WPA-CompPile
Research Bibliographies

Council of
Writing
Program
Administrators

CompPile

Carl Whithaus

Distributive Evaluation
(WPA-CompPile Research Bibliographies, No. 3)

February 2010*

Different readers read differently. This simple insight is the basis for all the work in distributive evaluation, a model that rejects "true score" and accepts individual variation in scores, rates, or other values placed on the same text. However, as this bibliography of research shows, writing faculty and WPAs who have researched and implemented distributive evaluation systems have moved in many different directions from this initial insight: Peter Elbow (2006, 1968) has argued for distributive evaluation practices that embrace the differences among individual readers; Fred Kemp (Kemp, 2005; Wasley, 2006) has designed ICON, a computerized system that distributes grading among multiple readers, but uses standardization (i.e., norming of readers) to produce consistent scoring; Asao Inoue (2005) and Carl Whithaus (2005) have argued for assessment practices where distributive evaluation is based on the community consensus in a particular classroom; and Scott Warnock (2009) and Paul Prior et al. (1997) have argued that distributive evaluation can incorporate the ways readers from different disciplines or professions read documents from their own perspectives.

Another way to divide the distributive evaluation projects annotated below is the difference between evaluating individual student performances (Elbow, 2006, 1996, 1968; Inoue, 2005; Sutton, 2004; Whithaus, 2005) and program evaluation (Warnock, 2009; Lewkowicz and Nunan, 1999). Within distributive evaluation projects focused on assessing students' writing, a further division exists between those interested primarily in the classroom and pedagogical impacts of distributive evaluation (e.g., Elbow 2006, 1968; Inoue, 2005) and those interested in consistent scoring of individuals across a writing program (e.g., Kemp, 2005; Wasley, 2006; Lucas, 1971; Hirsch and Harrington, 1981).

Considering the history of distributive evaluation as the tension between recognizing that readers read differently and trying to norm them away from those different readings as part of fairness in assessment is fascinating. This tension suggests the long history of the issues involved in distributive evaluation, even if the techniques associated with distributive evaluation did not begin to appear until the late 1960s (i.e., Elbow 1968). Since the late 19th-century, large-scale writing assessment projects have been troubled by the ways different readers evaluate essays. The dominant push in writing has been towards norming readers so that they produce the same scores and increase inter-rater reliability (See Norbert Elliott's *On a Scale* (2005)). Within work on distributive evaluation, Hirsch and Harrington (1981) wanted to create "a single appropriate scale—to design, in effect, a weighing instrument that gives a certain value to a piece of prose in the way that a scale gives a weight to a piece of matter" (p.189), their study ended up confirming the diversity of readers' responses as much as it convinced the field of writing assessment about the reliability and validity of their intrinsic communicative effectiveness method.

A key aspect of distributive evaluation since the mid-1990s has been the impact of information technologies on writing. Syverson's *Wealth of Reality* (1999) not only examines the importance of situational elements for understanding writing but also argues for an eportfolio model based on M.A Barr's Learning Record. In Syverson's Online Learning Record (OLR), responsibility for the value of a collection of texts is distributed among multiple stakeholders (Martin 2002). A number of the essays in Cambridge *et al.*'s edited collection *Electronic Portfolios* (2001) highlight ways in which information technologies enable e-portfolios to distribute evaluation of works across various audiences. Whithaus (2002) argues that the changing material conditions of texts and composing have reshaped the possibilities for writing assessment; he attributes these changes to software ranging from Microsoft Word's spelling and grammar checks to e-portfolios' authentic and distributive evaluation systems. Yancey's "Looking for sources of coherence in a fragmented world" (2004a) explores how the changing relations among texts, writers, and readers encourages shifts toward distributive writing assessment practices. Another technological development that has implications for distributive evaluation systems is the increasing use and availability of databases; Kemp (2005) argues that a database system for distributing grading can be used to improve college writing instruction.

In the last fifteen years (1994-2009), work related to, but not strictly focused on, distributive evaluation has occurred in the areas of the history of writing assessment (Elliot, 2005), computers and writing (Yancey, 2004b), institutional practices (Haswell, 2001), writing portfolios (Broad, 2003), e-portfolios, contract grading (Shor, 1996), writing assessment theory (Elbow, 1996; Haswell, 1998; Huot, 2002; Lynne, 2004), and human development (Haswell, 1991). In education and psychometrics, 4th generation assessment has also had a marked influence on distributive evaluation projects in writing studies; Guba and Lincoln's *Effective evaluation* (1981) is one of the seminal works in this area. These related works are listed at the end of this bibliography, but most are not annotated.

Cambridge, Barbara; Susan Kahn; Daniel P. Tompkins; Kathleen Blake Yancey (Eds.)

Electronic portfolios: Emerging practices in student, faculty, and institutional learning

Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education (2001)
http://www.aahe.org/pubs/Electronic_Portfolios/

> This collection of essays examines the multiple ways in which e-portfolios were being used for assessing students, faculty, and programs/institutions. The sections that focus on student e-portfolios and programmatic assessment sketch ways in which e-portfolios and digital technologies opened possibilities for creating distributive methods of written evaluation and feedback.
>
> KEYWORDS: e-portfolio, electronic portfolio, evaluation, placement, practice

Elbow, Peter

Do we need a single standard of value for institutional assessment? An essay response to Asao Inoue's "Community-based Assessment Pedagogy" [in *Assessing Writing* 09.3].

Assessing Writing 11.2 (2006) 81-99

> This article critiques how Asao Inoue has students assess and grade each other's writing. Elbow argues that a classroom where there is a single model (or rubric) used as the example of good writing distorts how the value of a piece of writing is socially constructed. Elbow contends that the social construction of value associated with a piece of writing should not be singular, but rather needs to represent multiple (and even competing) readings (*i.e.,* evaluations). He discusses a modified form of contract grading that fits with the theory of value and valuing he develops in the essay.

> KEYWORDS: assessment, distributive evaluation, model, value, multiple, rubric, institutional, real-world, nonacademic, community-based

Elbow, Peter

A method for teaching writing

College English 30.2 (1968) 115-125

> This article suggests that there are three criteria for judging a piece of student writing: (1) does it embody good reasoning, (2) is its style good, and (3) does it have the desired effect on the reader. The first two are commonly used by English teachers; the third is used by everyone everyday, but is excluded from writing courses. Elbow argues that teachers should create classes where the effectiveness of a piece of writing on readers is the first criteria for judging it. He goes on to describe reasons for, and the effects of, making students into readers and judges of each other's writing. The reasons include: (a) starting with skills students already possess, (b) realizing that different readers are affected by different qualities of writing, (c) seeing a wide range of written responses on the same task, and (d) recognizing that it is fun and interesting to have a class read the essays the students have written. Focusing on the effectiveness of a piece of writing as the criteria for judging it creates an environment where the students are invested in learning about writing and where the teacher becomes a coach rather than the dispenser of grades.

> KEYWORDS: improvement, pedagogy, self, audience-rating, grading, basic, Cicero, Quintillian, practice, evaluation, criteria, distributive evaluation

Haswell, Richard H.

Gaining ground in college writing: Tales of development and interpretation (SMU Studies in Composition and Rhetoric)

Dallas, TX: Southern Methodist University Press 1991

This book suggests that any attempt to reduce a piece of apprenticeship writing to one grade or score will belie the internal contradictions of a complex skill being learned. Considering theory and findings from human development, as well as analysis of postsecondary student writing at various ages and academic levels, it argues that most college-student essays will show uneven accomplishment and therefore that evaluating them through holistic methods is inappropriate. In particular Chapter 14 ("Diagnosis") looks closely at one student placement essay and highlights both the distribution of ratings among readers and the ways in which placement is probabilistic and speculative (p. 345). In his analysis of the student piece, Haswell notes how holistic scorers came up with a wide variance of rates, and argues that adjusting the rates to a "true score" doesn't make sense: "To my mind, the seven rates of 1, 4, 5, 5, 6, 7, and 8 describe the essay more accurately than any less varied set" (p. 347).

 KEYWORDS: development, life-span, FYC, college-span, theory, data, contrast-group, cross-sectional, first-year, sophomore, junior, alumn, ungrounded, college-span, workplace, advanced, emotion, trigger, forestructure, appropriation, alienation, regression, U-shaped, decalage, Piaget, curriculum, arrangement, gender-difference, style, volume-of-writing, transformative, theory, William Perry, Habermas, Gadamer

Haswell, Richard H.

Rubrics, prototypes, and exemplars: Categorization theory and systems of writing placement

 Assessing Writing 05.2 (1998) 231-268

This article examines the implications of categorization theory for writing placement systems. Two methods of placement are examined: a two-tiered system and holistic scoring. In the two-tiered system, the first step relies on a general impression (*i.e.*, no rubric for holistic, primary-trait, or other predetermined schema) is used; the second step relies on a contextualized evaluation (see Haswell 1991 for more details). Holistic scoring is described and critiqued because of the ways in which it hides variances in scoring and works to keep variances from occurring (p. 238). Holistic scoring is also critiqued because of a lack of theory (p. 244). Categorization theory is offered as support for a two-tiered system; three types of categorization are discussed: (1) classical (based on Aristotelian logic), (2) prototype (based on the non-Aristotelian logic found in James and Wittgenstein), and (3) exemplar (which "assumes a rummaging through episodic memory ending with a gestalt-like pattern recognition of specific exemplars" (p.247). The article ends by acknowledging other theories (reader response, feminism, social contextualism, and problem solving) that have informed writing placement, but argues

that categorization adds a useful lens through which to consider how evaluators interact with and rate student writing for placement in first-year composition.

KEYWORDS: assessment, placement, holistic, rating-method, reliability, variance, data, categorization, theory, prototypical, exemplar, fuzziness, rubric, research-method, Washington State University

Hirsch, E. D., Jr.; David P. Harrington

Measuring the communicative effectiveness of prose

In Frederiksen, Carl H.; Joseph F. Dominic (Eds.), *Writing: The nature, development, and teaching of written communication,* Vol. 2; Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum (1981) 189-208

Hirsch and Harrington develop a method of writing assessment called *intrinsic communicative effectiveness* that correlates the assessment of a piece of prose with its effects upon its target audience. This method compares the actual effects of a piece of prose with its potential optimal effects on a competent audience. Hirsch and Harrington review the work on *socialized holistic scoring* developed by Diederich at ETS, *primary trait* assessments developed at NAEP, and work on rating papers using *T-units*. They then distinguish between *intrinsic rhetorical effectiveness* and *intrinsic communicative effectiveness*. *Intrinsic rhetorical effectiveness* cannot be measured, but *intrinsic communicative effectiveness* is measurable. Drawing on the work of Walter Ong and Chaim Perelman, Hirsch and Harrington develop a concept of an *appropriate reader*. They then experiment with creating "synonymous versions" of an essay; the original and the rewritten "synonymous versions" are read by raters and compared in terms of average reading speed, average elapsed time in answering questions about the readings, and number of correct answers. The goal of this experiment is making explicit the principles of effective writing so that not only can high degrees of inter-rater reliability be achieved in standardized testing but also so that "scoring principles might be learned by anyone who could imagine how an appropriate reader would in fact read the piece of writing" (p. 206).

KEYWORDS: evaluation, communication, reader-response, audience-rating, data, research-method, distributive evaluation, revisited, The Philosophy of Composition, readability

Inoue, Asao B.

Community-based assessment pedagogy

Assessing Writing 9.3 (2005) 208-238

Inoue reports on an experiment to give students more control over writing assignments, assessments, and the reflective processes associated with them. Drawing on the works of Guba, Huot, White, and Tchudi, the article argues that traditional teacher comments and

grades negatively affect students' writing and learning. Inoue then explains the development and use of a class-constructed assessment rubric in his courses at a public, land-grant university. The article concludes with an argument for using student-constructed rubrics and public, reflective activities in writing classes in order to promote students' interest in, and ownership of, writing and learning about writing.

KEYWORDS: evaluation, classroom, student-centered, assignment, criteria, peer-evaluation, rubric, community-based

Kemp, Fred

Computers, innovation, and resistance in first-year composition programs

In McGee, Sharon James (Ed.), *Discord and direction: The postmodern writing program administrator*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press (2005) 105-122

This essay argues that many first-year writing students are failed by the administrative implementation of composition studies research and pedagogy. Using Texas Tech as an example, Kemp argues that the division of teacher roles into classroom instructor and document instructor allows for multiple readings (usually two) of each student essay. Each document instructor who reads a student essay grades and comments on it. This distributive system of assessment is called Interactive Composition Online (ICON), and is enabled by database-driven software (TOPIC). Class time is cut half, allowing students to focus more on writing rather than talking about writing. ICON also encourages objective grading; "by distributing grading and commenting across the entire system of fifty-seven professionals, we have *required* all those engaged to share the same criteria and terminology of effective writing" (p. 111). The essay ends with an argument for shifting responsibility from the individual writing instruction to the system of writing instruction; using technology is a key way of facilitating this shift.

KEYWORDS: WPA, change, computer, innovation, teacher-resistance, evaluation, teacher-less, colleague evaluator, Texas Tech University, TOPIC, FYC

Lewkowicz, Jo A.; David Nunan

The limits of collaborative evaluation

TESOL Quarterly 33.4 (1999) 681-700

Lewkowicz and Nunan discuss a three-year program evaluation of an Intensive English Language Program (IELP) in Hong Kong. IELP is a bridging program to help students move from Chinese-medium secondary schools to an English-medium university. The program assessment used a collaborative evaluation approach. Lewkowicz and Nunan review the literature on collaborative evaluation and the tensions between traditional quantitative evaluation (Suchman, 1967; Shadish, 1995) and fourth-generation, qualitative methods of evaluation (e.g., Guba and Lincoln, 1981; Stake, 1980). They

provide an overview of IELP, and describe their evaluation model: "the evaluation was to be transactional, with views being sought from a variety of participants at every stage of input as well as at the stage of data interpretation" (p. 688). While the IELP program was favorably evaluated, Lewkowicz and Nunan critique the collaborative evaluation process because stakeholders understood and were committed to the principles of the collaborative evaluation program differently. These different agendas coupled with the turnover in teachers limited the effectiveness of the collaborative evaluation. (It should be noted that most of the articles on distributive evaluation in this bibliography focus on the assessment of students and not on program-level assessments as Lewkowicz and Nunan do.)

KEYWORDS: distributive evaluation, collaborative, peer-evaluation, needs-analysis, ESL, pedagogy

Lucas, A.M.

Multiple marking of a matriculation biology essay question

British Journal of Educational Psychology 41.1 (1971) 78-84

Lucas reports on a study of six readers of the 1969 Matriculation Biology essay examination in Australia. These readers were all practicing biology teachers reading under the pressure of turning around 2,265 essays within 14 days. Multiple marking was found to increase the reliability of the mark significantly. The greatest increase in reliability occurred in change from one to two readers; increases to three or four readers had statistically significant impacts, but their magnitude was smaller. While this study discusses distributing evaluation among multiple markers, it also has many parallels with the development of normative holistic essay scoring for large-scale English writing exams.

KEYWORDS: holistic, assessment, scale, interrater-reliability, halo-effect, data, essay-exam, biology-course, distributive evaluation, entrance-exam

Martin, Kelly

Portfolio assessment and the learning record online

Kairos: A Journal for Teachers of Writing in Webbed Environments 7.3 (2002)
http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/issueArchive.html [full-text]

This webtext explores how an online portfolio such as the Learning Record Online can become an integral part of how writing teachers and students understand the relationships among new media, technology, and composition.

KEYWORDS: e-portfolio, evaluation, pedagogy, online

Prior, Paul; Gail E. Hawisher; Sibylle Gruber; Nicole MacLaughlin

Research and WAC evaluation: An in-progress reflection.

In Yancey, Kathleen Blake; Brian Huot (Eds.), *Assessing writing across the curriculum: Diverse approaches and practices.* Greenwich, CT: Ablex. (1999) 185-216

> This essay reflects on the development of the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program supported by the Center for Writing Studies (CWS) at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. It provides a model of a program assessment as a distributive evaluation, engaging multiple audiences and agendas. The authors argue that this distributive model of assessment is needed to encourage dialogic interactions among faculty working across departmental and disciplinary boundaries. The essay discusses stances, resources, and strategies used in the multi-year WAC program evaluation. One of the findings of the study is that faculty in different disciplines value different aspects of their students' writing. The essay suggests that "learning from those in other disciplinary cultures" can make WAC programs stronger and help writing faculty enrich students' experiences as writers in college.
>
> KEYWORDS: WAC, assessment, program

Sterling-Deer, Carolyn

Writing in the disciplines, technology, and disciplinary grounding

Across the Disciplines 6.0 (2009) http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/technologies/sterlingdeer.cfm

> Drawing on Boix Mansilla's (2004) criteria for assessing students' disciplinary knowledge and potential to make interdisciplinary connections, Sterling-Deer's study explores the use of Blackboard eLearning course management technology and ePortfolio technology to share course materials and to increase student reflection. Sterling-Deer discusses students' writing and their abilities to link to supporting documents as demonstrates of their learning. She argues that these e-portfolios illustrate students' struggles to provide their own academically and/or professionally focused e-portfolios despite the general-purpose ePortfolio templates. Her work suggests that students at LaGuardia Community College, CUNY are aware of the potential distribution of their work to multiple audiences, whereas the templates in the ePortfolio software insist on a single format/audience approach.
>
> KEYWORDS: WAC, WID, education-course, capstone, undergraduate, childhood, LaGuardia Community College/CUNY, two-year, e-portfolio, writing-intensive, interdisciplinary, validation, learning-community, evaluation

Sutton, Mark

Avoiding the black dot: Toward a model of fair grading for collaborative writing

Issues in Writing 14.2 (2004) 152-174

This article relates models of fairness from social psychology to writing assessment. Sutton argues that these models—distributive, procedural, and group—are more effective as a basis for assessing collaborative writing than the philosophical ones commonly used in composition studies. The study draws on a survey of 134 students from ten different classes taught by four instructors. In the survey, students had a preference for distributive fairness, which is based on how materials, such as rewards, are divided among a group. Procedural fairness analyzes how a situation such as a legal case or an employment situation is fair; it was the second most common model of social psychology fairness that students related to in the surveys. Group fairness was the least recognized form of fairness among the students, although it is the most accepted view of fairness among social psychologists. Sutton concludes that group fairness may be the most important model to use in developing and grading collaborative projects, because first-year students are unfamiliar with how to work effectively in groups and with the concepts of fairness that underlie group dynamics.

KEYWORDS: collaborative, assignment, grading, fairness, evaluation, criteria, practice, distributive evaluation, procedural, group, FYC

Syverson, Margaret A.

The wealth of reality: An ecology of composition

Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press (1999)

Syverson frames her study with four terms: distribution, embodiment, emergence, and enactment. These terms help explain complex adaptive systems, and Syverson argues that writing and writers should be understood as taking part in complex adaptive systems (*i.e.*, knowledge ecologies). She draws on the work of Lave and Wenger in situated cognition. One chapter traces the multiple influences in a Charles Reznikoff poem; another presents a case study of first-year college students composing a collaborative essay; another focuses on the tensions that arose in a list-serv discussion during the first Gulf War; the final chapter examines the implications from these case studies for composition research, pedagogy, and assessment. This chapter argues for a Learning Record approach, which incorporates situated and distributive evaluation, for teaching and assessing writing.

KEYWORDS: ecological, contextualism, Gulf War, Desert Storm, systems-analysis, organization, assessment, large-scale, Learning Record, chaos-theory, process, ethnographic, technology, computer, teacher-student, email, embodiment, 'enaction', enactment, case-study, workshop

Thomas, Freddy L.

Developing a culture of writing at Virginia State University: A new writing emphasis

Across the Disciplines 6.0 (2009)
http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/assessment/thomas.cfm

> Thomas discusses how e-portfolios are used as part of a Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) at Virginia State. The article provides the historical context of Virginia State, and then discusses moves to define and encourage a culture of writing at there. WAC/WID and e-portfolios are essential tools in the operationalizing of this culture of writing. Readers of these multi-year e-portfolios represent multiple disciplines and a commitment to using writing to develop critical thinking in courses across the curriculum.
>
> KEYWORDS: WAC, assessment, Virginia State University, African-Am, accreditation, e-portfolio, critical-thinking

Warnock, Scott

Methods and results of an accreditation-driven writing assessment in a business college

Journal of Business and Technical Communication 23.1 (2009) 83-107

> Warnock describes the logistics and methods used to assess the writing skills of Drexel University business majors as part of the reaccreditation process for the LeBow College of Business. The evaluators were English Department faculty and graduates of the College of Business, currently working in industry; they used a 10-category rubric that was developed with input from the College of Business faculty. The elements assessed were: (1) gross mistakes, (2) ethics, (3) purpose/main point, (4) audience, (5) organization, (6) evidence, (7) sentence style, (8) correctness, (9) document design, and (10) visuals. Using Waypoint software evaluators' numeric scores and comments were recorded for each category. The evaluators, representing writing experts and content experts, were trained on the use of the Waypoint software, but they were not normed using the scoring rubric. This approach was based on "the idea that a large enough group of real readers can assess writing in a way that makes a useful, representative statement about the way writing will be received by audience members for whom it may pertain" (p. 90). The mean overall scores varied in statistically significant ways between the business evaluators and the English evaluators (p. 92). The evaluators' written comments also revealed distinctions among the two types of readers. Warnock argues that these differences represent valid, real-world distinctions between types of readers. He advocates three practices for developing similar types of distributive evaluation systems: (1) avoid norming or holistic scoring practices; (2) overcome the obstacle of audience; and (3) generate large numbers.
>
> KEYWORDS: accreditation, bizcom, rubric, assessment, distributive, evaluation, holistic, audience, data, contrast-group, non-department

Wasley, Paula

A new way to grade

Chronicle of Higher Education 52.27 (March 2006) A6

This article reports on the implementation of ICON (for Interactive Composition Online) at Texas Tech. Based on TOPIC (Texas Tech Online-Print Integrated Curriculum), the first-year composition program implemented a system of distributive evaluation. Instead of a traditional classroom, first-year composition courses were modified to meet half as often and instructors (graduate students) were given roles as classroom or document instructors. Classroom instructors meet their classes once a week, and document instructors grade anonymous student papers online. Critics view ICON as a dehumanized, factory approach to teaching composition; proponents view ICON as a way to provide consistent, high-quality instruction in a large (3,000 student) composition program. Wasley's article documents this controversy around ICON. Lindsay Hutton, a graduate student at Texas Tech, is critical of the ICON. Fred Kemp, the designer of TOPIC, defends the program as "the best deal for freshmen that I've ever seen." Shirley K. Rose and Deborah H. Holdstein are quoted as critical of ICON.

KEYWORDS: Texas Tech University, program, TOPIC [Texas Tech Online-Print Integrated Curriculum], ICON [Interactive Composition Online], distributive evaluation, grading, pedagogy, cost-effective

Whithaus, Carl

Teaching and evaluating writing in the age of computers and high-stakes testing

Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum (2005)

Whithaus argues that IT is changing how students write. He advocates for the development of writing assessment systems (on both classroom- and large-scale levels) that acknowledge writing as a complex, multimodal task. Four techniques are discussed as elements within these new assessment systems: (1) interaction, (2) description, (3) situation, and (4) distribution. Interaction argues for including student response to feedback (whether real time or asynchronous) as part of the assessment of a student's abilities as a writer. Description suggests that assessment systems should describe what a writer does rather than use a deficit model focusing on what a text lacks. Situation is the inclusion of local variables rather than their exclusion. Distribution suggests that different readers read differently and that their multiple perspectives on a text should be incorporated into the evaluation of that work. Examples in the book include audio files, electronic portfolios, websites as individual expressive essays, hand-written essays, word processed essays, and blogs. The potential impact of Automatic Essay Scoring (AES) systems is also discussed.

KEYWORDS: testing, machine-scoring, high-stakes, practice, computer, evaluation, distributive evaluation, multimedia, e-portfolio, situational, ethnographic, negotiation, teacher-student, interaction

Whithaus, Carl

Think different/think differently: A tale of green squiggly lines, or evaluating student writing in computer-mediated environments

Kairos: A Journal for Teachers of Writing in Webbed Environments 7.x (2002)
http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/issueArchive.html

Whithaus argues that we should not construct elaborate systems of electronic writing assessment based on portfolio models without confronting the material conditions of students' new technological publishing environments. In the section "Self Assessment, Reflection, and a Wider Audience," he draws on electronic portfolio work at Kalamazoo College and Alverno College to show how colleges are distributing students' writing to multiple audiences. The responses from these multiple audiences/evaluators are incorporated into the e-portfolios. In these cases, e-portfolios reinforce a distributed evaluation model that acknowledges valid, yet different readings and evaluations of the same text.

KEYWORDS: word-processing, computer, Microsoft Word, authentic, assessment, evaluation, e-portfolio, distributive, self-assessment, Kalamazoo College, Alverno College

Yancey, Kathleen

Looking for sources of coherence in a fragmented world: Notes toward a new assessment design.

Computers and Composition 21.1 (2004) 89-102

Yancey argues that print and digital have become intertextual and that the key to understanding this intertextuality is composition. She then examines how coherence has been a key way of looking at and evaluating a printed text. Considering word processing, email, PowerPoint slides, and MUD/MOOs, she argues that digital texts change what coherence means because they can be sorted and re-contextualized by readers much more easily than print. The end of the article develops a heuristic for assessment based on this new view of coherence in digital texts (and print/digital intertexts):

1. What arrangements are possible?
2. Who arranges?
3. What is the intent?
4. What is the fit between the intent and the effect? (p. 96).

The discussion of the fit between the intent and the effect leads Yancey to emphasize "the relationships between and among composers, readers, and texts" (p. 100). Understanding textual coherence as a relationship among composers, readers, and texts moves towards incorporating distributive techniques into writing assessments.

KEYWORDS: assessment, profession, history, change, indirect, holistic, portfolio, validation, program, MUD, MOO, word-processing, PowerPoint, intertextuality, digital

ADDENDUM: RELATED WORKS

Broad, Bob

What we really value: Beyond rubrics in teaching and assessing writing

Logan, UT: Utah State University Press (2003)

KEYWORDS: assessment, evaluation, criteria, multifactorial, data, ethnographic, transcript-analysis, rubric, holistic

Elbow, Peter

Writing assessment in the 21st century: A utopian view

In L. Bloom, D. Daiker, & E. White (Eds.), *Composition in the twenty-first century: Crisis and change*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press. (1996) 83-100

KEYWORDS: assessment, placement, change

Guba, Egon G.; Yvonna S. Lincoln

Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches

San Francisco: Jossey-Bass (1981)

KEYWORDS: evaluation, assessment, authentic, naturalistic, model, response, situational, contextual

Haswell, Richard H. (Ed.)

Beyond outcomes: Assessment and instruction within a university writing program

Westport, CT: Ablex (2001)

KEYWORDS: assessment, institutional, ecological, practice, Washington State University, history

Huot, Brian

(Re)articulating writing assessment

Logan, UT: Utah State University Press   (2002)

>KEYWORDS: assessment, evaluation, change, theory, testing-theory, contextual, measurement, holistic, multiple-choice, direct-indirect, portfolio, power, reliability, validity

Lynne, Patricia

Coming to terms: A theory of writing assessment

Logan, UT: Utah State University Press   (2004)

>KEYWORDS: assessment, evaluation, theory, qualitative, quantitative

Shor, Ira

When students have power: Negotiating authority in a critical pedagogy

Chicago: University of Chicago Press (1996)

>KEYWORDS: liberatory, critical-pedagogy, student-centered, authority, negotiation, pedagogy

Yancey, Kathleen

Made not only in words: Composition in a new key

College Composition and Communication 56.2 (2004) 297-328

>KEYWORDS: Chair's Address, literacy, change, profession, faculty status, practice, pedagogy, history, curriculum, media, technology, circulation, production, academic-public, academic-nonacademic