2010 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Complete this form if your program already has results from a program assessment activity.

Name: Kenton Harsch
Program Name: English Language Institute
Unit: Department of Second Language Studies, College of Languages, Linguistics, & Literatures
UH User Name: kenton
Phone: 956-6946

1. List the program’s student learning outcomes.

Student Learning Outcomes
ELI Listening & Speaking Courses
After successful completion of ELI Listening & Speaking courses, students will be able to:
• demonstrate effective use of strategies for: comprehending advanced academic lectures in English; critically evaluating speakers’ perspectives, techniques, and arguments; and incorporating information from academic lectures into their overall studies
• make academic presentations (individually or in group or panel contexts) with a high degree of formal accuracy and cultural and stylistic appropriacy
• autonomously lead academic discussions using academic English, and demonstrate effective use of advanced strategies for participation in academic discussions with expert users of English
• self-assess their strengths in terms of listening/speaking abilities, identify areas for continued development, and state a range of strategies to address those areas

Student Learning Outcomes
ELI Reading Courses
After successful completion of ELI Reading courses, students will be able to:
• select reading and note-taking strategies appropriately for a range of different academic reading tasks, in accordance with courses they are enrolled in as well as their own purposes for reading advanced academic English texts
• evaluate authors’ messages, perspectives, techniques, and arguments
• evaluate print and web-based sources
• self-assess their strengths in terms of reading abilities, identify areas for continued development, and state a range of strategies to address those areas
Student Learning Outcomes
ELI Writing Courses – Undergraduate Level
After successful completion of ELI Writing courses, undergraduate students will be able to:

• fluently generate sufficient written text, at the brainstorming and drafting stages of the writing process, in response to a writing assignment
• Compose college writing that achieves a specific purpose and responds adeptly to an identifiable audience.
• Provide evidence of effective strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proofreading a text in order to produce finished prose.
• Compose an argument that makes use of source material that is relevant and credible and that is integrated in accordance with an appropriate style guide.

Working definitions for SLO #2 (by committee representing ELI and the English Department – the two programs offering FW):

• Revising: making global changes (e.g., adding, deleting, or moving content; rewriting for a different audience; rewriting in a different tone)
• Editing: making changes at the sentence level, including changes in sentence style, syntax, phrasing
• Proofreading: correcting grammar, punctuation and mechanics, spelling, formatting

Student Learning Outcomes
ELI Writing Courses – Graduate Level
After successful completion of ELI Writing courses, graduate students will be able to:

• fluently generate sufficient written text, at the brainstorming and drafting stages of the writing process, in response to a writing assignment
• analyze discipline and genre-specific academic English writing conventions and effectively apply that knowledge to graduate level writing tasks
• self-assess their strengths as academic writers, as well as areas for continued development, incorporating personal reflection and feedback from others
• appropriately incorporate a variety of reliable information sources that are relevant for doing graduate-level research in their academic writing

2. Where are your program’s student learning outcomes published?
(Mark all that apply and include URLs when appropriate)

[ ] Website. URL:
[ ] Student Handbook. URL, if available online:
[ ] Information Sheet, Flyer, or Brochure. URL, if available online:
[ ] UHM Catalog. Page Number:
[ √ ] Other: The program-level outcomes listed above are still in draft stages (subject to review by our faculty and administrators during the current academic year). SLOs for each individual course are published on course syllabi (see Appendix A for course-level SLOs). We hope to publish these program learning outcomes and our mission statement on the ELI website during the next academic year.
[ ] Other:
3. Provide the program’s activity map or other graphic that illustrates how program activities/services align with program student learning outcomes.

Key: I=Introduced; R=reinforced and opportunity to practice; M=mastery at the exit level.

* Since all students admitted to UH Manoa have studied English extensively, it is assumed that they have already been introduced to the concepts covered by these SLOs and that the ELI is reintroducing them in an academic context.

### ELI Listening & Speaking Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>ELI 70</th>
<th>ELI 80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>demonstrate effective use of strategies for comprehending advanced academic lectures in English, critically evaluating speakers' perspectives, techniques, and arguments, and incorporating information from academic lectures into their overall studies</td>
<td>(I*),R</td>
<td>(I*),R,M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make academic presentations (individually or in group or panel contexts) with a high degree of formal accuracy and cultural and stylistic appropriacy</td>
<td>(I*),R</td>
<td>(I*),R,M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autonomously lead academic discussions using academic English, and demonstrate effective use of advanced strategies for participation in academic discussions with expert users of English</td>
<td>(I*),R</td>
<td>(I*),R,M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-assess their strengths in terms of listening/speaking abilities, identify areas for continued development, and state a range of strategies to address those areas</td>
<td>(I*),R</td>
<td>(I*),R,M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ELI Reading Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>ELI 72</th>
<th>ELI 82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>select reading and note-taking strategies appropriately for a range of different academic reading tasks, in accordance with courses they are enrolled in as well as their own purposes for reading advanced academic English texts</td>
<td>(I*),R</td>
<td>(I*),R,M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate authors’ messages, perspectives, techniques, and arguments</td>
<td>(I*),R</td>
<td>(I*),R,M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate print and web-based sources</td>
<td>(I*),R</td>
<td>(I*),R,M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-assess their strengths in terms of reading abilities, identify areas for continued development, and state a range of strategies to address those areas</td>
<td>(I*),R</td>
<td>(I*),R,M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ELI Writing Courses – Undergraduate Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>ELI 73</th>
<th>ELI 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fluently generate sufficient written text, at the brainstorming</td>
<td>(I*),R</td>
<td>(I*),R,M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and drafting stages of the writing process, in response to a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compose college writing that achieves a specific purpose and</td>
<td>(I*),R</td>
<td>(I*),R,M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responds adeptly to an identifiable audience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide evidence of effective strategies for generating,</td>
<td>(I*),R</td>
<td>(I*),R,M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revising, editing, and proofreading a text in order to produce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finished prose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compose an argument that makes use of source material that is</td>
<td>(I*),R</td>
<td>(I*),R,M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevant and credible and that is integrated in accordance with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an appropriate style guide.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELI Writing Courses – Graduate Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>ELI 73</th>
<th>ELI 83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fluently generate sufficient written text, at the brainstorming</td>
<td>(I*),R</td>
<td>(I*),R,M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and drafting stages of the writing process, in response to a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analyze discipline and genre-specific academic English writing</td>
<td>(I*),R</td>
<td>(I*),R,M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conventions and effectively apply that knowledge to graduate level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-assess their strengths as academic writers, as well as</td>
<td>(I*),R</td>
<td>(I*),R,M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>areas for continued development, incorporating personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reflection and feedback from others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriately incorporate a variety of reliable information</td>
<td>(I*),R</td>
<td>(I*),R,M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources that are relevant for doing graduate-level research in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their academic writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To make the annual reports more meaningful and useful, please base your responses to questions 4-13 on assessment activities that took place between June 2009 and September 2010.
4. State the assessment question(s) and/or goals of the assessment activity. Include the student learning outcomes that were targeted, if applicable.

What did the program want to find out?

Three assessments were carried out during the period in question, labeled A, B, & C hereafter.

A) Survey of ex-ELI 83 students.
   1. Does the ELI 83 curriculum match with the writing needs of graduate students at UHM?
   2. Do ex-students feel that ELI 83 effectively prepared them for handling academic writing in their fields?
   3. How do ex-students of ELI 83 self-assess their language ability in terms of the learning outcomes of the course? Outcomes to be addressed:
      (1) analyze discipline and genre-specific academic English writing conventions and effectively apply that knowledge to writing tasks.
      (2) self-assess their strengths as academic writers, as well as areas for continued development, incorporating personal reflection and feedback from others
      (3) appropriately incorporate a variety of reliable information sources that are relevant for doing graduate-level research in their academic writing
      (Note: this self-assessment follows up on a previous evaluation of the first SLO above, which took place in 2008 and involved multiple readers using a rubric to evaluate samples of student writing.)

B) Assessment of SLO #3 for FW, conducted by the Assessment Office, involving student writing from ELI 100, ENG 100, ENG 100A, and ENG 190 (all the courses that fulfill the FW requirement at UH Manoa).
   Addresses SLO #3: Students will be able to compose an argument that makes use of source material that is relevant and credible and that is integrated in accordance with an appropriate style guide.

C) Support for instructors of online courses.
   • How effective is the support system currently in place in the ELI for its teachers of courses offered in online format?
   • What might be done to improve the ways the ELI can support teachers of online courses?

5. State the type(s) of evidence gathered

To assess the student learning outcome(s) or answer the assessment question, what evidence was collected?

A) Survey of ex-ELI 83 students. Students who had successfully completed ELI 83 between Fall 2007 and Spring 2009 were invited to complete an online questionnaire addressing the types of academic writing they experienced since completion of ELI 83, the degree to which they felt ELI 83 prepared them for these writing tasks and projects, and a self-assessment of their abilities in terms of ELI 83’s learning outcomes.
B) **Assessment of SLO #3 for FW.** The Assessment Office provided the ELI with names of students, randomly selected, for each section of ELI 100, and the ELI provided the Assessment Office with papers written by the three students. Readers from ENG and ELI were invited to be raters, and used a rubric developed by the Assessment Office (and approved by ENG and ELI) to score the papers on four factors derived from the SLO (“makes use of source material”, “relevancy of sources”, “credibility of sources”, and “style integration”). Raters were trained by faculty from the Assessment Office.

C) **Support for instructors of online courses.**

- Interviews with program administrators (ELI Director and Coordinator), one done jointly and one individually.
- Interview with the ELI’s online lead teacher.
- Focus group meeting with three current online teachers.
- Face-to-face interview interview with one current online teacher (who was also one of the investigators)
- E-mail interview with an online teacher from a previous semester

6) **List the person/people who interpreted or analyzed the evidence that was collected.**

Examples: program staff; faculty committee; advisory board; graduate students; external organization/evaluators

A) **Survey of ex-ELI 83 students.** Lawrence Davis, a PhD student in Second Language Studies (SLS) who had previously served as a GA in the ELI (both as an instructor of ELI 83 and as our program’s testing/evaluation specialist).

B) **Assessment of SLO #3 for FW.** Monica Stitt-Bergh and Marlene Lowe of the Assessment Office. Raters were faculty from the Department of English at UH Manoa. (Note: ELI administrators and faculty were invited to serve as raters, but due to time conflicts with ELI Placement Testing and the orientation for the Department of SLS, no one from the ELI was able to serve as a rater.)

C) **Support for instructors of online courses.** Ju-A Hwang and Riana Helen Agnesia, graduate students conducting the study for SLS 631: Second Language Program Evaluation, in Spring 2010 semester. (Note: in addition to being one of the investigators, Ms. Agnesia also has taught online ELI courses and was selected to begin serving as online lead teacher from Fall 2010.)

7) **How did he/she/they evaluate, analyze, or interpret the evidence?**

*What method was used to evaluate, analyze, or interpret the evidence?*

Examples: Compiled survey results; used qualitative methods to compile interview, focus group, or other open-ended response data; used a rubric or scoring criteria; used a scoring key on exams; used their professional judgment (no rubric or scoring key used); external organization/person analyzed data.

A) **Survey of ex-ELI 83 students.** Used interviews with selected ex-ELI 83 students to develop the survey instrument, used quantitative and qualitative methods along with professional judgment to compile survey results.
B) **Assessment of SLO #3 for FW.** Used rubrics as scoring criteria, compiled results from raters.

C) **Support for instructors of online courses.** Use qualitative methods to compile interview and focus group results, along with professional judgment when making suggestions.

8) **State how many persons** (e.g., students, clients) **submitted evidence that was evaluated** (e.g., state the sample size).

    *If applicable, please include the sampling technique used.*

A) **Survey of ex-ELI 83 students.** 40 respondents representing 16 native languages other than English. Email invitations were sent to 155 ex-ELI 83 students, so the response rate was 25.8%.

B) **Assessment of SLO #3 for FW.** 88 essays were scored (in total, 94 essays were submitted, 8 of which were considered “not scorable”, none of which were from ELI 100). Of the 88 scored, 9 were from ELI 100 (3 essays from each of 3 sections of the course).

C) **Support for instructors of online courses.** 8 participants (2 administrators, 1 online lead teacher, and 5 current or previous teachers of online courses).

9) **Summarize the actual results.**

A) **Survey of ex-ELI 83 students.**
   - 70% found ELI 83 to be useful, particularly the CAP (Convention Analysis Project), freewriting, peer review, and instructor feedback.
   - Types of academic writing done by ex-ELI 83 students covers a broad range of genres, both for-coursework and outside-coursework. The most common genres done for coursework were research papers, literature reviews, scholarly analysis/critiques, research proposals, and reflection papers, but other genres were mentioned. The most common outside-coursework genres were CVs/resumes, research proposals, papers for publication, conference abstracts, and theses/dissertations.
   - Student self-assessments of ability related to learning outcomes involved 8 questions for each SLO, and used a Likert scale of 1-5 (with 5 highest and 1 lowest). Results were:
     - SLO #1 (writing conventions): Overall mean = 3.92
     - SLO #2 (reflection & incorporating feedback): Overall mean = 4.09
     - SLO #3 (using sources, avoiding plagiarism): Overall mean = 4.16
B) **Assessment of SLO #3 for FW.** For each of the categories on the rubric, ELI results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Makes use of source material</th>
<th>Relevancy of sources</th>
<th>Credibility of sources</th>
<th>Style integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not prepared</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially prepared</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well prepared</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C) **Support for instructors of online courses.** While the evaluation and final paper was sufficient for the requirements of the course (SLS 631), the ELI considers the report to still be of “draft” nature and hopes that the two investigators will consider further discussion and revision to the report so that the ELI can make effective use of it. Nevertheless, some useful information appears to be evident in the draft report:

- Online courses appear to be running smoothly, and teachers are mostly satisfied with the support provided from administrators, the online lead teacher, the interaction afforded online teachers via their shared offices, and UH’s *Laulima* course management system.
- Although courses taught in online format involve the same SLOs as face-to-face courses, there are differences inherent in the media of instruction that warrant further investigation and development:
  - How technology affects teacher-student and student-student interaction.
  - Providing information to students about differences between online and face-to-face learning modes.
  - Access to and development of ELI resources that have been adapted to an online format.
- Teachers appear to appreciate that administrators recognize these differences and have made some adjustments to online teachers’ duties that reflect these differences.
- Teachers value and draw on the experience of the online lead teacher.
- There may be a need for collaboration and communication between the ELI and instructors of technology-focused courses offered in SLS.
- There appears to be a need for more centralized organization of information about available resources for online teachers.
10) What was learned from the results?

A) Survey of ex-ELI 83 students.

- The diverse range of genres reported by students, combined with their overall satisfaction with ELI 83, suggest that the curriculum for the course matches well with their academic needs. In particular, the wide range of reported conventions and genres supports the approach taken with the CAP.

- The ELI writing curriculum committee may want to consider replacing some components of the curriculum with genres commonly mentioned (e.g., research or conference proposals and CVs).

- ELI 83 appears to be highly successful at meeting the learning outcomes of the course. However, self-assessments must be balanced with other forms of assessment of student ability (such as the evaluation of student papers previously done to assess SLO #1).

B) Assessment of SLO #3 for FW.

- On the whole, the ELI is meeting the learning outcome. In three of the four categories, none of the ELI papers were in the “not prepared” category, and in the fourth category (“style integration”), the ELI’s percentage of “not prepared” students was the lowest of any of the FW courses.

- ELI 100 needs to devote more time, or perhaps develop more effective activities, for helping students learn how to follow style guides when integrating and citing their sources. Although only 11% of the essays were deemed “not prepared”, it is clearly the area where ELI 100 was the weakest.

C) Support for instructors of online courses. Again, given the “draft” nature of the report, the ELI does not wish to jump to any conclusions; further clarification is necessary related to what the investigators found. Nevertheless, a few insights have already emerged:

- The decision to create a GA position as online lead teacher was well founded. Although teachers of online courses belong to the ELI’s regular curriculum areas (listening/speaking, reading, and writing), there are enough differences in mode/media of instruction to warrant a support person (lead teacher) focusing specifically on online teaching issues.

- There appears to be a need to coordinate and provide a centralized forum for information and resources for online teachers. The ELI has already created a forum, but more work needs to be done to bring it up to date.

- Improvements may be needed for information provided to students about differences between online and face-to-face formats for ELI courses.
11) Use of results/program modifications:  
State how the program used the results  
--or--  
Explain planned use of results  
*Please be specific.*  

**A) Survey of ex-ELI 83 students.** A copy of Lawrence Davis’ report on this project will be made available to teachers in our writing curriculum area. Summary results of the study will be presented and discussed in a writing curriculum area meeting, with a focus on highlighting what is working well and how it might be applied in other ELI writing courses and the potential to consider replacing some components of ELI 83 with some common genres that have not been covered in the course.

**B) Assessment of SLO #3 for FW.** Data will be presented and discussed in a writing curriculum area meeting, with a focus on highlighting what is working well and how to provide students with more practice and feedback on how to follow style guides.

**C) Support for instructors of online courses.** Once again, given the “draft” nature of the report, the ELI does not wish to jump to any conclusions or jump into any actions that may not be needed. Much more clarification is necessary related to what the investigators found before action is taken in response to the report. However, ELI administrators will contact the investigators in an effort to get clarification about the results of the evaluation and the suggestions made by the investigators. It is hoped that this will be done during academic year 2010-2011.

12) Reflect on the assessment process.  

*Is there anything related to assessment procedures your program would do differently next time?*  
*What went well?*

The ELI would like to learn more about “best practices” for using the results of assessments, such as effective ways of sharing the data with relevant constituents (teachers, students, administrative staff), discussing results and what can be learned, and applying those ideas. We would also like to learn more about ways of making assessment an important part of our standard practices, given the constraints we face (e.g., limited human resources, occasional availability of testing/assessment specialists among our graduate students).

13) Other important information  

- Unlike curricular programs (from which students graduate with a degree or certificate), the ELI is a co-curricular, non-degree bearing program. Therefore, there is not a fixed set of courses that must be successfully completed by all students. Students’ course requirements are determined by a battery of placement tests taken at the time they enter UH Manoa, and placements range from some students being completely exempt (no ELI courses required) to others needing six courses across all three curriculum areas (with the majority of students falling in between zero and six courses required). Thus, it is important to note that exempting out of a curriculum area based on the placement test does not guarantee that a student has mastered all the outcomes of that area.

- The ELI is one of two programs that is housed within the Department of Second Language Studies. The other is the Hawai`i English Language Program (HELP). The
ELI is for students who have matriculated at UH Manoa, whereas HELP is an intensive English program for students whose English is not yet high enough for admission to university. Many students who complete HELP are admitted to UH Manoa and place into ELI courses. Because of our efforts to coordinate the SLOs of our two programs, the transition from HELP to ELI is usually as seamless as possible, and assessment is an important part of that process. Thus, our assessment efforts are designed not only to serve within the ELI, but across our two programs.

- While we sometimes have GAs who specialize in assessment and evaluation, we also have “gap semesters” where no GA is available for these purposes. Currently, program- and department-level resources are not adequate to engage in sustained comprehensive assessment, and no college-level resources have been allocated to this system-mandated initiative. Once additional support is consistently available, more will be done in a consistent and sustained way. The ELI is particularly interested in learning more about “best practices” for how programs integrate assessment into their standard practices in a sustainable way, especially programs with very limited human and other resources.
Appendix A: Student Learning Outcomes, ELI Courses
Listening/Speaking Curriculum Area

ELI 70
By the end of the course students will be able to:
• demonstrate good use of strategies for comprehending academic lectures in English.
• demonstrate effective use of strategies for incorporating information from academic lectures into their overall studies.
• make short academic presentations with some accuracy and cultural and stylistic appropriacy.
• with guidance, lead academic discussions using academic English.
• demonstrate good use of strategies for participation in academic discussions with other students who are second-language users of English.
• state a range of strategies for using listening/speaking opportunities to develop academic vocabulary (in English) and specify which they have an active command of in their repertoire.
• state a range of strategies for developing academic English and specify which they have an active command of in their repertoire.
• self-assess their strengths in terms of listening/speaking abilities, as well as identify areas for continued development.

ELI 80
By the end of the course students will be able to:
• demonstrate effective use of strategies for comprehending advanced academic lectures in English.
• critically evaluate speakers’ perspectives, techniques, and arguments.
• make academic presentations (individually or in group or panel contexts) with a high degree of formal accuracy and cultural and stylistic appropriacy.
• autonomously lead academic discussions using academic English.
• demonstrate excellent use of advanced strategies for participation in academic discussions with expert users of English.
• state a range of strategies for using listening/speaking opportunities to develop academic vocabulary (in English) and specify which they have an active command of in their repertoire.
• state a range of strategies for developing academic English and specify which they have an active command of in their repertoire.
• self-assess their strengths in terms of listening/speaking abilities, as well as identify areas for continued development.
Appendix A: Student Learning Outcomes, ELI Courses
Reading Curriculum Area

ELI 72
By the end of the course students will be able to:
• describe effective strategies for academic reading comprehension in English.
• apply strategies appropriately in a range of different academic reading tasks.
• recognize text structures at the paragraph level.
• recognize authors’ perspectives, techniques, and arguments.
• state a range of strategies for using reading opportunities to develop academic vocabulary (in English) and specify which they have an active command of in their repertoire.

ELI 82
By the end of the course students will be able to:
• state and describe a range of reading strategies for use with advanced academic English
• select reading strategies appropriately in accordance with courses they are enrolled in as well as their own purposes for reading
• evaluate authors’ messages, techniques, and arguments
• evaluate print and web-based sources
• use note-taking strategies with advanced academic English texts
Appendix A: Student Learning Outcomes, ELI Courses
Writing Curriculum Area

ELI 73
By the end of the course students will be able to:
• use various writing strategies to increase their writing fluency and improve the content of their personal and academic English writings. [Note: The term fluency means (in response to a writing assignment, and at the brainstorming and drafting stages of the writing process), the ability to generate sufficient written text with minimal hesitancy]
• evaluate the effectiveness of writing in personal and academic English writing genres.
• self-assess their personal as well as academic English writing ability in terms of their strengths and weaknesses.
• appropriately incorporate various information sources in their English academic writing (e.g., through quotations, paraphrases and summaries), according to UHM regulations on plagiarism and at least one academic citation style.
• state a range of strategies for using writing opportunities to develop academic vocabulary (in English) and specify which they have an active command of in their repertoire.

ELI 83
By the end of the course it is expected that students will be able to:
• analyze discipline and genre-specific academic English writing conventions and effectively apply that knowledge to writing tasks.
• self-assess their strengths as academic writers, as well as areas for continued development, incorporating personal reflection and feedback from others
• appropriately incorporate a variety of reliable information sources that are relevant for doing graduate-level research in their academic writing

ELI 100
By the end of the course students will be able to:
• Compose college writing that achieves a specific purpose and responds adeptly to an identifiable audience.
• Provide evidence of effective strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proofreading a text in order to produce finished prose.
• Compose an argument that makes use of source material that is relevant and credible and that is integrated in accordance with an appropriate style guide.