Communication Studies** | 384 (62.7%) | 338 (55.2%) | 39 (6.4%) | 6 (1%) | 1 (0.2%) | 55 (9%) | 39 (6.4%) | 8 (1.3%) | 172 (28.1%) | 124 (20.3%) | 46 (7.5%) | 612 |
| 1 | 256 (63.1%) | 220 (54.2%) | 30 (7.4%) | 5 (1.2%) | 1 (0.2%) | 45 (11.1%) | 33 (8.1%) | 6 (1.5%) | 104 (25.6%) | 76 (18.7%) | 27 (6.7%) | 406 |
| 2 | 32 (64%) | 29 (58%) | 3 (6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (6%) | 2 (4%) | 0 (0%) | 15 (30%) | 10 (20%) | 5 (10%) | 50 |
| (blank) | 96 (61.5%) | 89 (57.1%) | 6 (3.8%) | 1 (0.6%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (4.5%) | 4 (2.6%) | 2 (1.3%) | 53 (34%) | 38 (24.4%) | 14 (9%) | 156 |
| **Journalism and Media Production** | 2 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| 1 | 2 (100%) | 2 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **University College** | 25 (53.2%) | 17 (36.2%) | 7 (14.9%) | 1 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (10.6%) | 4 (8.5%) | 1 (2.1%) | 17 (36.2%) | 13 (27.7%) | 4 (8.5%) | 47 |
| **Undeclared** | 25 (53.2%) | 17 (36.2%) | 7 (14.9%) | 1 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (10.6%) | 4 (8.5%) | 1 (2.1%) | 17 (36.2%) | 13 (27.7%) | 4 (8.5%) | 47 |
| 1 | 17 (58.6%) | 12 (41.4%) | 4 (13.8%) | 1 (3.4%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (17.2%) | 4 (13.8%) | 1 (3.4%) | 7 (24.1%) | 5 (17.2%) | 2 (6.9%) | 29 |
| 2 | 3 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (50%) | 2 (33.3%) | 1 (16.7%) | 6 |
| (blank) | 5 (41.7%) | 5 (41.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (58.3%) | 6 (50%) | 1 (8.3%) | 12 |
| **Unknown** | 3 (100%) | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |
| **Leadership and Professional Studies** | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Not Major** | 3 (100%) | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |
| 1 | 3 (100%) | 3 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 |
| 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| (blank) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 |
| **Voiland College of Engineering and Architecture** | 1184 (58.9%) | 988 (49.2%) | 165 (8.2%) | 28 (1.4%) | 3 (0.1%) | 152 (7.6%) | 97 (4.8%) | 19 (0.9%) | 672 (33.4%) | 526 (26.2%) | 140 (7%) | 2010 |
| **Apparel, Merchandising, Design and Textiles** | 67 (53.6%) | 60 (48%) | 6 (4.8%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.8%) | 12 (9.6%) | 8 (6.4%) | 1 (0.8%) | 46 (36.8%) | 37 (29.6%) | 9 (7.2%) | 125 |
| 1 | 51 (60%) | 45 (52.9%) | 5 (5.9%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.2%) | 10 (11.8%) | 7 (8.2%) | 1 (1.2%) | 24 (28.2%) | 19 (22.4%) | 5 (5.9%) | 85 |
| 2 | 5 (29.4%) | 5 (29.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 12 (70.6%) | 11 (64.7%) | 1 (5.9%) | 17 |
| (blank) | 11 (47.8%) | 10 (43.5%) | 1 (4.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (8.7%) | 1 (4.3%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (43.5%) | 7 (30.4%) | 3 (13%) | 23 |
| **Architecture** | 41 (53.2%) | 37 (48.1%) | 3 (3.9%) | 1 (1.3%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (6.5%) | 3 (3.9%) | 2 (2.6%) | 31 (40.3%) | 25 (32.5%) | 6 (7.8%) | 77 |
| 1 | 24 (68.6%) | 22 (62.9%) | 2 (5.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (5.7%) | 1 (2.9%) | 1 (2.9%) | 9 (25.7%) | 7 (20%) | 2 (5.7%) | 35 |
| 2 | 11 (45.8%) | 10 (41.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (4.2%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (4.2%) | 1 (4.2%) | 0 (0%) | 12 (50%) | 9 (37.5%) | 3 (12.5%) | 24 |
| (blank) | 6 (33.3%) | 5 (27.8%) | 1 (5.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (11.1%) | 1 (5.6%) | 1 (5.6%) | 10 (55.6%) | 9 (50%) | 1 (5.6%) | 18 |
| **Bioengineering** | 30 (75%) | 23 (57.5%) | 6 (15%) | 1 (2.5%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (2.5%) | 1 (2.5%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (22.5%) | 7 (17.5%) | 2 (5%) | 40 |
| 1 | 18 (78.3%) | 12 (52.2%) | 5 (21.7%) | 1 (4.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (21.7%) | 5 (21.7%) | 0 (0%) | 23 |
| 2 | 6 (60%) | 6 (60%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (10%) | 1 (10%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (30%) | 1 (10%) | 2 (20%) | 10 |
| (blank) | 6 (85.7%) | 5 (71.4%) | 1 (14.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (14.3%) | 1 (14.3%) | 0 (0%) | 7 |
| **Chemical Engineering** | 73 (58.4%) | 59 (47.2%) | 9 (7.2%) | 5 (4%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (6.4%) | 4 (3.2%) | 2 (1.6%) | 44 (35.2%) | 32 (25.6%) | 11 (8.8%) | 125 |
| 1 | 38 (62.3%) | 30 (49.2%) | 4 (6.6%) | 4 (6.6%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (4.9%) | 2 (3.3%) | 0 (0%) | 20 (32.8%) | 15 (24.6%) | 4 (6.6%) | 61 |
| 2 | 14 (60.9%) | 13 (56.5%) | 1 (4.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (39.1%) | 5 (21.7%) | 4 (17.4%) | 23 |
| (blank) | 21 (51.2%) | 16 (39%) | 4 (9.8%) | 1 (2.4%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (12.2%) | 2 (4.9%) | 2 (4.9%) | 15 (36.6%) | 12 (29.3%) | 3 (7.3%) | 41 |
| **Civil Engineering** | 136 (62.4%) | 121 (55.5%) | 15 (6.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 17 (7.8%) | 13 (6%) | 0 (0%) | 65 (29.8%) | 50 (22.9%) | 14 (6.4%) | 218 |
| 1 | 91 (73.4%) | 81 (65.3%) | 10 (8.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (7.3%) | 5 (4%) | 0 (0%) | 24 (19.4%) | 19 (15.3%) | 5 (4%) | 124 |
| 2 | 16 (45.7%) | 16 (45.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (11.4%) | 4 (11.4%) | 0 (0%) | 15 (42.9%) | 11 (31.4%) | 4 (11.4%) | 35 |
| (blank) | 29 (49.2%) | 24 (40.7%) | 5 (8.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (6.8%) | 4 (6.8%) | 0 (0%) | 26 (44.1%) | 20 (33.9%) | 5 (8.5%) | 59 |
| **Computer Engineering** | 19 (52.8%) | 16 (44.4%) | 2 (5.6%) | 1 (2.8%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (5.6%) | 2 (5.6%) | 0 (0%) | 15 (41.7%) | 14 (38.9%) | 1 (2.8%) | 36 |
| 1 | 9 (52.9%) | 9 (52.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (11.8%) | 2 (11.8%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (35.3%) | 6 (35.3%) | 0 (0%) | 17 |
| 2 | 3 (42.9%) | 3 (42.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (57.1%) | 4 (57.1%) | 0 (0%) | 7 |
| (blank) | 7 (58.3%) | 4 (33.3%) | 2 (16.7%) | 1 (8.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (41.7%) | 4 (33.3%) | 1 (8.3%) | 12 |
| **Computer Science** | 209 (60.9%) | 164 (47.8%) | 38 (11.1%) | 6 (1.7%) | 1 (0.3%) | 34 (9.9%) | 19 (5.5%) | 7 (2%) | 100 (29.2%) | 79 (23%) | 20 (5.8%) | 343 |
| 1 | 136 (65.1%) | 106 (50.7%) | 26 (12.4%) | 3 (1.4%) | 1 (0.5%) | 23 (11%) | 12 (5.7%) | 6 (2.9%) | 50 (23.9%) | 43 (20.6%) | 6 (2.9%) | 209 |
| 2 | 39 (52%) | 30 (40%) | 7 (9.3%) | 2 (2.7%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (6.7%) | 3 (4%) | 0 (0%) | 31 (41.3%) | 22 (29.3%) | 9 (12%) | 75 |
| (blank) | 34 (57.6%) | 28 (47.5%) | 5 (8.5%) | 1 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (10.2%) | 4 (6.8%) | 1 (1.7%) | 19 (32.2%) | 14 (23.7%) | 5 (8.5%) | 59 |
| **Construction Management** | 74 (64.9%) | 70 (61.4%) | 4 (3.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (7.9%) | 7 (6.1%) | 2 (1.8%) | 31 (27.2%) | 25 (21.9%) | 6 (5.3%) | 114 |
| 1 | 60 (67.4%) | 56 (62.9%) | 4 (4.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (6.7%) | 4 (4.5%) | 2 (2.2%) | 23 (25.8%) | 18 (20.2%) | 5 (5.6%) | 89 |
| 2 | 3 (42.9%) | 3 (42.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (14.3%) | 1 (14.3%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (42.9%) | 3 (42.9%) | 0 (0%) | 7 |
| (blank) | 11 (61.1%) | 11 (61.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (11.1%) | 2 (11.1%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (27.8%) | 4 (22.2%) | 1 (5.6%) | 18 |
| **Electrical Engineering** | 145 (54.7%) | 121 (45.7%) | 20 (7.5%) | 4 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 22 (8.3%) | 12 (4.5%) | 3 (1.1%) | 98 (37%) | 75 (28.3%) | 22 (8.3%) | 265 |
| 1 | 92 (62.6%) | 75 (51%) | 14 (9.5%) | 3 (2%) | 0 (0%) | 14 (9.5%) | 6 (4.1%) | 3 (2%) | 41 (27.9%) | 34 (23.1%) | 6 (4.1%) | 147 |
| 2 | 30 (42.9%) | 27 (38.6%) | 3 (4.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (5.7%) | 4 (5.7%) | 0 (0%) | 36 (51.4%) | 23 (32.9%) | 13 (18.6%) | 70 |
| (blank) | 23 (47.9%) | 19 (39.6%) | 3 (6.3%) | 1 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (8.3%) | 2 (4.2%) | 0 (0%) | 21 (43.8%) | 18 (37.5%) | 3 (6.3%) | 48 |
| **Engineering** | 780 (59%) | 648 (49%) | 110 (8.3%) | 21 (1.6%) | 1 (0.1%) | 88 (6.7%) | 57 (4.3%) | 8 (0.6%) | 453 (34.2%) | 349 (26.4%) | 99 (7.5%) | 1323 |
| 1 | 487 (65.4%) | 401 (53.8%) | 72 (9.7%) | 14 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 52 (7%) | 31 (4.2%) | 4 (0.5%) | 205 (27.5%) | 168 (22.6%) | 34 (4.6%) | 745 |
| 2 | 143 (49.7%) | 129 (44.8%) | 12 (4.2%) | 2 (0.7%) | 0 (0%) | 14 (4.9%) | 11 (3.8%) | 2 (0.7%) | 130 (45.1%) | 91 (31.6%) | 39 (13.5%) | 288 |
| (blank) | 150 (51.7%) | 118 (40.7%) | 26 (9%) | 5 (1.7%) | 1 (0.3%) | 22 (7.6%) | 15 (5.2%) | 2 (0.7%) | 118 (40.7%) | 90 (31%) | 26 (9%) | 290 |
| **Materials Science** | 17 (50%) | 13 (38.2%) | 4 (11.8%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (14.7%) | 3 (8.8%) | 0 (0%) | 12 (35.3%) | 11 (32.4%) | 1 (2.9%) | 34 |
| 1 | 7 (41.2%) | 3 (17.6%) | 4 (23.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (29.4%) | 3 (17.6%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (29.4%) | 5 (29.4%) | 0 (0%) | 17 |
| 2 | 3 (42.9%) | 3 (42.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (57.1%) | 3 (42.9%) | 1 (14.3%) | 7 |
| (blank) | 7 (70%) | 7 (70%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (30%) | 3 (30%) | 0 (0%) | 10 |
| **Mechanical Engineering** | 344 (58.9%) | 281 (48.1%) | 53 (9.1%) | 9 (1.5%) | 1 (0.2%) | 35 (6%) | 23 (3.9%) | 3 (0.5%) | 204 (34.9%) | 158 (27.1%) | 44 (7.5%) | 584 |
| 1 | 220 (64%) | 179 (52%) | 35 (10.2%) | 6 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) | 21 (6.1%) | 14 (4.1%) | 1 (0.3%) | 103 (29.9%) | 85 (24.7%) | 17 (4.9%) | 344 |
| 2 | 62 (51.2%) | 54 (44.6%) | 7 (5.8%) | 1 (0.8%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (4.1%) | 2 (1.7%) | 2 (1.7%) | 53 (43.8%) | 39 (32.2%) | 14 (11.6%) | 121 |
| (blank) | 62 (52.1%) | 48 (40.3%) | 11 (9.2%) | 2 (1.7%) | 1 (0.8%) | 9 (7.6%) | 7 (5.9%) | 0 (0%) | 48 (40.3%) | 34 (28.6%) | 13 (10.9%) | 119 |

# Appendix C: Paper Submissions by Prefix and Course Number 2015-2017

This appendix lists the origin of every piece of writing composed at WSU and submitted as part of Tier II in the last biennium. Historically, courses like English 101 and History 105 (equivalent to General Education 110/111 prior to 2012) have been most heavily represented in this set, as they are two writing-intensive courses that nearly all students take prior to their junior year. This biennium, they continued to be the two most common sources of work submitted; however, students did pull from a variety of disciplines. The top ten sources of submitted work are as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Course | Papers Submitted |
| History 105 | 1615 |
| English 101 | 987 |
| English 402 | 727 |
| History 305 | 594 |
| Psychology 105 | 357 |
| Biology 106 | 355 |
| Economic Sciences 102 | 346 |
| Sociology 101 | 342 |
| Anthropology 101 | 338 |
| Human Development 205 | 296 |

Not all prefixes are currently used by the university. Some papers were submitted before the reorganization of some colleges in 2012, and their prefixes may not have originally fallen under the colleges listed below. Some papers were submitted from classes no longer offered. This list does not include papers written at other institutions, for general university purposes (e.g., certification letters) or in a professional setting.

Carson College of Business

Accounting

Accounting 105 1

Accounting 108 1

Accounting 230 14

Accounting 231 26

Accounting 241 1

Accounting 250 1

Accounting 301 1

Accounting 330 28

Accounting 331 2

Accounting 335 44

Accounting 420 1

Accounting 433 1

Accounting 438 2

Accounting 439 1

Business

Business 207 1

Business 210 9

Business 360 1

Business 401 1

Business 452 1

Business 453 1

Business Administration

Business Administration 210 4

Business Administration 212 1

Business Administration 280 1

Business Administration 316 1

Business Administration 321 1

Business Administration 347 1

Business Administration 368 1

Business Administration 437 1

Business Administration 478 1

Business Administration 497 1

Business Law

Business Law 101 1

Business Law 201 1

Business Law 210 171

Business Law 216 1

Business Law 240 1

Business Law 250 2

Business Law 321 1

Business Law 469 1

Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship 101 1

Entrepreneurship 343 1

Entrepreneurship 426 8

Entrepreneurship 485 4

Entrepreneurship 489 8

Entrepreneurship 490 10

Entrepreneurship 492 4

Finance

Finance 101 9

Finance 201 1

Finance 223 10

Finance 301 1

Finance 305 1

Finance 321 1

Finance 325 10

Finance 331 1

Finance 345 4

Finance 381 1

Finance 405 1

Finance 421 5

Finance 425 12

Finance 427 4

Finance 481 4

Finance 482 1

Hospitality Business Management

Hospitality Business Management 101 6

Hospitality Business Management 120 1

Hospitality Business Management 180 1

Hospitality Business Management 182 11

Hospitality Business Management 218 1

Hospitality Business Management 235 19

Hospitality Business Management 253 1

Hospitality Business Management 258 1

Hospitality Business Management 280 58

Hospitality Business Management 301 9

Hospitality Business Management 306 1

Hospitality Business Management 320 1

Hospitality Business Management 358 9

Hospitality Business Management 375 4

Hospitality Business Management 381 38

Hospitality Business Management 401 2

Hospitality Business Management 424 1

Hospitality Business Management 484 1

Hospitality Business Management 491 2

Hospitality Business Management 494 29

Hospitality Business Management 499 1

International Business

International Business 201 1

International Business 203 1

International Business 210 1

International Business 326 2

International Business 330 1

International Business 380 88

International Business 390 1

International Business 415 3

International Business 425 1

International Business 435 4

International Business 453 17

International Business 482 14

International Business 496 2

Management

Management 105 1

Management 215 3

Management 301 208

Management 302 1

Management 307 1

Management 315 4

Management 340 1

Management 355 1

Management 360 2

Management 385 1

Management 391 1

Management 401 50

Management 450 18

Management 455 2

Management 456 4

Management 483 7

Management 485 32

Management 487 15

Management 491 9

Management and Operations

Management and Operations 215 9

Management and Operations 301 2

Management and Operations 340 8

Management Information Systems

Management Information Systems 153 1

Management Information Systems 250 61

Management Information Systems 304 1

Management Information Systems 315 1

Management Information Systems 322 18

Management Information Systems 325 1

Management Information Systems 372 12

Management Information Systems 410 1

Management Information Systems 420 10

Management Information Systems 426 6

Management Information Systems 441 4

Management Information Systems 448 1

Marketing

Marketing 105 2

Marketing 250 1

Marketing 261 1

Marketing 279 1

Marketing 301 1

Marketing 360 200

Marketing 365 1

Marketing 368 5

Marketing 379 11

Marketing 407 8

Marketing 461 11

Marketing 464 1

Marketing 468 12

Marketing 477 25

Marketing 478 1

Marketing 479 1

Marketing 480 3

Marketing 482 1

Marketing 495 4

Marketing 496 1

College of Agricultural, Human and Natural Resource Sciences (CAHNRS)

Agriculture and Food Systems

Agriculture and Food Systems 101 9

Agriculture and Food Systems 302 3

Agriculture and Food Systems 336 10

Agriculture and Food Systems 401 1

Agriculture and Food Systems 445 1

Agricultural Technology and Production Management

Agricultural Technology and Production Management 402 1

Agriculture

Agriculture 102 1

Agriculture 271 1

Agriculture Education

Agriculture Education 110 1

Agriculture Education 440 1

Agriculture Education 450 1

Animal Sciences

Animal Sciences 101 75

Animal Sciences 130 1

Animal Sciences 180 4

Animal Sciences 201 3

Animal Sciences 203 2

Animal Sciences 205 12

Animal Sciences 230 1

Animal Sciences 266 5

Animal Sciences 280 4

Animal Sciences 285 28

Animal Sciences 313 3

Animal Sciences 314 1

Animal Sciences 316 2

Animal Sciences 320 1

Animal Sciences 331 1

Animal Sciences 350 12

Animal Sciences 351 1

Animal Sciences 395 1

Animal Sciences 404 2

Animal Sciences 408 1

Animal Sciences 418 3

Animal Sciences 438 1

Animal Sciences 465 1

Animal Sciences 468 4

Animal Sciences 473 1

Animal Sciences 485 2

Crop Science

Crop Science 102 13

Crop Science 120 1

Crop Science 202 6

Crop Science 301 1

Crop Science 302 5

Crop Science 305 7

Crop Science 360 6

Crop Science 401 3

Crop Science 403 6

Crop Science 411 14

Crop Science 415 1

Crop Science 445 1

Crop Science 495 1

Ecology

Ecology 309 1

Ecology 372 1

Economic Sciences

Economic Sciences 101 253

Economic Sciences 102 346

Economic Sciences 120 1

Economic Sciences 198 34

Economic Sciences 300 1

Economic Sciences 301 1

Economic Sciences 302 1

Economic Sciences 305 3

Economic Sciences 311 41

Economic Sciences 313 1

Economic Sciences 321 16

Economic Sciences 322 3

Economic Sciences 324 6

Economic Sciences 326 4

Economic Sciences 330 7

Economic Sciences 335 2

Economic Sciences 350 4

Economic Sciences 351 4

Economic Sciences 352 2

Economic Sciences 372 2

Economic Sciences 425 1

Economic Sciences 428 4

Economic Sciences 450 16

Economic Sciences 451 2

Economic Sciences 452 2

Economic Sciences 483 1

Economic Sciences 490 6

Entomology

Entomology 101 3

Entomology 102 4

Entomology 103 2

Entomology 150 2

Entomology 251 1

Entomology 343 40

Entomology 351 8

Entomology 401 4

Entomology 490 1

Environmental Sciences

Environmental Sciences 101 160

Environmental Sciences 275 1

Environmental Sciences 300 1

Environmental Sciences 301 1

Environmental Sciences 310 4

Environmental Sciences 332 1

Environmental Sciences 372 5

Environmental Sciences 402 1

Environmental Sciences 404 2

Environmental Sciences 444 6

Environmental Sciences 466 1

Environmental Sciences 492 1

Food Science

Food Science 110 1

Food Science 201 3

Food Science 220 4

Food Science 401 1

Food Science 430 1

Horticulture

Horticulture 102 10

Horticulture 113 2

Horticulture 150 2

Horticulture 156 1

Horticulture 202 9

Horticulture 232 2

Horticulture 251 3

Horticulture 310 5

Horticulture 313 7

Horticulture 320 2

Horticulture 331 2

Horticulture 351 3

Horticulture 357 7

Horticulture 425 4

Horticulture 445 2

Human Development

Human Development 101 158

Human Development 102 4

Human Development 103 92

Human Development 105 3

Human Development 110 1

Human Development 120 1

Human Development 121 1

Human Development 160 1

Human Development 200 23

Human Development 201 28

Human Development 202 16

Human Development 203 21

Human Development 204 177

Human Development 205 298

Human Development 206 1

Human Development 207 1

Human Development 210 1

Human Development 212 1

Human Development 215 2

Human Development 220 46

Human Development 230 1

Human Development 235 2

Human Development 250 3

Human Development 300 85

Human Development 301 36

Human Development 302 159

Human Development 304 26

Human Development 305 19

Human Development 306 12

Human Development 307 19

Human Development 308 6

Human Development 310 88

Human Development 320 20

Human Development 322 1

Human Development 330 1

Human Development 334 4

Human Development 335 3

Human Development 340 11

Human Development 341 23

Human Development 342 10

Human Development 343 1

Human Development 350 77

Human Development 360 21

Human Development 365 2

Human Development 370 1

Human Development 385 29

Human Development 387 1

Human Development 400 2

Human Development 401 1

Human Development 402 3

Human Development 403 80

Human Development 406 5

Human Development 408 15

Human Development 410 25

Human Development 415 4

Human Development 416 1

Human Development 420 8

Human Development 450 5

Human Development 479 6

Human Development 487 9

Human Development 497 12

Human Development 498 1

Human Development 499 1

Integrated Pest Management

Integrated Pest Management 452 1

Interior Design

Interior Design 103 1

Interior Design 201 21

Interior Design 203 9

Interior Design 312 5

Interior Design 321 4

Interior Design 326 5

Interior Design 333 2

Interior Design 392 1

Interior Design 426 3

Interior Design 490 1

Interior Design 498 3

Natural Resource Sciences

Natural Resource Sciences 154 1

Natural Resource Sciences 200 1

Natural Resource Sciences 300 71

Natural Resource Sciences 301 21

Natural Resource Sciences 302 3

Natural Resource Sciences 305 11

Natural Resource Sciences 310 10

Natural Resource Sciences 312 26

Natural Resource Sciences 401 1

Natural Resource Sciences 404 1

Natural Resource Sciences 411 1

Natural Resource Sciences 419 3

Natural Resource Sciences 431 4

Natural Resource Sciences 438 1

Natural Resource Sciences 446 1

Natural Resource Sciences 450 17

Natural Resource Sciences 454 5

Natural Resource Sciences 464 3

Plant Pathology

Plant Pathology 103 1

Plant Pathology 300 3

Plant Pathology 429 6

Plant Pathology 455 1

Soil Science

Soil Science 101 8

Soil Science 201 12

Soil Science 302 1

Soil Science 360 1

Soil Science 441 3

Viticulture and Enology

Viticulture and Enology 113 19

Viticulture and Enology 303 1

Viticulture and Enology 313 11

Viticulture and Enology 413 2

College of Arts and Sciences

American Studies

American Studies 216 1

American Studies 316 1

American Studies 472 1

American Studies 475 1

Anthropology

Anthropology 100 1

Anthropology 101 339

Anthropology 102 2

Anthropology 105 1

Anthropology 108 1

Anthropology 130 12

Anthropology 201 76

Anthropology 202 1

Anthropology 203 68

Anthropology 205 1

Anthropology 206 1

Anthropology 230 24

Anthropology 231 1

Anthropology 250 1

Anthropology 260 6

Anthropology 300 2

Anthropology 301 7

Anthropology 302 15

Anthropology 303 3

Anthropology 307 6

Anthropology 309 23

Anthropology 310 1

Anthropology 315 1

Anthropology 316 67

Anthropology 317 2

Anthropology 319 1

Anthropology 320 8

Anthropology 326 1

Anthropology 327 6

Anthropology 330 13

Anthropology 331 6

Anthropology 332 1

Anthropology 334 1

Anthropology 340 1

Anthropology 350 54

Anthropology 380 1

Anthropology 381 10

Anthropology 382 1

Anthropology 390 12

Anthropology 395 7

Anthropology 404 12

Anthropology 405 9

Anthropology 410 3

Anthropology 417 2

Anthropology 418 27

Anthropology 430 3

Anthropology 450 1

Anthropology 467 1

Anthropology 468 16

Anthropology 478 1

Anthropology 490 1

Anthropology 498 1

Art

Art 100 1

Art 101 19

Art 103 1

Art 111 1

Art 160 2

Art 201 1

Art 202 2

Art 320 1

Art 350 1

Asian Studies

Asian Studies 101 1

Asian Studies 111 10

Asian Studies 121 2

Asian Studies 123 1

Asian Studies 180 1

Asian Studies 205 1

Asian Studies 266 1

Asian Studies 285 3

Asian Studies 301 15

Asian Studies 314 2

Asian Studies 315 3

Asian Studies 330 4

Asian Studies 350 3

Asian Studies 440 1

Asian Studies 473 2

Asian Studies 475 2

Asian Studies 476 2

Astronomy

Astronomy 135 6

Astronomy 150 1

Astronomy 436 1

Astronomy 450 6

Biology

Biology 101 44

Biology 102 231

Biology 105 8

Biology 106 357

Biology 107 254

Biology 108 1

Biology 109 1

Biology 110 3

Biology 111 3

Biology 120 29

Biology 125 1

Biology 140 43

Biology 166 2

Biology 180 1

Biology 204 1

Biology 212 1

Biology 215 1

Biology 221 8

Biology 233 1

Biology 251 108

Biology 252 1

Biology 257 2

Biology 298 2

Biology 308 2

Biology 315 1

Biology 320 1

Biology 321 23

Biology 322 1

Biology 327 1

Biology 330 15

Biology 332 7

Biology 333 30

Biology 335 2

Biology 343 1

Biology 350 2

Biology 353 15

Biology 372 89

Biology 383 1

Biology 393 47

Biology 394 1

Biology 398 1

Biology 401 17

Biology 402 1

Biology 405 2

Biology 407 4

Biology 408 10

Biology 410 1

Biology 412 4

Biology 418 9

Biology 420 1

Biology 430 2

Biology 432 2

Biology 438 12

Biology 462 1

Biology 473 3

Biology 475 2

Biology 486 1

Biology 490 1

Biology 499 4

Botany

Botany 120 1

Chemistry

Chemistry 101 122

Chemistry 102 48

Chemistry 105 140

Chemistry 106 152

Chemistry 110 1

Chemistry 116 1

Chemistry 153 1

Chemistry 166 1

Chemistry 220 1

Chemistry 222 9

Chemistry 243 1

Chemistry 301 1

Chemistry 303 1

Chemistry 315 1

Chemistry 331 1

Chemistry 333 24

Chemistry 334 1

Chemistry 345 158

Chemistry 347 9

Chemistry 348 1

Chemistry 362 1

Chemistry 365 2

Chemistry 395 1

Chemistry 413 1

Chemistry 426 1

Chemistry 435 1

Chemistry 490 1

Chemistry 499 1

Chemistry 717 1

Chinese

Chinese 111 13

Chinese 121 3

Chinese 131 2

Chinese 306 1

Chinese 322 1

Chinese 330 2

Chinese 497 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 101 86

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 102 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 105 2

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 111 7

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 120 3

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 131 6

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 151 11

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 171 10

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 201 9

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 204 6

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 205 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 207 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 209 30

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 220 4

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 254 3

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 255 2

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 260 17

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 271 12

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 280 3

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 300 36

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 301 10

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 304 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 305 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 308 11

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 309 8

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 315 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 319 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 321 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 322 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 325 11

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 331 2

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 332 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 335 4

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 336 2

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 338 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 350 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 372 2

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 373 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 375 2

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 376 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 377 4

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 378 4

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 379 4

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 380 5

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 385 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 398 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 403 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 404 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 405 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 421 3

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 432 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 440 11

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 446 3

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 454 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 483 1

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 489 3

Contemporary Ethnic Studies 491 6

Criminal Justice

Criminal Justice 101 54

Criminal Justice 105 2

Criminal Justice 107 1

Criminal Justice 201 66

Criminal Justice 204 1

Criminal Justice 205 112

Criminal Justice 209 1

Criminal Justice 225 1

Criminal Justice 300 2

Criminal Justice 303 1

Criminal Justice 305 1

Criminal Justice 311 45

Criminal Justice 320 60

Criminal Justice 321 3

Criminal Justice 330 89

Criminal Justice 361 1

Criminal Justice 365 34

Criminal Justice 370 27

Criminal Justice 380 13

Criminal Justice 385 24

Criminal Justice 400 12

Criminal Justice 402 1

Criminal Justice 403 107

Criminal Justice 420 40

Criminal Justice 424 2

Criminal Justice 426 1

Criminal Justice 427 4

Criminal Justice 428 5

Criminal Justice 450 16

Criminal Justice 491 3

Criminal Justice 499 1

Criminal Justice 561 1

Dance

Dance 150 1

Dance 356 1

Digital Technology and Culture

Digital Technology and Culture 101 70

Digital Technology and Culture 121 1

Digital Technology and Culture 201 4

Digital Technology and Culture 331 1

Digital Technology and Culture 335 15

Digital Technology and Culture 336 3

Digital Technology and Culture 338 19

Digital Technology and Culture 354 10

Digital Technology and Culture 355 14

Digital Technology and Culture 356 50

Digital Technology and Culture 358 1

Digital Technology and Culture 365 1

Digital Technology and Culture 375 38

Digital Technology and Culture 435 4

Digital Technology and Culture 475 14

Digital Technology and Culture 476 2

Digital Technology and Culture 477 1

Digital Technology and Culture 478 10

Digital Technology and Culture 498 1

Drama

Drama 161 1

Drama 335 1

English

English 100 14

English 101 990

English 102 23

English 104 7

English 105 108

English 107 3

English 108 37

English 110 14

English 120 10

English 150 7

English 175 1

English 191 2

English 201 190

English 202 2

English 204 1

English 205 19

English 210 8

English 211 3

English 216 3

English 220 4

English 235 1

English 248 2

English 250 1

English 251 48

English 252 1

English 255 1

English 261 1

English 271 1

English 278 1

English 297 1

English 298 142

English 300 1

English 301 170

English 302 102

English 304 3

English 305 10

English 306 8

English 308 5

English 309 10

English 311 6

English 317 2

English 320 1

English 321 4

English 322 3

English 323 20

English 324 13

English 325 35

English 326 15

English 339 11

English 341 1

English 343 2

English 345 5

English 351 20

English 352 4

English 353 7

English 355 3

English 356 2

English 357 2

English 360 8

English 362 14

English 366 7

English 368 4

English 370 3

English 371 11

English 372 26

English 373 23

English 375 2

English 401 5

English 402 728

English 409 2

English 410 9

English 415 1

English 419 10

English 420 1

English 446 3

English 451 4

English 452 1

English 456 1

English 460 6

English 472 1

English 475 4

English 482 1

English 483 1

English 485 4

English 494 2

English 499 2

Film

Film 372 1

Fine Arts

Fine Arts 101 91

Fine Arts 102 11

Fine Arts 103 5

Fine Arts 104 1

Fine Arts 110 2

Fine Arts 162 1

Fine Arts 191 1

Fine Arts 201 27

Fine Arts 202 47

Fine Arts 203 1

Fine Arts 280 1

Fine Arts 301 2

Fine Arts 303 12

Fine Arts 304 1

Fine Arts 305 8

Fine Arts 307 4

Fine Arts 320 1

Fine Arts 321 2

Fine Arts 331 2

Fine Arts 332 1

Fine Arts 340 1

Fine Arts 350 7

Fine Arts 367 1

Fine Arts 371 1

Fine Arts 380 10

Fine Arts 381 1

Fine Arts 404 1

Fine Arts 405 3

Fine Arts 490 1

Foreign Language

Foreign Language 101 15

Foreign Language 110 1

Foreign Language 120 21

Foreign Language 300 1

Foreign Language 302 2

Foreign Language 350 1

Foreign Language 410 10

Foreign Language 440 1

French

French 102 1

French 110 23

French 120 8

French 140 1

French 203 1

French 204 1

French 261 1

French 308 1

French 361 1

French 408 1

French 410 8

French 450 2

French 470 1

General Education

General Education 110 1

General Education 111 1

General Studies

General Studies 110 2

General Studies 111 4

General Studies 230 1

General Studies 340 1

General Studies 400 1

Geology

Geology 101 185

Geology 102 6

Geology 103 16

Geology 201 2

Geology 210 39

Geology 219 1

Geology 230 54

Geology 301 1

Geology 303 3

Geology 320 2

Geology 340 2

Geology 350 1

Geology 356 1

Geology 390 3

German

German 101 3

German 203 3

German 204 1

German 308 1

German 420 4

Greek

Greek 101 1

History

History 101 34

History 102 45

History 104 1

History 105 1618

History 106 2

History 110 49

History 111 41

History 120 128

History 121 101

History 126 1

History 129 1

History 130 2

History 140 1

History 150 40

History 167 1

History 172 1

History 201 2

History 202 1

History 205 11

History 216 1

History 230 5

History 231 7

History 235 1

History 250 1

History 262 2

History 270 1

History 271 9

History 272 9

History 274 3

History 275 12

History 280 2

History 287 1

History 298 7

History 300 43

History 301 1

History 303 3

History 305 594

History 306 1

History 307 1

History 308 27

History 313 1

History 314 4

History 319 12

History 322 5

History 331 6

History 335 3

History 340 3

History 341 1

History 345 1

History 350 5

History 355 11

History 360 1

History 362 2

History 365 1

History 373 17

History 374 1

History 386 3

History 387 11

History 388 5

History 389 1

History 390 17

History 395 12

History 398 16

History 399 3

History 400 2

History 403 1

History 409 11

History 410 10

History 412 1

History 413 5

History 414 3

History 416 1

History 417 3

History 418 6

History 419 10

History 421 3

History 422 17

History 425 1

History 433 2

History 435 4

History 436 16

History 440 8

History 441 1

History 444 8

History 447 3

History 449 1

History 450 2

History 454 1

History 455 12

History 462 4

History 466 3

History 468 5

History 469 9

History 472 2

History 473 4

History 475 5

History 476 2

History 477 5

History 480 3

History 486 6

History 491 1

History 492 3

History 494 1

History 495 5

History 497 1

History 499 1

Humanities

Humanities 304 1

Japanese

Japanese 101 1

Japanese 102 1

Japanese 111 3

Japanese 123 2

Japanese 204 1

Japanese 306 1

Jazz

Jazz 362 1

Latin

Latin 363 1

Liberal Arts

Liberal Arts 413 1

Liberal Arts 470 2

Liberal Arts 471 1

Liberal Arts 497 9

Mathematics

Mathematics 105 85

Mathematics 106 3

Mathematics 108 1

Mathematics 171 12

Mathematics 172 5

Mathematics 201 6

Mathematics 202 145

Mathematics 205 1

Mathematics 212 5

Mathematics 216 5

Mathematics 220 18

Mathematics 230 1

Mathematics 251 14

Mathematics 252 14

Mathematics 270 1

Mathematics 273 4

Mathematics 300 3

Mathematics 301 10

Mathematics 315 8

Mathematics 320 3

Mathematics 330 1

Mathematics 351 2

Mathematics 370 6

Mathematics 398 13

Mathematics 401 3

Mathematics 403 5

Mathematics 415 2

Mathematics 421 6

Mathematics 453 1

Mathematics 464 1

Mathematics 490 1

Mathematics 495 1

Military Science

Military Science 102 1

Military Science 201 5

Military Science 202 4

Military Science 301 2

Molecular Biosciences

Molecular Biosciences 101 119

Molecular Biosciences 104 1

Molecular Biosciences 107 3

Molecular Biosciences 301 1

Molecular Biosciences 303 1

Molecular Biosciences 304 88

Molecular Biosciences 305 7

Molecular Biosciences 306 2

Molecular Biosciences 320 1

Molecular Biosciences 401 1

Molecular Biosciences 402 2

Molecular Biosciences 404 1

Molecular Biosciences 411 4

Molecular Biosciences 413 2

Molecular Biosciences 430 1

Molecular Biosciences 442 2

Molecular Biosciences 446 4

Molecular Biosciences 454 2

Molecular Biosciences 494 1

Molecular Biosciences 498 1

Molecular Biosciences 580 1

Music

Music 102 9

Music 103 4

Music 120 16

Music 135 1

Music 153 83

Music 154 2

Music 160 52

Music 161 11

Music 162 2

Music 163 24

Music 168 1

Music 190 2

Music 202 4

Music 208 1

Music 210 2

Music 242 1

Music 262 172

Music 265 16

Music 281 1

Music 302 3

Music 303 7

Music 304 1

Music 308 1

Music 358 1

Music 359 12

Music 360 11

Music 361 1

Music 362 132

Music 363 12

Music 364 1

Music 365 1

Music 391 1

Music 403 1

Music 408 1

Music 431 5

Music 432 1

Music 439 2

Music 461 3

Music 465 1

Music 491 3

Music 494 1

Music 496 1

Mythology

Mythology 101 1

Oceanography

Oceanography 101 1

Organic Chemistry

Organic Chemistry 263 1

Organic Chemistry 345 1

Philosophy

Philosophy 101 56

Philosophy 102 2

Philosophy 103 68

Philosophy 105 2

Philosophy 200 17

Philosophy 201 2

Philosophy 207 12

Philosophy 210 11

Philosophy 220 2

Philosophy 280 1

Philosophy 314 14

Philosophy 315 5

Philosophy 320 8

Philosophy 321 1

Philosophy 322 3

Philosophy 361 1

Philosophy 364 1

Philosophy 365 213

Philosophy 370 7

Philosophy 390 2

Philosophy 400 1

Philosophy 407 4

Philosophy 413 3

Philosophy 420 1

Philosophy 425 2

Philosophy 431 2

Philosophy 442 6

Philosophy 447 1

Philosophy 460 1

Philosophy 470 5

Physics

Physics 101 115

Physics 102 37

Physics 105 4

Physics 188 1

Physics 201 250

Physics 202 164

Physics 205 14

Physics 206 8

Physics 210 1

Physics 304 1

Physics 312 1

Physics 321 1

Physics 324 1

Physics 427 1

Piano

Piano 102 1

Political Science

Political Science 101 187

Political Science 102 118

Political Science 103 87

Political Science 105 3

Political Science 106 1

Political Science 200 1

Political Science 201 5

Political Science 202 1

Political Science 206 20

Political Science 230 1

Political Science 250 1

Political Science 300 92

Political Science 301 1

Political Science 302 1

Political Science 304 1

Political Science 305 23

Political Science 314 14

Political Science 316 92

Political Science 317 31

Political Science 324 1

Political Science 327 1

Political Science 333 9

Political Science 340 35

Political Science 361 1

Political Science 365 1

Political Science 370 1

Political Science 371 1

Political Science 400 31

Political Science 402 3

Political Science 404 19

Political Science 405 1

Political Science 406 1

Political Science 410 9

Political Science 412 1

Political Science 416 5

Political Science 417 37

Political Science 418 53

Political Science 419 1

Political Science 420 3

Political Science 421 1

Political Science 424 35

Political Science 425 2

Political Science 426 1

Political Science 427 89

Political Science 428 12

Political Science 429 5

Political Science 430 4

Political Science 432 9

Political Science 435 9

Political Science 437 2

Political Science 438 6

Political Science 442 8

Political Science 445 2

Political Science 446 4

Political Science 455 2

Political Science 470 1

Political Science 472 11

Political Science 475 1

Political Science 476 1

Political Science 497 1

Political Science 533 1

Psychology

Psychology 100 1

Psychology 101 9

Psychology 102 2

Psychology 105 360

Psychology 110 1

Psychology 115 1

Psychology 121 1

Psychology 150 1

Psychology 200 1

Psychology 201 5

Psychology 202 2

Psychology 204 1

Psychology 210 39

Psychology 228 1

Psychology 230 14

Psychology 231 1

Psychology 238 1

Psychology 261 1

Psychology 265 22

Psychology 295 1

Psychology 301 7

Psychology 306 8

Psychology 308 11

Psychology 309 3

Psychology 310 1

Psychology 311 16

Psychology 312 153

Psychology 315 1

Psychology 320 10

Psychology 321 111

Psychology 324 94

Psychology 325 1

Psychology 328 65

Psychology 330 1

Psychology 331 1

Psychology 333 142

Psychology 338 1

Psychology 342 1

Psychology 350 165

Psychology 351 2

Psychology 360 2

Psychology 361 51

Psychology 363 26

Psychology 372 44

Psychology 375 1

Psychology 384 4

Psychology 401 40

Psychology 403 14

Psychology 408 1

Psychology 410 2

Psychology 412 1

Psychology 433 1

Psychology 440 39

Psychology 444 7

Psychology 445 4

Psychology 464 27

Psychology 466 7

Psychology 470 102

Psychology 473 9

Psychology 485 1

Psychology 490 17

Psychology 491 1

Psychology 492 1

Psychology 495 1

Public Relations

Public Relations 312 1

Russian Studies

Russian Studies 101 1

Russian Studies 102 1

Russian Studies 321 2

Russian Studies 410 4

Russian Studies 521 1

Science

Science 101 39

Science 102 22

Science 107 1

Science 201 1

Science 202 1

Science 321 1

Science 350 1

Science 381 1

Sociology

Sociology 100 1

Sociology 101 342

Sociology 102 118

Sociology 107 3

Sociology 150 1

Sociology 201 2

Sociology 230 1

Sociology 245 21

Sociology 250 2

Sociology 251 34

Sociology 257 1

Sociology 300 31

Sociology 301 1

Sociology 302 1

Sociology 310 36

Sociology 317 2

Sociology 320 21

Sociology 322 1

Sociology 332 6

Sociology 340 17

Sociology 346 2

Sociology 350 18

Sociology 351 59

Sociology 360 19

Sociology 361 27

Sociology 362 19

Sociology 364 1

Sociology 367 1

Sociology 368 4

Sociology 372 12

Sociology 373 6

Sociology 384 16

Sociology 390 10

Sociology 393 1

Sociology 413 1

Sociology 415 5

Sociology 418 2

Sociology 430 8

Sociology 461 1

Sociology 493 1

Spanish

Spanish 101 4

Spanish 102 5

Spanish 110 6

Spanish 111 3

Spanish 121 5

Spanish 122 1

Spanish 190 1

Spanish 203 5

Spanish 204 26

Spanish 205 1

Spanish 207 1

Spanish 276 5

Spanish 290 11

Spanish 300 1

Spanish 301 1

Spanish 306 4

Spanish 308 7

Spanish 310 2

Spanish 311 1

Spanish 320 1

Spanish 321 1

Spanish 357 1

Spanish 361 1

Spanish 362 1

Spanish 365 1

Spanish 367 6

Spanish 374 1

Spanish 377 2

Spanish 408 2

Spanish 420 10

Spanish 450 2

Spanish 453 1

Spanish 468 1

Statistics

Statistics 212 128

Statistics 215 2

Statistics 311 1

Statistics 324 1

Statistics 360 1

Statistics 370 2

Statistics 423 2

Women’s Studies

Women’s Studies 101 99

Women’s Studies 105 2

Women’s Studies 120 13

Women’s Studies 129 1

Women’s Studies 136 1

Women’s Studies 163 1

Women’s Studies 200 1

Women’s Studies 201 18

Women’s Studies 204 3

Women’s Studies 207 1

Women’s Studies 211 3

Women’s Studies 220 12

Women’s Studies 224 1

Women’s Studies 298 1

Women’s Studies 300 35

Women’s Studies 301 1

Women’s Studies 302 7

Women’s Studies 305 1

Women’s Studies 308 1

Women’s Studies 309 4

Women’s Studies 315 3

Women’s Studies 316 3

Women’s Studies 317 1

Women’s Studies 318 1

Women’s Studies 320 1

Women’s Studies 322 1

Women’s Studies 324 4

Women’s Studies 330 1

Women’s Studies 332 7

Women’s Studies 336 2

Women’s Studies 338 48

Women’s Studies 340 2

Women’s Studies 351 4

Women’s Studies 363 5

Women’s Studies 364 2

Women’s Studies 369 8

Women’s Studies 388 1

Women’s Studies 390 1

Women’s Studies 398 1

Women’s Studies 399 2

Women’s Studies 403 8

Women’s Studies 406 3

Women’s Studies 454 1

Women’s Studies 481 4

Women’s Studies 484 3

Women’s Studies 485 2

College of Education

Education Administration

Education Administration 306 1

Education Administration 352 1

Education Administration 409 2

Education Administration 414 1

Education Administration 445 1

Education Research

Education Research 301 1

Education Research 307 1

Educational Psychology

Educational Psychology 301 1

Educational Psychology 401 26

Educational Psychology 445 1

Kinesiology

Kinesiology 138 2

Kinesiology 199 62

Kinesiology 263 3

Kinesiology 264 19

Kinesiology 266 1

Kinesiology 267 19

Kinesiology 270 4

Kinesiology 275 19

Kinesiology 291 2

Kinesiology 312 18

Kinesiology 313 25

Kinesiology 314 26

Kinesiology 340 1

Kinesiology 361 15

Kinesiology 362 3

Kinesiology 364 10

Kinesiology 365 1

Kinesiology 380 9

Kinesiology 392 2

Kinesiology 393 1

Kinesiology 412 1

Kinesiology 446 1

Kinesiology 461 1

Kinesiology 484 2

Kinesiology 490 1

Kinesiology 493 1

Kinesiology 496 38

Movement Studies

Movement Studies 314 1

Movement Studies 362 1

Special Education

Special Education 101 1

Special Education 301 9

Special Education 401 3

Special Education 404 4

Special Education 420 12

Special Education 421 1

Special Education 440 1

Special Education

Special Education 470 3

Sports Management

Sports Management 101 30

Sports Management 191 2

Sports Management 210 1

Sports Management 225 1

Sports Management 240 3

Sports Management 250 1

Sports Management 270 1

Sports Management 274 1

Sports Management 276 21

Sports Management 279 1

Sports Management 290 77

Sports Management 307 1

Sports Management 362 1

Sports Management 365 1

Sports Management 367 59

Sports Management 374 7

Sports Management 376 1

Sports Management 377 10

Sports Management 379 5

Sports Management 394 1

Sports Management 400 1

Sports Management 420 1

Sports Management 464 21

Sports Management 468 18

Sports Management 489 1

Teaching and Learning

Teaching and Learning 101 1

Teaching and Learning 201 1

Teaching and Learning 251 1

Teaching and Learning 252 1

Teaching and Learning 301 63

Teaching and Learning 304 4

Teaching and Learning 305 28

Teaching and Learning 306 18

Teaching and Learning 307 56

Teaching and Learning 310 22

Teaching and Learning 316 1

Teaching and Learning 317 1

Teaching and Learning 320 1

Teaching and Learning 321 24

Teaching and Learning 322 30

Teaching and Learning 329 1

Teaching and Learning 330 5

Teaching and Learning 333 26

Teaching and Learning 339 4

Teaching and Learning 352 45

Teaching and Learning 362 1

Teaching and Learning 371 22

Teaching and Learning 372 1

Teaching and Learning 390 1

Teaching and Learning 395 1

Teaching and Learning 401 16

Teaching and Learning 402 11

Teaching and Learning 407 1

Teaching and Learning 409 14

Teaching and Learning 414 6

Teaching and Learning 420 1

Teaching and Learning 427 1

Teaching and Learning 445 26

Teaching and Learning 464 3

Teaching and Learning 467 1

Teaching and Learning 470 1

Teaching and Learning 483 2

Teaching and Learning 485 1

Teaching and Learning 490 1

Teaching and Learning 564 1

Elson S. Floyd College of Medical Sciences

Speech and Hearing Sciences

Speech and Hearing Sciences 201 2

Speech and Hearing Sciences 205 2

Speech and Hearing Sciences 306 2

Speech and Hearing Sciences 371 3

Speech and Hearing Sciences 372 4

Speech and Hearing Sciences 376 1

Speech and Hearing Sciences 378 1

Speech and Hearing Sciences 473 1

Speech and Hearing Sciences 477 1

Speech and Hearing Sciences 479 1

Speech and Hearing Sciences 480 1

Speech and Hearing Sciences 482 2

College of Nursing

Nursing

Nursing 215 2

Nursing 308 3

Nursing 309 120

Nursing 311 1

Nursing 315 103

Nursing 316 1

Nursing 317 13

Nursing 321 1

Nursing 322 92

Nursing 323 2

Nursing 324 1

Nursing 325 15

Nursing 326 1

Nursing 328 12

Nursing 333 1

Nursing 360 40

Nursing 366 10

Nursing 400 96

Nursing 403 1

Nursing 405 22

Nursing 406 11

Nursing 414 1

Nursing 415 2

Nursing 417 1

Nursing 425 1

Nursing 427 1

Nursing 440 58

Nursing 455 5

Nursing 456 2

Nursing 460 1

Nursing 462 10

Nursing 465 9

Nursing 477 42

Nursing 478 1

Nursing 492 1

Nursing 495 2

Nursing 498 16

Nursing 499 5

Nursing 577 1

College of Pharmacy

Nutrition and Exercise Physiology

Nutrition and Exercise Physiology 300 10

Nutrition and Exercise Physiology 320 2

Nutrition and Exercise Physiology 427 9

Nutrition and Exercise Physiology 435 2

Nutrition and Exercise Physiology 437 1

Nutrition and Exercise Physiology 463 1

Nutrition and Exercise Physiology 465 4

College of Veterinary Medicine

Neuroscience

Neuroscience 138 4

Neuroscience 150 4

Neuroscience 301 5

Neuroscience 305 5

Neuroscience 333 1

Neuroscience 360 1

Neuroscience 403 5

Neuroscience 404 1

Neuroscience 409 2

Neuroscience 430 2

Neuroscience 495 1

Neuroscience 499 3

Veterinary Clinical Medicine and Surgery

Veterinary Clinical Medicine and Surgery 361 3

Veterinary Medicine

Veterinary Medicine 361 1

Veterinary Pathology

Veterinary Pathology 499 1

Edward R. Murrow College of Communication

Communication and Journalism

Communication and Journalism 309 1

Communication and Journalism 311 1

Communication and Journalism 333 104

Communication and Journalism 335 6

Communication and Journalism 350 7

Communication and Journalism 360 7

Communication and Journalism 380 1

Communication and Journalism 425 4

Communication and Journalism 455 1

Communication and Journalism 466 1

Communication and Journalism 475 1

Communication and Society

Communication and Society 230 1

Communication and Society 231 1

Communication and Society 301 34

Communication and Society 302 1

Communication and Society 305 1

Communication and Society 309 3

Communication and Society 312 1

Communication and Society 321 51

Communication and Society 324 12

Communication and Society 325 2

Communication and Society 326 3

Communication and Society 380 1

Communication and Society 381 2

Communication and Society 421 16

Communication and Society 471 1

Communication and Society 475 2

Communication and Society 476 1

Communication and Society 477 13

Communication Studies

Communication Studies 101 119

Communication Studies 102 87

Communication Studies 104 1

Communication Studies 105 180

Communication Studies 128 1

Communication Studies 130 2

Communication Studies 138 35

Communication Studies 178 1

Communication Studies 205 1

Communication Studies 209 1

Communication Studies 210 11

Communication Studies 225 35

Communication Studies 255 1

Communication Studies 265 1

Communication Studies 270 1

Communication Studies 280 1

Communication Studies 300 211

Communication Studies 301 14

Communication Studies 302 1

Communication Studies 303 1

Communication Studies 304 2

Communication Studies 309 29

Communication Studies 310 7

Communication Studies 312 65

Communication Studies 320 4

Communication Studies 321 17

Communication Studies 324 2

Communication Studies 333 29

Communication Studies 335 2

Communication Studies 338 2

Communication Studies 350 4

Communication Studies 360 5

Communication Studies 361 1

Communication Studies 380 36

Communication Studies 381 17

Communication Studies 382 10

Communication Studies 383 22

Communication Studies 390 1

Communication Studies 395 4

Communication Studies 400 8

Communication Studies 410 1

Communication Studies 415 17

Communication Studies 420 19

Communication Studies 421 10

Communication Studies 440 10

Communication Studies 441 1

Communication Studies 450 1

Communication Studies 451 1

Communication Studies 460 52

Communication Studies 470 1

Communication Studies 471 78

Communication Studies 474 1

Communication Studies 475 27

Communication Studies 476 13

Communication Studies 477 7

Communication Studies 478 10

Communication Studies 479 16

Communication Studies 480 1

Communication Studies 481 1

Communication Studies 482 3

Communication Studies 484 2

Communication Studies 495 4

Communication Studies 497 1

Communication Studies 560 1

Interdisciplinary Studies

Interdisciplinary Studies

Interdisciplinary Studies 198 2

Interdisciplinary Studies 364 1

Interdisciplinary Studies 398 2

Interdisciplinary Studies 497 1

University College

Honors

Honors 102 1

Honors 150 1

Honors 198 2

Honors 248 1

Honors 250 1

Honors 270 45

Honors 280 147

Honors 290 35

Honors 298 55

Honors 308 1

Honors 320 1

Honors 370 52

Honors 380 66

Honors 390 10

Honors 398 4

Honors 450 2

University College

University College 100 3

University College 101 4

University College 104 22

University College 109 1

University College 197 1

University College 199 1

University College 204 1

University College 250 14

University College 262 1

University College 295 1

University College 300 6

University College 301 4

University College 302 1

University College 303 1

University College 304 27

University College 312 1

University College 331 1

University College 370 1

University College 395 2

University College 398 1

University College 407 1

University College 447 1

University College 492 1

University College 496 1

University College 497 76

Voiland College of Engineering and Architecture

Aerospace Studies

Aerospace Studies 101 4

Aerospace Studies 201 1

Aerospace Studies 202 5

Aerospace Studies 302 1

Aerospace Studies 311 3

Aerospace Studies 312 1

Aerospace Studies 313 2

Apparel, Merchandising, Design and Textiles (AMDT)

AMDT 105 3

AMDT 108 23

AMDT 203 1

AMDT 210 3

AMDT 211 5

AMDT 212 3

AMDT 216 1

AMDT 220 2

AMDT 221 2

AMDT 226 1

AMDT 250 4

AMDT 277 1

AMDT 301 1

AMDT 307 46

AMDT 314 16

AMDT 315 3

AMDT 321 1

AMDT 402 1

AMDT 408 5

AMDT 412 1

AMDT 413 4

AMDT 417 27

AMDT 420 13

AMDT 429 2

AMDT 430 21

AMDT 440 21

AMDT 446 1

AMDT 450 1

AMDT 488 23

AMDT 490 5

AMDT 492 3

AMDT 495 1

AMDT 496 4

AMDT 498 3

Architecture

Architecture 101 2

Architecture 209 1

Architecture 215 20

Architecture 230 2

Architecture 301 2

Architecture 304 1

Architecture 309 19

Architecture 351 8

Architecture 352 4

Architecture 428 2

Bioengineering

Bioengineering 101 2

Bioengineering 102 7

Bioengineering 105 2

Bioengineering 106 14

Bioengineering 107 11

Bioengineering 120 1

Bioengineering 140 3

Bioengineering 151 1

Bioengineering 170 1

Bioengineering 205 4

Bioengineering 221 1

Bioengineering 251 13

Bioengineering 321 1

Bioengineering 322 7

Bioengineering 333 1

Bioengineering 340 1

Bioengineering 353 4

Bioengineering 365 2

Bioengineering 372 8

Bioengineering 393 1

Bioengineering 407 1

Bioengineering 418 1

Bioengineering 423 1

Bioengineering 438 1

Chemical Engineering

Chemical Engineering 101 4

Chemical Engineering 106 1

Chemical Engineering 110 5

Chemical Engineering 301 3

Chemical Engineering 304 1

Chemical Engineering 310 1

Chemical Engineering 333 1

Chemical Engineering 334 1

Chemical Engineering 345 1

Chemical Engineering 432 1

Chemical Engineering 450 1

Chemical Engineering 476 1

Civil Engineering

Civil Engineering 101 2

Civil Engineering 106 1

Civil Engineering 120 1

Civil Engineering 202 1

Civil Engineering 211 1

Civil Engineering 215 23

Civil Engineering 302 6

Civil Engineering 315 8

Civil Engineering 317 27

Civil Engineering 322 1

Civil Engineering 330 13

Civil Engineering 341 3

Civil Engineering 351 5

Civil Engineering 365 1

Civil Engineering 400 2

Civil Engineering 402 1

Civil Engineering 414 2

Civil Engineering 460 1

Civil Engineering 463 1

Civil Engineering 480 2

Civil Engineering 495 1

Computer Science

Computer Science 111 5

Computer Science 115 1

Computer Science 121 7

Computer Science 122 5

Computer Science 223 4

Computer Science 224 1

Computer Science 252 1

Computer Science 260 1

Computer Science 300 1

Computer Science 302 10

Computer Science 305 1

Computer Science 317 2

Computer Science 320 25

Computer Science 322 4

Computer Science 323 4

Computer Science 350 1

Computer Science 351 1

Computer Science 355 3

Computer Science 360 1

Computer Science 362 1

Computer Science 401 1

Computer Science 402 4

Computer Science 403 1

Computer Science 411 2

Computer Science 421 1

Computer Science 440 1

Computer Science 443 1

Computer Science 464 1

Computer Science 466 1

Computer Science 483 1

Computer Science 487 1

Computer Science 490 2

Construction Management

Construction Management 102 26

Construction Management 132 1

Construction Management 201 1

Construction Management 202 2

Construction Management 252 22

Construction Management 254 1

Construction Management 262 1

Construction Management 352 2

Construction Management 362 21

Construction Management 365 1

Construction Management 368 2

Construction Management 371 10

Construction Management 372 1

Construction Management 451 4

Design and Construction

Design and Construction 100 55

Design and Construction 101 2

Design and Construction 140 1

Design and Construction 250 54

Design and Construction 252 1

Design and Construction 320 1

Design and Construction 350 41

Design and Construction 380 1

Electrical Engineering

Electrical Engineering 209 1

Electrical Engineering 234 42

Electrical Engineering 261 3

Electrical Engineering 262 1

Electrical Engineering 302 1

Electrical Engineering 311 9

Electrical Engineering 321 23

Electrical Engineering 327 1

Electrical Engineering 351 3

Electrical Engineering 352 40

Electrical Engineering 362 2

Engineering

Engineering 102 1

Engineering 105 1

Engineering 107 7

Engineering 114 1

Engineering 120 19

Engineering 201 2

Engineering 214 1

Engineering 215 1

Engineering 220 2

Engineering 224 2

Engineering 225 1

Engineering 304 1

Engineering 313 1

Engineering 327 2

Engineering 401 1

Engineering 402 1

Engineering 490 1

Engineering 496 1

Materials Science

Materials Science 110 5

Materials Science 153 1

Materials Science 201 27

Materials Science 220 1

Materials Science 262 1

Materials Science 316 2

Materials Science 320 10

Materials Science 323 4

Materials Science 401 3

Mechanical Engineering

Mechanical Engineering 101 1

Mechanical Engineering 106 1

Mechanical Engineering 201 1

Mechanical Engineering 215 1

Mechanical Engineering 216 20

Mechanical Engineering 220 177

Mechanical Engineering 301 19

Mechanical Engineering 303 16

Mechanical Engineering 304 33

Mechanical Engineering 305 1

Mechanical Engineering 306 18

Mechanical Engineering 309 66

Mechanical Engineering 310 27

Mechanical Engineering 311 1

Mechanical Engineering 313 16

Mechanical Engineering 314 1

Mechanical Engineering 316 1

Mechanical Engineering 320 1

Mechanical Engineering 348 6

Mechanical Engineering 363 1

Mechanical Engineering 401 1

Mechanical Engineering 404 1

Mechanical Engineering 414 1

Mechanical Engineering 438 1

Mechanical Engineering 441 2

Mechanical Engineering 485 2

1. WSU News Announcement, Sept. 17, 2015: “Sept. 23: Helping first-generation students is focus of talk” (Makhtani). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)