Analysis Notes

• Sample size differences required comparison by percentages
  – In 2006, samples analyzed = 91
  – In 2007, samples analyzed = 514

• The 2007 rubric contained a new category: “unacceptable”
Gross Errors

- Not found: 85.8%
- Found: 13.2%
- Unrated: 1.0%

Year: 2007
Ethics

- Ethical: 94.9%
- Suspect: 3.7%
- Unrated: 1.4%

2007
Purpose/Main Point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrated</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organization

- Excellent: 18.7%
- Good: 50.8%
- Fair: 23.9%
- Poor: 4.3%
- Unacceptable: 0.4%
- Unrated: 2.0%

(2007)
Evidence

[Bar chart showing percentage distribution of ratings in 2007.]

- Excellent: 16.9%
- Good: 49.2%
- Fair: 27.6%
- Poor: 3.5%
- Unacceptable: 0.8%
- Unrated: 2.0%
Sentence Style: Flow of Writing

Excellent: 9.7%
Good: 48.3%
Fair: 25.7%
Poor: 9.7%
Unacceptable: 4.1%
Unrated: 2.5%
Correctness: Grammar/Mechanics

- Excellent: 12.7%
- Good: 49.4%
- Fair: 23.9%
- Poor: 9.1%
- Unacceptable: 3.5%
- Unrated: 1.4%

[2007]
Document Design/Appearance

- Excellent: 13.4%
- Good: 56.4%
- Fair: 21.0%
- Poor: 2.5%
- Unacceptable: 1.6%
- Unrated: 5.1%
Visuals *(if applicable)*

![Bar chart showing the distribution of visuals ratings for 2006 and 2007. The ratings are Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Unacceptable, and Unrated. The percentages for each category are as follows: Excellent 7.7% (2006), 5.8% (2007), Good 15.4% (2006), 11.7% (2007), Fair 11.0% (2006), 6.0% (2007), Poor 3.3% (2006), 2.9% (2007), Unacceptable 0.2% (2006), 5.6% (2007), Unrated 62.6% (2006), 73.7% (2007).]
Gross Errors

- Not found: 85.7%
- Found: 11.0%
- Unrated: 3.3%

Year: 2006
Ethics

- Ethical: 94.5%
- Suspect: 2.2%
- Unrated: 3.3%

2006
Purpose/Main Point

- Excellent: 30.8%
- Good: 49.5%
- Fair: 12.1%
- Poor: 2.2%
- Unacceptable: 5.5%
- Unrated:
Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>Unrated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence

- Excellent: 22.0%
- Good: 47.3%
- Fair: 23.1%
- Poor: 4.4%
- Unacceptable: 3.3%
- Unrated:

2006
Sentence Style: Flow of Writing

- Excellent: 16.5%
- Good: 44.0%
- Fair: 28.6%
- Poor: 7.7%
- Unacceptable: 3.3%
- Unrated: 0%
Correctness: Grammar/Mechanics

- Excellent: 14.3%
- Good: 49.5%
- Fair: 23.1%
- Poor: 9.9%
- Unacceptable: 3.3%
- Unrated: 3.3%

Data for 2006
Document Design/Appearance

- Excellent: 35.2%
- Good: 46.2%
- Fair: 9.9%
- Poor: 5.5%
- Unacceptable: 3.3%
- Unrated: 0%

Date: 2006
Visuals *(if applicable)*

- Excellent: 7.7%
- Good: 15.4%
- Fair: 11.0%
- Poor: 3.3%
- Unacceptable: Unrated
- Unrated: 62.6%
Gross Errors

85.7% Not found, 85.8% Found, 11.0% Found, 13.2% Found, 3.3% Unrated, 1.0% Unrated

2006

2007
Ethics

94.5%  94.9%

Ethical

2.2%  3.7%

Suspect

3.3%  1.4%

Unrated

2006  2007
Purpose/Main Point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrated</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audience

- Excellent: 17.6% (2006), 16.3% (2007)
- Good: 57.1% (2006), 58.4% (2007)
- Fair: 18.7% (2006), 19.8% (2007)
- Poor: 2.2% (2006), 3.7% (2007)
- Unacceptable: 0.2% (2006), Unacceptable 0.2% (2007)
- Unrated: 4.4% (2006), 1.6% (2007)
Organization

![Bar chart showing organization ratings for 2006 and 2007]

- **Excellent**: 27.5% (2006), 18.7% (2007)
- **Good**: 48.4% (2006), 50.8% (2007)
- **Fair**: 16.5% (2006), 23.9% (2007)
- **Poor**: 4.4% (2006), 4.3% (2007)
- **Unacceptable**: 0.4% (2006), 0.4% (2007)
- **Unrated**: 3.3% (2006), 2.0% (2007)
Sentence Style: Flow of Writing

![Bar chart showing the distribution of sentence style by year. The categories are Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Unacceptable, and Unrated. The chart compares the percentages for 2006 and 2007. The data is as follows:

- Excellent: 16.5% (2006), 9.7% (2007)
- Good: 44.0% (2006), 48.3% (2007)
- Fair: 28.6% (2006), 25.7% (2007)
- Poor: 7.7% (2006), 9.7% (2007)
- Unacceptable: 4.1% (2006), 3.3% (2007)
- Unrated: 2.5% (2006), 2.5% (2007)
Correctness: Grammar/Mechanics

- **Excellent**: 14.3% (2006), 12.7% (2007)
- **Good**: 49.5% (2006), 49.4% (2007)
- **Fair**: 23.1% (2006), 23.9% (2007)
- **Poor**: 9.9% (2006), 9.1% (2007)
- **Unacceptable**: 3.5% (2006), 3.3% (2007)
- **Unrated**: 1.4% (2006), 1.4% (2007)
Document Design/Appearance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrated</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visuals (if applicable)