



Department of Rhetoric And Writing

Assessment Narrative and Report

January 2016

Brian Ray

Introduction: At the beginning of the spring 2016 semester, the composition program conducted an assessment of its first-semester composition course, RHET 1311. The program assessed 57 electronic portfolios gathered from 18 sections (including a set of 16 from a single section) on Thursday, January 7. Our purpose was twofold: First, we sought to continue our existing assessment process in line with that of prior directors of composition. Second, we intended to pilot a revised rubric based on the WPA Outcomes Statement 3.0, our own program's course learning objectives, and the university's Values and Skills outcomes. The rubric we produced was modeled on the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) VALUE rubrics for written communication, as well as those used by other writing programs. Our assessment procedure was based on narratives made available by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA), and on best practices recommended by experts in writing assessment (O'Neill et al., 2009; White et al., 2015; Yancey et al., 2013).

Rubric: Faculty and graduate students worked from July through October 2015 to construct a 3-point rubric with 6 categories that corresponded to criteria across objectives and outcomes from different sources (as discussed above). We circulated the rubric to all composition instructors for comment, and submitted it to the Core Council. (See attached.) The ultimate result was a set of six measurable course objectives according to whether they were beginning, developing, proficient, or advanced:

- A. Demonstrate basic rhetorical ability by completing texts for at least 3 different rhetorical situations, with each one written appropriately for that context. (E.g., personal essay, literacy narrative, exploratory source-based paper.)
- B. Demonstrate awareness of basic proofreading and editing skills by completing finished drafts that follow appropriate conventions of grammar punctuation, usage, and spelling.
- C. Revise and reflect on all major projects [at least 3] effectively, based on instructor feedback, peer review, and self-assessment. (E.g., evidence of improvement on global & local issues plus a substantial reflection essay.)
- D. Produce at least one final draft that effectively integrates electronic and print sources into the writer's own text and documents them effectively. (E.g., exploratory paper that uses primary and secondary sources located through library databases to pose and answer a question.)
- E. Effectively use different software programs and applications to compose and revise documents in different modes and mediums. (E.g., an e-portfolio site or blog with working links that is eye-friendly, readable, and navigable.)

- F. Demonstrate awareness of multiple genres by producing at least one effective text in a professional, public, and non-essay genre. (E.g., portfolio contains a press release, an opinion-editorial essay, and a design for a billboard ad or PSA.)

Raters: The program recruited six experienced composition instructors across rank (GA, part-time, full-time) to rate roughly 10 portfolios each. The raters were compensated with a \$125 honorarium. Prior to scoring, the raters met to review 3 sample portfolios and compare scores. The calibration session was meant to help ensure interrater reliability.

Sampling: We used two methods to collect portfolios. First, in accordance with standard writing assessment practices, we solicited 228 portfolios across sections taught by graduate, part-time, and full-time composition instructors. These portfolios are the culminating assignment for all RHET 1311 students. Here they gather all of their drafts of major writing projects and arrange them into an electronic document using Google Sites, WordPress, or Weebly. These portfolios are graded on students' ability to arrange and reflect on their revise, polished writing. In order to earn full credit, their portfolio sites must be navigable, contain working links and files, and show a sense of design and audience awareness in how they present the material.

We asked all instructors to grade their own students' work using the pilot rubric and to upload those scores (along with links to the portfolios) to shared folders on UALR's Google Drive. Doing so enabled us to compare averages and individual scores between instructors and normed raters. From this collection of student work, we randomly sampled 57 portfolios (25 percent). Nearly three quarters (42/72 percent) were chosen from 18 sections of RHET 1311. The rest came from a single section (16 total, from section 22), as requested by the Core Council.

Interrater Reliability: Deviation was normal ($p > .05$) for four of the raters across all six categories of the rubric, indicating that the rubric's language and scales were clear enough to produce consensus. (A t-test was used to determine the significance of difference between averages in each category.) Two raters did score significantly higher than the others in several categories, especially in basic proofreading/editing, revision, and electronic literacy. As later discussion confirms, students seemed to struggle the most in these three categories. The table below shows averages for each rater in each rubric category:

Category	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4	Rater 5	Rater 6
Rhetorical Ability	1.7	1.7	1.9	2.1	2.2	1.78
Proofreading/Editing	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.67	2.4	2
Revision/Reflection	1.3	1.5	1.1	1	1.8	1.78
Source Use	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.1	1.4	2.4
Electronic Literacy	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.2	2.1	2.1
Genre Awareness	1.4	1.7	1.7	1.89	2	1.89

Results: Students seem to be performing best in the categories of rhetorical purpose, basic proofreading and editing abilities, and genre awareness. Average scores for these categories was 1.89, 1.87, and 1.76 respectively. These averages are roughly (though slightly below) the proficient level. Raw scores show that the highest numbers of students in these categories are proficient with 38, 37, and 34 students respectively (56-63 percent of the sample). When

students scoring at the advanced level factored in, roughly 70-78 percent of the portfolios achieved a score of proficient or better in these three categories. Meanwhile, 13, 14, and 16 of these portfolios scored at the developing level (22-27 percent). It is notable that no portfolios scored at the beginning levels in these categories.

By contrast, the results show lower scores for revision and reflection, source use, and electronic literacy. The averages in these categories are 1.41, 1.51, and 1.55 respectively. Here, higher numbers of students scored at the developing level—27, 26, and 26 (approx. 43 percent)—as well as the beginning level. The number of scores at both the proficient and advanced levels dropped to 23, 22, and 20 (33-38 percent).

Finally, averages were computed for the scores that instructors gave their students in the sample. For all six categories, instructor averages were significantly higher than rater averages. Although instructor averages were higher, they were still consistent with the exception of revision and reflection (much lower than the other five categories). The table below shows averages and scores:

Category	Total Beginning	Total Developing	Total Proficient	Total Advanced	Rater Average	Proficient or Better	Instructor Average
Rhetorical Ability	0	13	38	7	1.89	77%	2.6
Proofreading/Editing	0	14	37	7	1.87	75%	2.23
Revision/Reflection	5	27	23	3	1.41	44%	1.9
Source Use	4	26	22	6	1.51	48%	2.4
Electronic Literacy	3	26	20	9	1.55	50%	2.18
Genre Awareness	2	16	34	6	1.76	69%	2.36

Correlations: Students who scored lower on the weakest category (revision and reflection) also tended to score lower in at least one other category. All but two of these portfolios scored lower in one other category, and 7 of them scored at the developing or beginning level in 3 or more categories. Categories that correlated most strongly with revision included software literacy (21), source use (20), and genre awareness (13). The most common correlation was found between revision and software literacy.

Reflection and Next Steps: Our foremost concern was the creation of a valid rubric that would generate reliable scores among composition instructors. Based on instructor ratings, the rubric appears largely successful in this regard. However, the difference between rater and instructor averages may be cause for concern. Although it is somewhat expected that instructors might rate their own students higher (due to bias), the size of the difference indicates a need for more discussion with instructors to ensure that the language and categories in the rubric reflect their expectations.

Notably, some instructors during faculty meetings expressed the desire for a wider scale. This seems reasonable, although widening the scale could have an adverse effect of reducing rater reliability and grading consistency. After the scoring session on January 7, raters did express concern that many student portfolios did not fit easily into existing categories. Many seemed to

lie between proficient and developing on source use, for example, because it was unclear to what extent they had been asked to use sources on a given assignment.

Unsurprisingly, the lowest scoring portfolios were missing two key requirements: statements of reflection, and drafts. These students may not have devoted sufficient time to learning how to use common platforms such as Google Sites, WordPress, and Weebly. Consequently, they did not upload the drafts or reflection pieces that would have satisfied these categories of the rubric. The electronic portfolio is the most significant assignment that requires both software literacy and evidence of revision, and it is also often introduced late in the semester. (We are increasingly encouraging teachers to make the portfolio a larger component of their instruction earlier in the semester, and to stress its value in helping students learn to make rhetorical decisions. It is also a relatively new addition to the composition curriculum, introduced in the Fall 2014 semester. It is likely that by orienting students to the electronic portfolio earlier in the semester, and integrating it more fully into the RHET 1311 curriculum, instructors will help improve student performance in these areas.

Performance on source citation may also be due to the recent addition of research and information literacy to the RHET 1311 curriculum. Traditionally, this course has served as a basic introduction to persuasive and expository writing and analysis, with informal use of sources. RHET 1312 has served as the more formal introduction to information literacy and source use. We anticipate that as instructors become more familiar with the new course sequence, and as our program designs a more coherent set of expectations for use and documentation of sources appropriate for RHET 1311, that performance will improve. We plan to stress the importance of information literacy to both students and instructors, and to ensure that all sections of 1311 include assignments that clearly require evidence-based writing.

The department will continue to conduct teaching workshops and professional development sessions to facilitate this process. We have also held workshops and information sessions for students who may need additional instruction in constructing electronic portfolios. Holding more of these kinds of sessions throughout the semester may increase their impact on student success. We will also continue to partner with the writing center and the library staff to ensure that students are receiving help in terms of portfolio building but also source evaluation and documentation. We will discuss other possible strategies at composition faculty meetings, as well as focus groups with instructors.

Despite the lower scores in source use, revision and reflection, and electronic literacy, the results are encouraging in rhetorical ability, editing and proofreading, and genre awareness. These are the areas that RHET 1311 was originally designed to develop, and so as we make adjustments to the curriculum we want to ensure that this course continues to provide strong results for these outcomes.

References

O'Neill, Peggy, Cindy Moore, and Brian Huot. *A Guide to College Writing Assessment*. Logan: Utah State UP, 2009.

White, Ed, Norbert Elliott, and Irvin Peckham. *Very Like a Whale: The Assessment of Writing Programs*. Logan: Utah State UP, 2015.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake, Stephen J. McElroy, and Alizabeth Powers. "Composing, Networks, and Electronic Portfolios: Notes Toward a Theory of Assessing ePortfolios." In McKee, Heidi A., and Dànienne Nicole DeVoss DeVoss, eds. *Digital Writing Assessment & Evaluation*. Logan, UT: Computers and Composition Digital Press/Utah State University Press, 2013. Web.

<p>Develop a writing project through multiple drafts</p> <p>Develop flexible strategies for reading, drafting, reviewing, collaborating, revising, rewriting, rereading, and editing</p> <p>Use composing processes and tools as a means to discover and reconsider ideas</p> <p>Experience the collaborative and social aspects of writing processes</p> <p>Learn to give and to act on productive feedback to works in progress</p>		<p>(3) Understand and implement methods for finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing primary and secondary sources;</p>							
<p>Understand and use a variety of technologies to address a range of audiences</p> <p>Adapt composing processes for a variety of technologies and modalities</p>	<p>Match the capacities of different environments (e.g., print and electronic) to varying rhetorical situations</p>	<p>(1) Locate, evaluate, organize, and use research materials from electronic sources.</p>							
	<p>Locate and evaluate (for credibility, sufficiency, accuracy, timeliness, bias, and so on) primary and secondary research materials, including journal articles and essays, books, scholarly established and maintained databases or archives, and informal electronic networks and internet sources</p>	<p>SKILLS III: Information Technology (locating, retrieving, evaluating, synthesizing)</p> <p>(2) Develop current technological literacies for drafting, reviewing, revising, editing, and sharing texts</p>	<p>E. Effectively use different software programs and applications to compose and revise documents in different modes and mediums. (E.g., an e-portfolio site or blog with working links that is eye-friendly, readable, and navigable.)</p>	<p>Reinforcement of Comp I Objectives.</p>	<p>E-portfolios contain several pieces composed using different software applications, contain working links, and attention to navigation and document design.</p>	<p>E-portfolios contain a few pieces composed using different software applications, and the document is largely easy to navigate (with small lapses in navigation and design).</p>	<p>E-portfolios contain only 1-2 pieces composed using different software applications, or there are significant problems in site usability and design that make reading difficult.</p>	<p>E-portfolio is composed using only one software application, or is extremely difficult to navigate due to logistical and design flaws.</p>	
<p>Explore the concepts of intellectual property (such as fair use and copyright) that motivate documentation conventions</p>	<p>Practice applying citation conventions systematically in their own work</p>	<p>VALUES I: Ethical and Personal Responsibility</p> <p>(1) Adhere to ethical uses of sources [and] practice appropriate documentation of research.</p>			<p>See objective D.</p>				
<p>Reflect on the development of composing practices and how those practices influence their work</p>		<p>(2) Recognize the value of and demonstrate the respect for other points of view [and] understand that communicating and working with others requires taking responsibility for one's own work.</p>			<p>See objective C.</p>				
<p>Gain experience negotiating variations in genre conventions</p> <p>Learn common formats and/or design features for different kinds of texts</p>	<p>Understand why genre conventions for structure, paragraphing, tone, and mechanics vary</p>	<p>VALUES II: Civic Responsibility</p> <p>(1) Recognize the importance of written communication in academic, professional, and civic arenas of life;</p>	<p>F. Demonstrate awareness of multiple genres by producing at least one effective text in a professional, public, and non-essay genre. (E.g., portfolio contains a press release, an opinion-editorial essay, and a design for a billboard ad or PSA.)</p>	<p>Demonstrate control and agency over genres by producing a sequence of related assignments across professional, public, and non-essay genres. (E.g., portfolio contains sustained engagement with a research topic through a press release, an opinion-editorial essay, and a design for a billboard ad or PSA.)</p>	<p>For Comp I: E-portfolio contains a range of documents that successfully address expectations in professional, public, and essay genres. For Comp II: E-portfolio contains a range of documents on a single research agenda that effectively leverage genre affordances and constraints to offer arguments.</p>	<p>For Comp I: E-portfolio contains some documents that address expectations in professional, public, and essay genres. For Comp II: E-portfolio contains some documents on a single research agenda that employ of some constraints and affordances in these genres.</p>	<p>For Comp I: E-portfolio contains pieces that attempt to address expectations in one or more professional, public, or essay genre. For Comp II: E-portfolio contains pieces only in one genre, or which struggle to fully exploit affordances and constraints across genres.</p>	<p>For Comp I and II: E-portfolio contains pieces composed only in one genre, or pieces that routinely struggle to take advantage of genre conventions.</p>	
<p>Learn common formats and/or design features for different kinds of texts</p>	<p>Gain experience reading and composing in several genres to understand how genre conventions shape and are shaped by readers' and writers' practices and purposes</p>	<p>(2) Apply writing skills for civic engagement [and] understand the relationships between language, knowledge, and power.</p>							

COMP I LEARNING OBJECTIVES: At the end of the course students will be able to...	3 points (Advanced)	2 points (Proficient)	1 points (Developing)	0 points (Beginning)
A. Demonstrate basic rhetorical ability by completing texts for at least 3 different rhetorical situations, with each one written appropriately for that context. (E.g., personal essay, literacy narrative, exploratory source-based paper.)	Completes texts for at least 3 different rhetorical situations, each one using the appropriate voice, tone, structure, and level of formality for that rhetorical situation.	Completes 3 texts and demonstrates a reasonable attempt in each one to adapt to the rhetorical situation.	In only one text is there a demonstrated attempt to adapt to the rhetorical situation.	There is no demonstrated attempt to adapt to the rhetorical situation in any of the texts.
	All finished drafts have clearly identifiable central points that are supported with appropriate and sufficient evidence.	All finished drafts have clearly identifiable central points but some of the evidence is insufficient or inappropriate.	Finished drafts have central points but they are not clearly identifiable or developed with sufficient and appropriate evidence.	Finished drafts have no central point.
B. Demonstrate awareness of basic proofreading and editing skills by completing finished drafts that follow appropriate conventions of grammar punctuation, usage, and spelling.	Finished drafts have no errors or almost no errors.	Finished drafts have some errors but none that affect comprehension.	Finished drafts have enough errors to affect comprehension and call into question the writer's ethos of care.	Finished drafts have so many errors that a reader has difficulty understanding the writer's meaning and purpose.
C. Revise and reflect on all major projects [at least 3] effectively, based on instructor feedback, peer review, and self-assessment. (E.g., evidence of improvement on global & local issues plus a substantial reflection essay.)	All major papers reflect significant revision over drafts in response to peer comments. Reflective essay clearly articulates reasons for changes and how feedback, self-assessment, and revision helped the writer develop.	Some major papers reflect moderate revision over drafts in response to peer comments. Reflective essay justifies changes, but may or may not demonstrate how feedback, self-assessment, and revision helped the writer develop.	Major papers demonstrate inconsistent revisions based on peer comments. Reflective essay makes simplistic or superficial statements justifying changes and may not address development as a writer.	Portfolio is incomplete, or essays are largely unrevised.
D. Produce at least one final draft that effectively integrates electronic and print sources into the writer's own text and documents them effectively. (E.g., exploratory paper that uses primary and secondary sources located through library databases to pose and answer a question.)	For Comp I: At least one paper shows ample evidence in support of writer's discussion that is relevant to topic, with appropriate documentation (direct or indirect). For Comp II: At least one paper uses ample sources that directly support specific claims throughout the essay, and they are documented effectively.	For Comp I: At least one paper shows sufficient evidence that is relevant to the writer's topic, though they are not always documented accurately. For Comp II: At least one paper uses sufficient sources to support most claims, and may not always document sources effectively.	For Comp I: At least one paper makes an attempt to include sources, but they may not seem relevant to the topic, and documentation is inconsistent. For Comp II: At least one paper offers an argument but does not consistently support claims with evidence, and may document sources inconsistently.	For Comp I: No papers make an observable attempt to include sources, or make only passing reference to sources without documentation. For Comp II: No papers offer reliable or relevant sources in support of argument, with little attempt at documentation.
E. Effectively use different software programs and applications to compose and revise documents in different modes and mediums. (E.g., an e-portfolio site or blog with working links that is eye-friendly, readable, and navigable.)	E-portfolios contain several pieces composed using different software applications, contain working links, and attention to navigation and document design.	E-portfolios contain a few pieces composed using different software applications, and the document is largely easy to navigate (with small lapses in navigation and design).	E-portfolios contain only 1-2 pieces composed using different software applications, or there are significant problems in site usability and design that make reading difficult.	E-portfolio is composed using only one software application, or is extremely difficult to navigate due to logistical and design flaws.
F. Demonstrate awareness of multiple genres by producing at least one effective text in a professional, public, and non-essay genre. (E.g., portfolio contains a press release, an opinion-editorial essay, and a design for a billboard ad or PSA.)	For Comp I: E-portfolio contains a range of documents that successfully address expectations in professional, public, and essay genres. For Comp II: E-portfolio contains a range of documents on a single research agenda that effectively leverage genre affordances and constraints to offer arguments.	For Comp I: E-portfolio contains some documents that address expectations in professional, public, and essay genres. For Comp II: E-portfolio contains some documents on a single research agenda that employ of some constraints and affordances in these genres.	For Comp I: E-portfolio contains pieces that attempt to address expectations in one or more professional, public, or essay genre. For Comp II: E-portfolio contains pieces only in one genre, or which struggle to fully exploit affordances and constraints across genres.	For Comp I and II: E-portfolio contains pieces composed only in one genre, or pieces that routinely struggle to take advantage of genre conventions.

Timestamp	Student Name (Blue=Same Section)	A: Basic Rhetorical Ability	Instructor: Rhetoric	B: Basic Proofreading	Instructor: Proofrea	C: Revision and Reflection	Instructor: Revision	D: Source Use	Instructor: Sourc	E: Software Literacy	Instructor: Soft	F: Genre Awareness	Instructor: Genre Awareness
1/7/2016 14:22:49		1	2	2	2	0	2	1	2	0	2	1	2
1/7/2016 14:17:36		1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	2
1/7/2016 11:00:04		2	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	1	3	1	2
1/7/2016 10:33:09		2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	3
1/7/2016 11:19:38		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
1/7/2016 11:36:22		2	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3
1/7/2016 11:44:44		3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3
1/7/2016 14:05:46		2	3	2	2	1	3	2	3	1	3	2	3
1/7/2016 14:28:21		2	2	1	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
1/7/2016 14:36:55		1	2	1	2	1	2	1	3	1	3	1	2
1/7/2016 10:35:53		2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	2
1/7/2016 10:45:45		2	3	1	3	0	1	0	3	1	1	1	3
1/7/2016 10:56:22		2	2	2	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	3
1/7/2016 11:14:44		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	1	1	2	2
1/7/2016 11:23:48		2	3	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	3
1/7/2016 11:37:28		1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	3	1	1
1/7/2016 14:11:20		2	3	2	3	1	2	2	3	1	3	2	3
1/7/2016 14:32:02		1	3	2	3	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	3
1/7/2016 14:33:19		3	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	2
1/7/2016 11:06:56		2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
1/7/2016 14:34:28		2	3	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	1	3
1/7/2016 14:35:38		2	3	2	1	1	2	2	3	1	3	1	3
1/7/2016 14:36:36		3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	3
1/7/2016 14:39:21		1	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3
1/7/2016 14:38:12		1	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	3
1/7/2016 10:25:11		1	2	1	2	0	1	1	3	1	1	0	3
1/7/2016 10:35:58		2	3	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	3
1/7/2016 10:51:27		2	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	2
1/7/2016 11:02:41		2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	0	2	0	2
1/7/2016 11:15:53		1	3	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
1/7/2016 11:34:58		2	3	2	3	1	3	2	3	0	3	1	3
1/7/2016 11:47:56		2	2	3	2	1	3	2	2	2	3	3	2
1/7/2016 13:57:02		2	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	1	3	2	3
1/7/2016 14:40:30		Error	Error	Error	Error	Error	Error	Error	Error	Error	Error	Error	Error
1/7/2016 14:16:15		2	3	2	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	2
1/7/2016 14:04:35		2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1
1/7/2016 10:40:36		2	3	2	3	2	2	1	3	2	2	1	3
1/7/2016 10:53:28		2	2	3	2	3	2	1	2	3	3	2	2
1/7/2016 11:29:30		2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2
1/7/2016 11:50:52		2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	2
1/7/2016 13:51:50		2	3	2	2	1	3	1	3	3	2	2	3
1/7/2016 14:04:35		3	3	3	3	2	3	1	3	3	3	3	3
1/7/2016 14:15:48		1	0	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
1/7/2016 14:25:26		3	3	3	3	1	2	3	2	1	2	2	2
1/7/2016 14:33:59		3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2
1/7/2016 14:32:15		2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
1/7/2016 10:36:12		2	3	1	3	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	1
1/7/2016 10:47:25		3	3	2	3	0	2	2	3	1	3	2	3
1/7/2016 11:26:24		2	3	2	3	1	1	1	3	1	3	2	2
1/7/2016 13:57:23		2	3	2	3	1	3	1	3	2	2	2	3
1/7/2016 13:48:03		2	3	1	2	1	2	1	3	2	3	2	2
1/7/2016 11:45:18		2	2	2	3	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
1/7/2016 13:51:46		1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2
1/7/2016 14:30:29		1	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2
1/7/2016 11:17:59		2	2	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	1
1/7/2016 11:08:49		2	3	2	2	1	3	1	3	3	3	2	3
1/7/2016 13:54:50		2	2	1	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	3
	Total Beginning	0		0		5		4		3		2	
	Total Advanced	7		7		3		6		6		6	
	Total Developing	13		14		27		26		26		16	
	Total Proficient	38		37		23		22		20		34	
	Average	1.89	2.6	1.87	2.23	1.41	1.9	1.51	2.4	1.55	2.16	1.76	2.36