Name of Program/Department:	English Composition Program / Department of English, Modern Languages, and Philosophy
Academic Year:	2016-2017
Name of Preparer:	Rachel N. Spear, PhD, Composition Coordinator and Assistant Professor of English

Program Mission Statement

The mission of Francis Marion University's Composition Program is to prepare students for both academic and public contexts, enhance critical thinking and rhetorical awareness, and foster students' abilities to communicate effectively in various writing situations.

Related to our mission and as part of our planned improvements, we implemented a new composition sequence fall 2016, developed from close examination of the former sequence and a comparative analysis of similar composition programs while keeping our student demographic and program mission in mind. That examination revealed that the former sequence delayed instruction on analysis and argumentation, held repetition of course objectives, and resulted in transfer credit issues. Thus, in efforts to prepare students better for college-level writing and to align our program with the norm in composition studies while keeping our student demographic in mind, we developed a new composition sequence, aimed at increasing student success and strengthening the outcome of our program goals. The new sequence proposal was approved by the university on February 16, 2016, and was implemented fall 2016. This new sequence shifted from the former three-course sequence to the below two-course sequence:

1) ENG 101 or ENG 101E + ENG 101L
2) ENG 102

The new course sequence supports various levels of student preparation by offering two options for the first course: students self-select into either English 101 "Analysis and Argument," a three-credit course, or English 101E (plus English 101L), the "extended" version of English 101 that includes a corequisite studio (lab) component. This self-selected lab, ENG 101L, is a one-credit elective hour that meets twice a week, provides supplemental individualized attention from professors and undergraduate tutors, and is assessed with the designation of satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Upon successful completion of that first semester, students move into English 102 "Rhetoric, Genre, and Research." This new two-semester sequence focuses on the idea that students will benefit with more instruction on analysis and argument in their earlier course and with an emphasis on transferring and applying their skills in that second course.

The new sequence takes our students' needs into account not only by implementing the self-selected writing studio counterpart (ENG 101L) for additional invention and instruction as an option with that first course but also by capping all composition courses at fifteen students per class. With smaller class sizes, the new sequence will foster more opportunities for instructor feedback, individualized attention, and cooperative learning.

While this change was aimed at preparing students for college-level writing sooner in their academic careers, alleviating transfer issues that existed with our former three-course sequence, and aligning Francis Marion with the disciplinary norm, it also better accounts for the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) policies while positioning the university to account for the new Secondary South Carolina high school standards in efforts to better bridge students' high school experiences with their first-year composition experiences.

These changes to the composition sequence are designed with our program mission statement and program goals in mind.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

FMU's Composition Program holds four primary goals:

1. To prepare students to use language conventions and styles for writing in a variety of rhetorical situations
2. To deepen students' understanding of the power and influence of written, digital, and visual texts, both those they read and those they compose themselves
3. To develop students' information literacy
4. To guide students through processes of reflection so they can evaluate and improve their current and future reading and writing practices.

These four programmatic goals are closely tied with several of FMU's General Education goals and requirements (or portions of these below goals):

Goal 1: The ability to write and speak English clearly, logically, creatively, and effectively. [Note: The composition program does not assess speaking skills.]

Goal 2: The ability to read and listen with understanding and comprehension. [Note: The composition program does not assess listening skills.]

Goal 3: The ability to use technology to locate, organize, document, present, and analyze information and ideas. [Note: The composition program assesses the use of technology through information literacy and composition skills.]

Goal 9: The ability to reason logically and think critically in order to develop problem-solving skills and to make informed and responsible choices. [Note: The composition program does not assess the ability to make "responsible choices."]

A separate report to map our assessment to these general education goals is attached as an appendix (see Appendix A).

Executive Summary of Report

This report includes an overview of Francis Marion University's Composition Program and our assessment process and outcomes for the 2016-2017 academic year.

During this 2016-2017 academic year, we implemented our new composition sequence, aimed at enhancing our composition program and students' learning and as part of last year's planned improvements. During the 2015-2016 academic year, we met 1 out of the 7 targets, revealing that students' writing portfolios were weak in skills related to analysis, argumentative writing, and transfer knowledge. These findings were in line with previous years' findings, which served as strong impetuses for the development and implementation of our new two-course composition sequence and its heightened emphasis on analysis, argumentative writing, and transfer knowledge. While last year's direct and indirect assessment results affirmed this plan to move to our new composition sequence, we acknowledge that data collected in this report and in these next couple of years' reports will not relate solely to our new sequence by nature of the transition from our former sequence to this new sequence. Although these transitional years may yield skewed data, we plan to use this time to gain insight about our students' learning and our program and to pilot and solidify our assessment procedures by 2019.

This academic year's assessment consisted of both direct and indirect assessments. The indirect assessment is based on student attitude surveys for all of the fall composition courses, which includes English 101 (Analysis and Argument), English 101 E (Analysis and Argument with Extended Studio), and English 102 (Rhetoric, Genre, and Research). The direct assessment of student writing consists of a portfolio-based pilot assessment method that links to the student learning outcomes for the English 102 course. Specifically, our direct assessment this year used 7 measures that map to our English 102 course student learning objectives. This pilot was developed based on revisions from last year's portfolio-based pilot with our former sequence. While an exact comparison to last year's findings is not possible, some general comparisons may be made by nature of the focus on that final course in both sequences.

This year, our direct assessment revealed that portfolios improved across all seven measures. Specifically, we met 6 of the 7 targets, and the one target that was not met (Measure 4, on integration of sources) went up by 2% from last year. This year, our indirect assessment shows that students' attitude towards their writing courses are generally positive. Specific survey results generally show an increase from (or similarity with) previous years' data (when possible comparisons can be made). Such improvements imply that our switch to the new two-course composition sequence and its respective changes proved to be successful. In addition, our action items from last year (focusing on faculty resources that assist faculty in transitioning to this new sequence and in strengthening instruction on analysis, argument, and transfer knowledge) proved fruitful. Based on this year's direct and indirect assessment results, our action items for next year will revolve primarily on the integration of sources, thesis statements, reflection on writing, and persuasive rhetorical strategies. Furthermore, in efforts to continue to strengthen our program, we will continue to add faculty resources and to work with faculty with the implemented programmatic changes as part of our planned improvements.

All composition courses covered in this report are general education courses and tie closely to the Francis Marion University's General Education goals, and thus, the results and planned improvements included in this report apply to the general education program as well.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

While the programmatic goals serve as a foundation for the program, each course has its own student learning outcomes (SLOs) to meet the program goals. The SLOs are described for each course in individual instructors' syllabi as well as in our composition program's annual publication titled *Final Draft*. To review the SLOs for all the courses in the new sequence, see Appendix B.

The following report, in many ways, recognizes that our program is in its transitional years, where our new sequence has started but students from the old sequence are continuing to satisfy their composition requirements. Thus, the data is not pure data related solely to our new sequence, and we are optimizing our efforts and using the next couple of years to pilot assessment procedures that will, in turn, strengthen our program and programmatic assessment.

Specifically, during this 2016-2017 academic year, we focused on piloting English 102's assessment; this pilot derived from a revision from our portfolio-based pilot assessment we conducted last year (related to our former sequence while keeping our new sequence in mind). We intend to pilot an assessment procedure for English 101 during the 2017-2018 academic year. These pilots will provide insight into the development of our assessment methods for our new composition sequence.

Below are the Student Learning Outcomes for the **ENG 102** course:

1. Read and analyze arguments with an awareness of rhetorical situations, exploring persuasive strategies and possible consequences
2. Understand primary and secondary research and use multiple methods to find and evaluate information from a variety of sources
3. Summarize and synthesize multiple sources, integrating others' ideas into original arguments, documenting appropriately
4. Create reasoned and well-supported arguments for specific audiences and in specialized genres
5. Compare and contrast how different communities, including academic discourse communities, discuss and respond to a similar topic or issue
6. Develop and refine voice and style
7. Reflect on and articulate one's own composition choices, conveying rhetorical awareness and ability to transfer skills

These SLOs are mapped to our below assessment measures, which were used for our direct assessment of English 102's portfolios.

Measure 1: The portfolio demonstrates student's successful capability to engage with one or more DISCOURSE COMMUNITIES' discussions and responses to an issue or topic.
[ENG 102, SLO 5and SLO 1]

Measure 2: The portfolio demonstrates that student can create a reasoned and well-supported ARGUMENT.
 [ENG 102, SLO 4]

Measure 3: The portfolio demonstrates that student can produce writing for a specific AUDIENCE.
 [ENG 102, SLO 4]

Measure 4: The portfolio demonstrates that student can INTEGRATE SOURCES from primary and secondary sources as appropriate.
[ENG 102, SLO 3 and SLO 2]

Measure 5: The portfolio demonstrates that student can DOCUMENT appropriate SOURCES correctly and effectively.
[ENG 102, SLO 3 and SLO 2]

Measure 6: The portfolio demonstrates student's developed VOICE and STYLE, employing appropriate rhetorical and persuasive strategies and conventions.
[ENG 102, SLO 6 and SLO 1]

Measure 7: The portfolio demonstrates student's TRANSFER KNOWLEDGE, describing the process of composition in other contexts, conveying rhetorical awareness and transfer skills.
[ENG 102, SLO 7 and SLO1]

These measures and their respective SLOs align with the program learning goals. For ease of understanding, while the measures encompass the SLOs, from here on out, they will be referred to as measures and will be the basis of the program's direct assessment.

Assessment Methods and Procedures

This academic year, we performed both direct and indirect assessment through administering a student writing assessment as well as student attitude surveys.

1. *Direct Assessment: Student Writing Assessment*

Methods: For our direct assessment, we piloted a portfolio-based assessment with 15 sections of English 102, totaling 75 portfolios. This pilot was revised from last year's portfolio-based pilot with our former sequence; that pilot gave us insight into the method and will serve as a baseline for comparison when applicable. Such comparisons can be made across sequences at a general level due to the fact that last year's assessment and this year's assessment are both assessments of students' final composition course, indicating students' completion of the composition sequence and their composition requirement. However, these comparisons cannot be interrupted as exact because of the sequence change and restructuring of the composition program. Furthermore, this year's pilot will aid in our creation of baselines and benchmarks for future direct assessments. **For the purpose of this report, we will use 75% as a target for the direct assessment and will use last year's results as general baselines, knowing that comparisons are not exact yet hold potential to offer some insight.**

Procedures: The portfolio-based English 102 pilot consisted of collecting writing portfolios from 75 randomly selected students out of 15 sections of the course in Spring 2017; these sections were taught by 9 different faculty, all of whom volunteered to participate.

Each of these 75 portfolios consisted of one reflective argumentative essay and one selected, polished essay from the course, based on a department prompt (see Appendix C). This prompt was created and approved by members of the First-Year Writing Advisory Committee (FWAC) prior to the assessment, using last year's pilot prompt and assessment to inform its revision.

Students' and sections' identifiers (names and section numbers) were removed in preparation for a blind scoring, where readers did not know the names of students or their respective instructors or section numbers. We had 10 English faculty members participate in the assessment. Each portfolio was read and scored by a minimum of two English faculty using the seven indicated measures and the four-point scoring rubric (where 4 is the highest). In addition, second readers did not have access to first reader's scores, and the portfolios were dispersed systemically to avoid two readers scoring the exact same set of portfolios. Furthermore, prior to the scoring, all 10 assessors participated in a norming session. Also, when the two readers' scores had more than a one-point deviation for more than two measures, the portfolio had a third reader score the portfolio. Out of the 75 portfolios, 5 portfolios needed a third reader.

The measures and rubric were approved by FWAC prior to the assessment and are included in this report as Appendix D.

Once scored by the readers, to calculate percentages for each measure, we averaged the scores from the readers and identified those averages that are 2.5 or greater on the four-point scale. This year's assessment calculations altered slightly from last year's calculations, which were

percentages when the average scores were greater than a 2 on the four-point scale. Because of this slight change in calculations, this report includes a chart that holds both calculations to reflect last year's IE report data while accurately making general baseline comparisons for this report (see Appendix E).

We intend to use the results of this year's pilot assessment as a guide to assist the First-Year Writing Advisory Committee (FWAC) in determining and setting baselines and benchmarks to use in subsequent assessments of our new sequence.

2. *Indirect Assessment: Writing Attitude Surveys*

Methods: For our indirect assessment, we developed surveys that connect to and extend beyond our student learning objectives, allowing us to gather indirect programmatic data. Some survey questions carried over from the previous sequence's surveys, which would allow for some general comparisons; however, similar to the direct assessment, comparisons across sequences are not exact. In addition, with the change in sequence, we developed new survey questions to pertain to these new courses and the changes made. All revisions and changes were reviewed and approved by our First-Year Writing Advisory Committee (FWAC) before surveys were distributed.

Procedures: The composition program conducted a writing attitude survey among all students taking a composition course in the fall 2016 semester. This survey was completed by 733 students out of our 967 fall composition students, or about 76% of the students. Specifically, we had 129 students in ENGL 101E, 353 students in ENG 101, and 251 students in ENG 102 take the survey. The responses to key items are recorded in the results sections and mapped to SLOs when applicable.

For the purpose of this indirect assessment, we often take the highest and second highest marks into consideration when calculating percentages while making note of the highest mark when particularly revealing. Similar to the above direct assessment, baselines will rely on last year's data as comparative marks when possible and applicable, keeping in mind that baselines and benchmarks for the new program are in the process of being set and will rely on our pilot data. Furthermore, with the development of the new sequence, a number of survey questions were new this year, thus, not having previous data for comparison. Significant questions are included in this report.

In addition to adding insight to our program, responses to applicable survey questions will aid in improving our program's directed self-placement method, which was implemented with the new sequence and implemented to aid students when self-selecting between the English 101 or the "extended" version of that course, English 101E with its corequisite English 101L.

Assessment Results

1. *Student Writing Assessment*

Below are results to the Student Writing Assessment, the direct assessment that was a portfolio-based pilot. As previously stated, since we restructured the composition program and are in process of piloting and developing a new process for its assessment methods, we do not have baselines or benchmarks for this new sequence. Rather, when possible, we will draw general comparisons from last year's assessment results, using that as a general baseline (see Appendix E), but due to program changes, comparisons are not exact. As previously stated, calculations are based on portfolios' averages that are 2.5 or greater on the four-point scale, and this year's assessment results will aid in the determination of subsequent assessments' baselines and benchmarks for our new program.

Measure 1: The portfolio demonstrates student's successful capability to engage with one or more DISCOURSE COMMUNITIES' discussions and responses to an issue or topic.
[ENG 102, SLO 5 and SLO 1]

    A) RESULTS: 83% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 62 of the 75 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
    B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target was met. In addition, compared to last year's 65%, our assessment indicates an 18% improvement.

Measure 2: The portfolio demonstrates that student can create a reasoned and well-supported ARGUMENT.
[ENG 102, SLO 4]

    A) RESULTS: 80% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 60 of the 75 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
    B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target was met. In addition, compared to last year's 57%, our assessment indicates a 23% improvement.

Measure 3: The portfolio demonstrates that student can produce writing for a specific AUDIENCE.
[ENG 102, SLO 4]

    A) RESULTS: 77% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 58 of the 75 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
    B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target was met. In addition, compared to last year's 63%, our assessment indicates a 14% improvement.

Measure 4: The portfolio demonstrates that student can INTEGRATE SOURCES from primary and secondary sources as appropriate.
[ENG 102, SLO 3 and SLO 2]

A) RESULTS: 72% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 54 of the 75 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target was not met. This might be due to students needing more instruction on strengthening their synthesis and integration of their sources into their written essays. While the target of 75% was not met, when compared to last year's assessment which resulted in 70% when average scores were 2.5 or greater, we did see an improvement this year of 2%.

Measure 5: The portfolio demonstrates that student can DOCUMENT appropriate SOURCES correctly and effectively.
[ENG 102, SLO 3 and SLO 2]

A) RESULTS: 77% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 58 of the 75 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target was met. In addition, compared to last year's 72%, our assessment indicates a 5% improvement.

Measure 6: The portfolio demonstrates student's developed VOICE and STYLE, employing appropriate rhetorical and persuasive strategies and conventions.
[ENG 102, SLO 6 and SLO 1]

A) RESULTS: 76% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 57 of the 75 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target was met. In addition, compared to last year's 59%, our assessment indicates a 17% improvement.

Measure 7: The portfolio demonstrates student's TRANSFER KNOWLEDGE, describing the process of composition in other contexts, conveying rhetorical awareness and transfer skills.
[ENG 102, SLO 7 and SLO 1]

A) RESULTS: 79% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 59 of the 75 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target was met. In addition, compared to last year's 48%, our assessment indicates a 31% improvement. While we recognize that the revisions to the portfolio prompt ask students to address their transfer knowledge directly (something last year's prompt did not do), we also attribute the vast improvement to our newly implemented sequence change and its emphasis on transfer knowledge.

Overall, all seven measures had an increase with the change in sequence and its corresponding changes. Such increases range from 2% to 31% with the most substantial increase being Measure 7 and the least being Measure 4. Six out of the seven measures met the target of 75% this academic year, whereas last year, we only met one out of the seven. Across the board, these results from this pilot convey that our composition program changes have had positive impacts.

2. *Writing Attitude Surveys*

Below are results for responses to key items on the Writing Attitude Surveys, which is our indirect assessment that is administered to all composition students during fall semesters. The First-Year Writing Advisory Committee (FWAC) developed these surveys for our new composition sequence. While some questions (or slight variations of those questions) from our former surveys carried over, new questions were made and approved by FWAC.

In addition, we offer corresponding keys to relate back to the English 102 course SLOs when applicable. Note that not every SLO may be keyed below; rather, both the direct and indirect assessments cover all SLOs and even go beyond the SLOs to offer other informative data about our newly implemented courses, the directed self-placement method, and the writing studio component – all of which add insight about our composition program and possible areas of improvement to strengthen it.

To what extent did your instructor's comments help you to improve your writing?
[ENG 101 and ENG 101E, SLOs 1-7; ENG 101L, SLOs 1-7; ENG 102, SLOs 1-7]

    A) RESULTS:
       English 101E: 93.8%
       English 101:   92.35%
       English 102:   89.64%

    B) DISCUSSION: The extended version of that first semester course, ENG 101E, indicated the highest assistance in their instructor's feedback helping. Specifically, 71.32% shared that instructors' comments "always" helped while 93.8% shared it "always" or "often" helped. Furthermore, all classes indicate that students are benefiting from their instructors feedback. While these courses are new and no previous baseline exists, last year's courses had an average of 90.6% indicating that instructors' comments "always" or "often" helped whereas this year's courses have an average of 92%. The difference is not great enough to draw conclusions.

How would you rate your confidence in your ability to read and analyze texts (such as images or written arguments)?
[ENG 101 and ENG 101E, SLO 1, SLO 2, and SLO 6; ENG 102, SLO 1, SLO 4, and SLO 5]

    A) RESULTS:
       English 101E: 83.72%
       English 101:   81.31%
       English 102:   80.87%

    B) DISCUSSION: This question is similar to previous years' survey question regarding confidence in analyzing arguments, and numbers are about the same. Specifically, last year's survey indicated 82% were confident in

analyzing arguments in ENG 112 with about 29% "very" confident. Our survey results this year indicate that 30%, 34%, and 39% identify as "very" confident respectively in ENG 101E, ENG 101, and ENG 102. This averages to be 34%, indicating a 5% increase in that top tier of "very" confident.

Did your course and coursework affirm or improve your understanding of the term "rhetorical situation"? (Percentages calculated based on answers that indicate course improved understanding of the term.)
[ENGL 101 and ENG 101E, SLO 1 and SLO 6; ENG 102, SLO 1]

      A) RESULTS:
          English 101E: 85.27%
          English 101:   81.87%
          English 102:   73.3%

      B) DISCUSSION: This was a new survey question this year; thus, we do not have previous data for comparison. The average for the courses is 80%. While the ENG 102 percentage is lower, this may be due to some students feeling as if their previous composition course prepared them sufficiently with the term. Thus, the percentage does not raise concern.

Did your course and coursework affirm or improve your understanding of the role of audience in relation to composition tasks? (Percentages calculated based on answers that indicate course improved understanding of that role.)
[ENG 102, SLO 4]

      A) RESULTS:
          English 101E: 93.02%
          English 101:   87.81%
          English 102:   85.66%

      B) DISCUSSION: While the wording of this survey question was revised for this year, last year's survey had a similar question related to audience. These marks are similar to that data, recorded as 92% for ENG 111 last year. While one might assume that students who might have been placed in ENG 111 would have self-selected into ENG 101E, that assumption has its flaws. Thus, no comparisons can be made. Rather, results indicate a similar percentage to previous data.

Did your course help you practice or learn to cite and document sources? (Percentages calculated based on "yes" answers.)
[ENG 101 and ENG 101E, SLO 5; ENG 102, SLO 3]

      A) RESULTS:
          English 101E: 91.47%
          English 101:   84.35%

English 102:   88.05%

B) DISCUSSION: This was a new survey question this year; thus, no previous data exists for comparison. However, the data this year indicates that students are practicing and learning to cite and document sources at a high rate in all of their composition courses.

How confident are you in your ability to use a handbook to cite sources correctly using MLA documentation style? (Percentages calculated based on "very" and "mostly" answers.)
[ENG 101 and ENG 101E, SLO 5; ENG 102, SLO 3]

A) RESULTS:
English 101E: 69%
English 101:   73.4%
English 102:   82.5%

B) DISCUSSION: While the wording of this survey question was revised for the new sequence, last year's survey had a similar question related to citation where that question asked about students' confidence. Those marks from last year revealed that 64% of ENG 112 students surveyed were "very" or "mostly" confident with only 29% claiming "very." The average from this year's data is 75%, which shows an 11% increase. Transitional students who would have needed ENG 112 were enrolled in our new sequence ENG 101; a general comparison to that one course shows an increase of about 9%. However, direct comparisons between the courses fall short.

Did your course or coursework affirm or improve your understanding and application of various research methods? (Percentages calculated on answers that indicate course improved understanding and application of various research methods.)
[ENG 102, SLO 2]

A) RESULTS:
English 101E: 93.8%
English 101:   82.72%
English 102:   88.85%

B) DISCUSSION: This was a new survey question this year; thus, no previous data exists for comparison. However, the data this year indicates that students are learning and applying various research methods at a high rate in all of their composition courses.

How confident do you feel about your ability to summarize other people's ideas? (Percentages calculated based on "very" and "mostly" answers.)
[ENG 102, SLO 3]

A) RESULTS:

English 101E: 80.62%
English 101:   83.29%
English 102:   82.07%

B) DISCUSSION: This question was new this year; thus, no previous data exists for comparison. However, the results show that students are summarizing others' ideas at a high percentage, and there is no concern raised about these marks.

How confident do you feel about your ability to create thesis statements? (Percentages calculated based on "very" and "mostly" answers.)
[ENG 101 and ENG 101E, SLO 2]

A) RESULTS:
English 101E: 80.62%
English 101:   72.81%
English 102:   76%

B) DISCUSSION: Being a new survey question, no previous data exists for comparison. However, the results do not raise concern.

How would you rate your confidence in your ability to create a sound argumentative thesis? (Percentages calculated based on "very" and "mostly" answers.)
[ENG 102, SLO 4]

A) RESULTS:
English 101E: 74%
English 101:   67%
English 102:   69%

B) DISCUSSION: Being a new survey question, no previous data exists for comparison. The average is 70%, which is lower than we would like. Thus, we will highlight the need to work more with students and their development of argumentative thesis statements as well as their confidence in doing so.

How would you rate your confidence in your ability to build and support your arguments with effective claims and evidence? (Percentages calculated based on "very" and "mostly" answers.)
[ENG 102, SLO 4]

A) RESULTS:
English 101E: 78%
English 101:   83%
English 102:   85%

B) DISCUSSION: While the wording of this survey question was revised for the sequence and this year's survey, last year's survey had a similar question

related to confidence in writing persuasive arguments. Last year's results in ENG 112 indicated that 78% were "very" and "mostly" confident with 33% being "very." This year's results indicate an average of 82%, which is an increase of 4%. Furthermore, transitional students who would have needed ENG 112 were enrolled in our new sequence ENG 101; a general comparison to that one course shows an increase of about 5%. However, direct comparisons between the courses fall short.

How would you rate your confidence in your ability to write with persuasive rhetorical strategies while considering possible consequences? (Percentages calculated based on "very" and "mostly" answers.)
[ENG 101 and ENG 101E, SLO 6; ENG 102, SLO 1]

    A) RESULTS:
        English 101E: 60.5%
        English 101:   68.6%
        English 102:   69%

    B) DISCUSSION: While this question is a new survey question with no previous data for comparison, results are lower than desired. This may be due to the wording of the question or may be due to students' not understanding or lacking confidence in their abilities to employ specific rhetorical strategies.

How helpful have you found the knowledge from this composition class when you are writing for other classes (exams, essays, presentations) or for other contexts outside of class? (Percentages calculated based on "very helpful" and "somewhat helpful" answers.)
[ENG 102, SLO 7]

    A) RESULTS:
        English 101E: 96.12%
        English 101:   90.94%
        English 102:   88.07%

    B) DISCUSSION: This question is a new survey question with no previous data for comparison. The "very helpful" category results were at 61%, 51%, and 51% respectively. With ENG 102's emphasis on students' ability to transfer and apply knowledge beyond their composition courses, there is room for improvement. However, there is no concern with these results.

Do you think that what you learned in ENG 102 class will be useful in future college classes and/or during your working life? (Percentages calculated based on "very useful" and "somewhat useful" answers.)
[ENG 102, SLO 7]

    A) RESULTS:
        English 102:   91.63%

B) DISCUSSION: This question is a new survey question with no previous data for comparison. The "very useful" category results were at 65%. With ENG 102's emphasis on students' ability to transfer and apply knowledge beyond their composition courses, there is room for improvement. However, there is no concern with these results. This particular question indicates that students are, indeed, developing skills that they recognize can transfer beyond their course.

Select all that apply to your standard writing or composition process after being presented with the composition assignment:
[ENG 101L, SLOs 1-5, SLO 7; ENG 101 and ENG 101E, SLO 3 and SLO 4; ENG 102, SLO 7]

A) RESULTS:

	ENG 101E	**ENG 101**	**ENG 102**
Performed brainstorming	82.17%	83.57%	84.86%
Completed a rough draft	79.07%	91.22%	90.84%
Participated in a peer-review process	74.42%	88.95%	82.47%
Reviewed feedback from peer or instructor	85.27%	86.69%	86.06%
Made revisions that went beyond correcting grammar	73.64%	81.02%	84.46%
Visited the Writing Center for assistance	30.23%	33.99%	28.29%
Edited my work for grammatical and mechanical errors	78.29%	80.45%	85.26%
Proofread my work	81.40%	82.72%	86.85%
Read my work out loud	50.39%	36.54%	51%
Reflected on writing and/or writing process after completing it	51.94%	60.34%	62.55%

B) DISCUSSION: This question is a new survey question with no previous data for comparison. Not every item on the chart maps to the course SLOs. The ones that do map to course SLOs show that students are engaging in process-based writing at high percentages in their composition courses. The lowest percentage that extends to our course SLOs relates to students' reflection about their writing processes or products with marks of 52%, 60%, and 63% respectively; thus, there is room for improvement. Furthermore, adding an option related to rhetorical analysis or genre analysis would strengthen this survey question and its connection to another course SLO, allowing it to explicitly map to all the SLOs in ENG 101L.

The following shows student responses to survey questions that are not keyed to specific objectives; however, they are applicable as they do give us important information about the program and students' perspectives of their learning.

Has this course helped you improve your writing or composition? (Percentages refer to those answering "yes.")

A) RESULTS:

   English 101E: 94.5%
   English 101:   87.25%
   English 102:   86%
     Average: 89%

B) DISCUSSION: The results are similar to previous years' results related to improvement of writing skills. All previous years' data is based on our former sequence; thus, comparisons fall short because of the different sequences. However, one conclusion that can be made is that students still identify as developing their writing skills at a similar percentage with the change in sequence. Below is a chart of those previous years' results:

	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015
English 111	93%	94%	91%	94%	91%	89%
English 112	85%	86%	90%	90%	87%	88%
English 200	88%	78%	82%	87%	99%	81%
Average	**89%**	**86%**	**88%**	**90%**	**92%**	**86%**

How would you rate your general attitude towards this course? (Percentages refer to those answering "very" or "mostly satisfied.")

A) RESULTS:

   English 101E: 86.82%
   English 101:   81.58%
   English 102:   72.51%
     Average: 80.31%

B) DISCUSSION: While the results are similar to previous years' results related to students' general attitude towards the course (see the below chart), the percentage of that ENG 102 student attitude is on the lower-end of the spectrum. This might be because students and faculty are adjusting to the new curriculum. In addition, it might be a result of our transitional students, who began their composition requirements in the ENG 111-ENG 112-ENG 200 sequence, resisting the requirement of needing to take ENG 102 to complete their requirement (to give them credit for their ENG 200 course as outlined by our transitional guidelines for students). Data from the past six years (2010-2015, charted below) indicate an average of 80.67%; thus, results generally remain similar with the change:

	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015

English 111	84%	80%	81%	84%	**81%**	**88%**
English 112	80%	82%	81%	87%	**80%**	**89%**
English 200	77%	67%	76%	76%	**79%**	**84%**
Average	**80%**	**76%**	**79%**	**82%**	**80%**	**87%**

How would you rate your general attitude towards the writing studio component of this course? (Percentages refer to those answering "very" or "mostly satisfied.")

      A) RESULTS:
         English 101E: 85%

      B) DISCUSSION: The writing studio component is part of the ENG 101E course, which students self-selected. Since this curriculum is new, there is no previous data for comparison. However, our former sequence's ENG 111 had a writing lab requirement, and data for the past six years (2010-2015) ranges from 81% to 87%. Thus, while the writing studio as a self-selection option is new, we can assume that students' attitudes are similar to previous years when students were placed in that ENG 111.

To what extent was your studio work useful for writing assignments in your English 101E class? (Percentages refer to those answering "always useful" and "mostly useful.")

      A) RESULTS:
         English 101E: 83.72%

      B) DISCUSSION: While this is a new question related to our change in sequence with no data for comparison, there is no concern about the results. The high percentage (with 53.5% marking "always" and about 30% marking "mostly") indicates that students view the studio useful in their ENG 101E course.

To what extent has the small class size of your composition course helped with your learning experience? (Percentages refer to those answering "greatly helped" and "somewhat helped.")

      A) RESULTS:
         English 101E: 98.5%
         English 101:   96.6%
         English 102:   96.8%
           Average: 97.3%

      B) DISCUSSION: While these numbers are high and are indicative that students recognized the value of the small class size, what is also significant is that the percentages related to "greatly helped" were remarkably high, respectively being 81%, 73%, and 71%. All of these numbers convey that our switch to smaller class sizes was successful from students' perspectives.

How did the small class size help with your writing and learning experiences? Select all that apply.

	ENG 101E	ENG 101	ENG 102
The small class size helped because it gave me more time to work with my professor.	70.54%	68.27%	66.53%
The small class size helped because it allowed more group work during our class.	44.96%	57.51%	54.58%
The small class size helped to make me feel more a part of a writing community.	41.09%	44.48%	42.63%
The small class size helped because it played a role in the amount of feedback I obtained from my peers and professor.	69.77%	71.67%	71.31%
The small class size helped because it allowed more time to work on my specific needs.	65.12%	52.69%	55.38%
The small class size helped me in other ways not listed above.	35.43%	30.88%	34.26%
I do not believe that the small class size played any role in my writing and learning experiences.	09.3%	11.33%	07.57%

Based on your experience this semester, do you think ENG 101E/101L was the right fit for you as a writer? (Note: Asked to the English 101E students.)
---and---
Based on your experience this semester, do you think ENG 101 was the right fit for you as a writer? (Note: Asked to the English 101 students.)

        A) RESULTS:
           English 101E: 88.7%
           English 101:   88.7%

        B) DISCUSSION: Students self-selected into either English 101E/101L or English 101, and students overwhelmingly felt as if their selection was the best fit for their success as a writer.

Action Items

This section will cover improvements made this 2016-2017 academic year as well as planned improvements and initiatives as a result of this year's assessment. The first sub-section covers the improvements that were initiated during this academic year, which connects to last year's assessment, highlights our program improvements, archives the 2016-2017 growth, and establishes a foundation for future planned action items. The second sub-section outlines the actions items that work to close the loop based on our analysis of this year's assessment data. These planned action items will be carried out the next academic year.

2016-2017 Improvements and Initiatives:

Below is a list of our program improvements and initiatives that are currently in place and that occurred this academic year based on former assessment results preceding this report:

1. Fall 2016, we implemented a new two-semester composition sequence based on analysis, argument, research, and transfer. The first course holds the option of students self-selecting into a course that has a counterpart writing studio. All classes are capped at 15 students to invite more feedback, more individual attention, and a stronger writing community.

2. Implementing this new sequence also involved making sure that our transitional students were accurately enrolled in their respective and appropriate courses to ensure successful completion of their composition requirements. To do so, composition guidelines were created and distributed to students and advisors. In addition, I spoke at advising sessions and worked with our department assistant to verify the fall schedule of all composition students.

3. The Composition Program continued to use optional supplemental texts in composition classes, as a community, or common, read for students. In the fall, the supplemental texts included Flournoy's *The Turner's House* and Klay's *Redployment*. The authors met with our composition students during the Pee Dee Fiction and Poetry Festival. In the spring, the supplemental text was *Mot: A Memoir* by Sarah Einstein, who was the Hunter Series Speaker, and students were able to discuss the book with her at the colloquium and lecture.

4. The First-Year Writing Advisory Committee developed and approved the portfolio-based pilot for English 102 to serve as a possibility and basis for a future assessment method. This creation used last year's English 200 portfolio-based pilot, adjusting the prompt accordingly while taking our findings from last year into account. Specifically, we clarified portions and specified that the reflection should be a thesis-driven argument. Furthermore, we clarified the assessment instructions to indicate that students' knowledge and application of terms did not have explicitly reference the terminology (i.e., discourse communities, rhetorical strategies, audience, etc.) in efforts to have a more accurate scoring of students' abilities.

5. The First-Year Writing Advisory Committee developed and approved a pilot assessment procedure for English 101 to be piloted in fall 2017-2018. The measures and scoring rubric still have to be finalized and approved by the committee at the start of the fall semester.

6. We are continuing to add faculty instructional resources on our shared Composition Studies Blackboard site, including but not limited to sample assignments, readings, and helpful websites. This year, we focused on adding the following resources: sample syllabi, sample assignments, and instructional resources. These resources relate to an array of topics such as teaching our common read text, teaching research skills, and teaching analysis. Last year, we had an action item of adding resources to help with Measures 1, 2, 3, and 4, which relate respectively to discourse communities, arguments, and integration of sources.

7. Like previous years, we continued to showcase student writing in October as part of the National Day on Writing project in efforts to raise the campus-wide public viewing of student writing and student successes. However, this year, we focused on a more university-wide participation by creating an event where faculty and students could pause at noon on one day and write. We had 15 faculty members across 5 disciplines participate in some form; some incorporated writing prompts while others passed out stickers and advertised other campus events related to the National Day on Writing.

8. We were again able to offer $250 to the McCrimmon Award winner and two additional awards of $50 each for the best papers in English 101 and English 102. Due to this being a part of our transitional years, the categories actually involved a) English 111, 112, 101, and 101E and b) English 200 and English 102. We held an awards ceremony and reception in April to honor these outstanding writers and their accomplishments.

9. Again, we were able to recognize our award recipients as well as several other students by working with Fountainhead Press to have their writing published in next year's *Final Draft* text. The 8 featured authors were also recognized at our departmental awards ceremony.

10. In response to the development of the new sequence and to faculty's requests, we held the following pedagogical workshops: "Teaching the New Sequence" (12/06/2016) and "Writing Studios" (04/06/2017); sixteen faculty attended the December workshop, and eight attended in April. These workshops were aimed at helping faculty teach in and acclimate to the new sequence and the course's student learning outcomes and the studio component.

11. In response to faculty's desire to learn more about the changes to the MLA style and about methods related to teaching multimodal assignments (both which may relate to teaching research), we collaborated with the Writing Center and the Computers and Resources Committee to hold the following pedagogical workshops: "MLA Updates" (09/27/2016) and "Multimodal Assignments" (02/14/2017); fourteen faculty attended the workshop on the MLA updates, and seven attended the one on multimodal assignments.

12. In conjunction with the new sequence, we solicited feedback from faculty about their courses and textbooks to establish snapshots of how faculty are creating courses and how we could better serve faculty with resources to help with their instruction. We will continue to collect feedback and to work with our faculty with our program changes.

Action Items Based on the 2016-2017 Assessment Results:

Our assessment data this year reveals that are program improvements and initiatives were successful. Specifically, all of our direct assessment percentages increased from last year, and this year, we met 6 of the 7 measures. Even the one measure that was not met still showed a 2% improvement. In addition, our indirect assessment showed that student experiences with the new composition sequence are positive. We attribute these successes to the implementation of our new composition program and its respective changes coupled with strengthening our assessment pilot as well as adding faculty resources and coordinating pedagogical workshops for our faculty. In addition, our successes are largely due to having faculty dedicated to our program initiatives.

While our program data highlights improvement across the board (see Appendix E for a charted comparison), based on a close examination of our direct and indirect 2016-2017 assessment results, we have identified the below action items as part of our planned improvements:

1. In our direct assessment, we did not meet our target for Measure 4, which relates to students' ability to integrate sources. Thus, while we added resources about researching, in general, last year to our shared site, we will specifically focus on finding and adding resources for faculty that aid in the integration of sources.

2. Our indirect assessment revealed that students lack confidence in creating thesis statements; thus, to help improve that area, we will add faculty resources on writing thesis statements, in general, and on writing argumentative thesis statements.

3. Our indirect assessment indicates that students feel as if they reflected on their writing and/or writing process at a lower percentage than desired (ranging from 52%-63% depending on the course). To aid in ways that faculty might bring reflection into their courses more, we will add faculty resources to our shared site and/or coordinate a pedagogical faculty workshop related to reflection. We will also ask existing faculty for examples of how they bring reflection into the courses and share those examples with other faculty.

4. Our indirect assessment from this year shows that students lack confidence in their "ability to write with persuasive rhetorical strategies while considering possible consequences." This lower percentage may be due to the wording of that survey question. We will discuss the wording with our First-Year Writing Advisory Committee to determine whether the wording needs to be changed or whether the phrasing could be broken down to students with examples. We will alter the phrasing, add resources, and/or work with faculty to work to improve students' comfort levels with their ability to write with persuasive strategies.

5. We will use this year's pilot assessment for ENG 102 and insight gained from its measures and rubric to help FWAC in finalizing the measures and rubric for our pilot assessment for ENG 101 for the 2017-2018 academic year.

6. We will hold colloquia for our common texts fall 2017 (Chaon's *You Remind Me of Me* and Haigh's *Baker Towers* in conjunction with the Pee Dee Fiction and Poetry Festival) and spring 2018 (in conjunction with the Hunter Series Lecture). To help faculty incorporate

these authors and texts into their composition courses, we will collect and post pedagogical resources to our shared faculty space. When applicable, shared resources could overtly link to course SLOs.

7. We will continue to have pedagogical workshops for our English faculty, developing workshop topics based on our faculty's ideas and program needs. We aim to have two workshops next academic year. We will also continue to add faculty resources to our shared faculty space on topics that might improve programmatic goals and relate to course SLOs, as needed.

Appendix

Please find the below additional materials attached:

Appendix A: FMU's General Education and the Composition Program: Academic year 2016-2017

Appendix B: COMPOSITION 101/101E/102 SEQUENCE

Appendix C: ENGL 102 Pilot Prompt: Reflective Argument Essay with Selected Research Paper from English 102 Course

Appendix D: SLOs Rubric for Pilot Portfolio Assessment

Appendix E: 2016-2017 ENG 102 Portfolio Pilot Comparison to 2015-2016 ENG 200 Portfolio Pilot

Appendix A:
FMU's General Education and the Composition Program
Academic Year 2016-2017

Submitted by
Rachel N. Spear, PhD
Coordinator of Composition and
Assistant Professor of English

Department of English, Modern Languages, and Philosophy

Introduction

FMU's Composition Program holds four primary goals:
1. To prepare students to use language conventions and styles for writing in a variety of rhetorical situations
2. To deepen students' understanding of the power and influence of written, digital, and visual texts, both those they read and those they writing themselves
3. To develop students' information literacy
4. To guide students through processes of reflection so they can evaluate and improve their current and future reading and writing practices.

These four programmatic goals are closely tied with several of FMU's General Education goals and requirements:

Goal 1: The ability to write and speak English clearly, logically, creatively, and effectively. [Note: The composition program does not assess speaking skills.]

Goal 2: The ability to read and listen with understanding and comprehension. [Note: The composition program does not assess listening skills.]

Goal 3: The ability to use technology to locate, organize, document, present, and analyze information and ideas. [Note: The composition program assesses the use of technology through information literacy and composition skills.]

Goal 9: The ability to reason logically and think critically in order to develop problem-solving skills and to make informed and responsible choices. [Note: The composition program does not assess the ability to make "responsible choices."]

Our Composition Program goals unfold in conjunction with individual course student learning outcomes. In the academic year 2016-2017, the program pulled from indirect and direct assessments. Specifically, 733 composition students, or about 76% of fall composition students taking any composition course, participated in a writing attitude survey. In addition, we performed a direct assessment of our ENG 102, the last course in our new two-course sequence. This new sequence was implemented this 2016-2017 academic year; thus, we recognize that all assessment data obtained contains transitional students from our former sequence (ENG 111, ENG 112, and ENG 200) and will not be pure data. Our portfolio-based direct assessment of ENG 102 consisted of 75 randomly selected portfolios from 15 sections of ENG 102. For a complete

explanation of the assessment methods, please refer to the English Composition Program's Institutional Effectiveness Report: Academic Year 2016-2017.

In addition, all of the reported results of the direct and indirect assessments performed in 2016-2017 can be found in the English Composition Program's Institutional Effectiveness Report: Academic Year 2015-2016. Below is an explanation of how some of those results map to the General Education Goals.

Mapping the Composition Assessment
to the General Education Goals

While we recognize FMU's Composition Program's vital role in FMU's General Education requirements, we have identified General Education's goals 1, 2, 3, and 9 as being the goals to which our writing program most closely links. To demonstrate assessment of these four goals, the below section explains how specific components of our direct and/or indirect assessments best relate to the respective goal(s).

Goal 1. The ability to write and speak English clearly, logically, creatively, and effectively.

To assess Goal 1, results from the composition program's direct assessment related to ENG 102, specifically looking at Measure 2, Measure 3, and Measure 4, which corresponds with ENG 200's student learning outcome of "writ[ing] in specialized genres for specific audiences" will be considered. These measures and this SLO were selected because the ability to write clearly, logically, creatively, and effectively can be determined by looking at students' portfolios and examining whether they demonstrate that students can create reasoned, well-supported arguments; that students can produce writing for a specific audience; and that students can integrate sources appropriately.

Note: We do not assess the ability to speak clearly, logically, creatively, and effectively.

> Measure 2: The portfolio demonstrates that student can create a reasoned and well-supported ARGUMENT.
>> RESULTS: 80% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 60 of the 75 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.

> Measure 3: The portfolio demonstrates that student can produce writing for a specific AUDIENCE.
>> RESULTS: 77% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 58 of the 75 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.

> Measure 4: The portfolio demonstrates that student can INTEGRATE SOURCES from primary and secondary sources as appropriate.
>> RESULTS: 72% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 54 of the 75 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.

In addition, a specific question in the indirect assessment, our writing attitude survey, adds insight into this goal and should be considered:

SURVEY QUESTION: Has this course helped you to improve your writing? (Percentages refer to those answering "yes.")

	Fall 2016
English 101E	94.5%
English 101	87.25%
English 102	86%
Average	89%

Goal 2. The ability to read and listen with understanding and comprehension.

To assess Goal 2, results from the composition program's direct assessment related to ENG 102, specifically looking at Measure 1 and Measure 4 will be considered. These two measures correspond with ENG 102's student learning outcomes that state students should be able to "read and analyze arguments with an awareness of rhetorical situations, exploring persuasive strategies and possible consequences," "understand primary and secondary research and use multiple methods to find and evaluate information from a variety of sources, " "summarize and synthesize multiple sources, integrating others' ideas into original arguments, documenting appropriately," and "compare and contrast how different communities, including academic discourse communities, discuss and respond to a similar topic or issue." These two measures were selected because the ability to engage with others' composition products and the ability to convey appropriate integration of research imply an ability to read with understanding and comprehension. In addition, a couple indirect assessment survey questions ask students about their reading experience and comprehension and will be outlined below the two aforementioned measures. These survey questions relate to students' confidence in summarizing and analyzing, skills that should be preceded by reading with understanding and comprehension.

Note: We do not assess the ability to listen with understanding and comprehension.

>   Measure 1: The portfolio demonstrates student's successful capability to engage with one or more DISCOURSE COMMUNITIES' discussions and responses to an issue or topic.
>   >   RESULTS: 83% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 62 of the 75 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.

>   Measure 4: The portfolio demonstrates that student can INTEGRATE SOURCES from primary and secondary sources as appropriate.
>   >   RESULTS: 72% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 54 of the 75 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.

SURVEY QUESTION: How confident do you feel about your ability to summarize other people's ideas? (Percentages calculated based on "very" and "mostly" answers.)
>   >   RESULTS:
>   >   English 101E: 80.62%
>   >   English 101:   83.29%
>   >   English 102:   82.07%

SURVEY QUESTION: How would you rate your confidence in your ability to read and analyze texts (such as images or written arguments)?

> RESULTS:
> English 101E: 83.72%
> English 101:   81.31%
> English 102:   80.87%

Goal 3. The ability to use technology to locate, organize, document, present, and analyze information and ideas.

To assess Goal 3, results from the composition program's direct assessment related to ENG 102, specifically looking at Measure 4 and Measure 5 will be considered. Measure 4 assesses students' integration of sources from primary and secondary sources, and Measure 5 looks at whether documentation of appropriate sources is correct and effective. In addition, indirect assessment survey questions related to analyzing arguments, citing sources, and research abilities should be considered.

Our assessment of this goal relates to students' use of technology as it connects to students researching, analyzing, and writing habits. We do not assess students' strengths with the technology directly; rather, inferences about the use of technology can be made based on students' abilities and confidence of their research methods and their final composition products – as those products demonstrate successful and appropriate use of technology to locate, organize, document, present, and analyze information and ideas. Thus, the below measures and survey questions are connect to this goal:

> Measure 4: The portfolio demonstrates that student can INTEGRATE SOURCES from primary and secondary sources as appropriate.
> > RESULTS: 72% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 54 of the 75 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.

> Measure 5: The portfolio demonstrates that student can DOCUMENT appropriate SOURCES correctly and effectively.
> > RESULTS: 77% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 58 of the 75 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.

SURVEY QUESTION: How would you rate your confidence in your ability to read and analyze texts (such as images or written arguments)?

> RESULTS:
> English 101E: 83.72%
> English 101:   81.31%
> English 102:   80.87%

SURVEY QUESTION: Did your course help you practice or learn to cite and document sources? (Percentages calculated based on "yes" answers.)

> RESULTS:
> English 101E: 91.47%
> English 101:   84.35%
> English 102:   88.05%

SURVEY QUESTION: How confident are you in your ability to use a handbook to cite sources correctly using MLA documentation style? (Percentages calculated based on "very" and "mostly" answers.)

> RESULTS:
> English 101E: 69%
> English 101:   73.4%
> English 102:   82.5%

SURVEY QUESTION: Did your course or coursework affirm or improve your understanding and application of various research methods? (Percentages calculated on answers that indicate course improved understanding and application of various research methods.)

> RESULTS:
> English 101E: 93.8%
> English 101:   82.72%
> English 102:   88.85%

Goal 9. The ability to reason logically and think critically in order to develop problem-solving skills and to make informed and responsible choices.

To assess Goal 9, results from the composition program's direct assessment related to ENG 102, specifically looking at Measure 2, Measure 3, and Measure 4, will be considered. Measure 2 assesses students' creation of reasoned and well-supported arguments, which requires logical and critical thinking as well as problem-solving skills. Measure 3 assesses students' writing to specific audiences, which extends to reasoning logically, thinking critically, and developing problem-solving skills. Measure 4 looks at students' integration of sources from primary and secondary sources as appropriate, which, again, requires logical and critical thinking and works to develop students' problem-solving skills. Specifically, students have to make decisions about the appropriate kinds of research to perform as it relates to the audience, genre, and purpose while analyzing and writing to specific audiences. Thus, their research and writing choices should be informed and are based on substantial analysis of their desired purpose and intended audience.

Note: We do not assess whether or not students make "responsible choices."

> Measure 2: The portfolio demonstrates that student can create a reasoned and well-supported ARGUMENT.
> > RESULTS: 80% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 60 of the 75 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.

> Measure 3: The portfolio demonstrates that student can produce writing for a specific AUDIENCE.
> > RESULTS: 77% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 58 of the 75 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.

> Measure 4: The portfolio demonstrates that student can INTEGRATE SOURCES from primary and secondary sources as appropriate.
> > RESULTS: 74% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 34 of the 46 had an average score of greater than two on the 4-point scale.

Appendix B:

COMPOSITION 101/101E/102 SEQUENCE
COURSE TITLES, CATALOG DESCRIPTIONS, and STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

ENG 101: Analysis and Argument

Catalog Description
(3) The grade of C or higher in English 101 (or in English 101E plus a grade of S in English 101L) is required for the student to advance to English 102. Introduction to critical reading and to composing processes, including invention and revision, through writing analyses and arguments for specific audiences and purposes. Through extensive writing assignments, practice, and peer activities, students will learn to read and write in various rhetorical contexts and will be introduced to documentation of sources. Small class sizes allow individual attention and cooperative learning. Credit cannot be earned for both English 101 and English 101E.

Student Learning Outcomes
In **ENG 101**, students will demonstrate the ability to
- Understand the term rhetorical situation, analyzing audience and purpose in order to compose in multiple genres
- Develop ideas and content appropriate to specific rhetorical situations, establishing control of thesis, paragraphs, and larger organization of the essay
- Develop drafts and revise writing based on feedback from others, recognizing that writing involves collaboration with others
- Write about and reflect on the strengths and weakness of their own reading and writing processes
- Understand and employ research methods at an introductory level, documenting sources appropriately
- Read and analyze arguments with an awareness of rhetorical situations, exploring persuasive strategies and possible consequences
- Enhance language skills, establishing control of surface features such as syntax, grammar, and punctuation

ENG 101E: Analysis and Argument with Extended Studio

Catalog Description
(3) (Corequisite: English 101L) The grade of C or higher in English 101 (or in English 101E plus a grade of S in English 101L) is required for the student to advance to English 102. English 101E is the equivalent of English 101 (see catalog description for ENG 101) with a studio component that complements learning experiences by providing additional individualized instruction and assistance with the development of course assignments, emphasizing invention, revision, and reflection within the writing process. Credit cannot be earned for both English 101 and English 101E.

Student Learning Outcomes
In **ENG 101E**, students will demonstrate the ability to
- Understand the term rhetorical situation, analyzing audience and purpose in order to compose in multiple genres
- Develop ideas and content appropriate to specific rhetorical situations, establishing control of thesis, paragraphs, and larger organization of the essay

- Develop drafts and revise writing based on feedback from others, recognizing that writing involves collaboration with others
- Write about and reflect on the strengths and weakness of their own reading and writing processes
- Understand and employ research methods at an introductory level, documenting sources appropriately
- Read and analyze arguments with an awareness of rhetorical situations, exploring persuasive strategies and possible consequences
- Enhance language skills, establishing control of surface features such as syntax, grammar, and punctuation

ENG 101L: Extended Studio

Catalog Description
(1:2) (Corequisite: English 101E) Extended studio time and space for students enrolled in English 101E. The studio component complements the English 101E learning experiences by providing additional individualized instruction and assistance with the development of course assignments, emphasizing invention, revision, and reflection within the writing process. Assessed as S (satisfactory) or U (unsatisfactory). To receive credit for English 101L, students must receive a grade of C or higher in English 101E; credit for ENG 101L can only be earned once.

Studio Objectives
In the **extended studio** space, students will receive individualized supplemental instruction and practice in writing skills that may include the following:
- Invention Strategies
- Drafting of Content
- Revision
- Editing and Conventions
- Collaboration
- Rhetorical Analysis
- Reflection

ENG 102: Rhetoric, Genre, and Research

Catalog Description
(3) (Prerequisite: A grade of C or higher in a) English 101 or in b) English 101E plus a grade of S in English 101L.) Complex composition assignments involving rhetorical strategies, critical reading, and formal research. Practice performing multiple research methods, evaluating and documenting sources, synthesizing research, and developing original arguments. Emphasis on analyzing genre to inform writing strategies and research methods, preparing students to transfer knowledge about genre and composition to other writing contexts. Small class sizes allow individual attention and cooperative learning. Students must complete English 102 with a grade of C or higher to satisfy the English Composition portion of the Communications area of the General Education Requirements.

Student Learning Outcomes
In **ENG 102**, students will demonstrate the ability to
- Read and analyze arguments with an awareness of rhetorical situations, exploring persuasive strategies and possible consequences

- Understand primary and secondary research and use multiple methods to find and evaluate information from a variety of sources
- Summarize and synthesize multiple sources, integrating others' ideas into original arguments, documenting appropriately
- Create reasoned and well-supported arguments for specific audiences and in specialized genres
- Compare and contrast how different communities, including academic discourse communities, discuss and respond to a similar topic or issue
- Develop and refine voice and style
- Reflect on and articulate one's own composition choices, conveying rhetorical awareness and ability to transfer skills

Appendix C:

ENG 102: Rhetoric, Genre, and Research: Exam Prompt:
Reflective Argument Essay with Selected Research Paper from ENG 102 Course

Due the day of the final exam

This prompt is to be distributed to students after week ten of the semester and before week fifteen. By discretion of each instructor, this prompt is either the entire final exam of the course <u>or</u> a portion of the final exam of the course; the percentage weight is determined by each instructor.

You must submit (1) a 3-5 page **reflective argument essay** and (2) a **selected, polished paper** from your ENG 102 course that integrates sources and contains a works cited page. Both the reflective argument essay and your selected paper with research will be submitted as your composition portfolio at the time of your final exam.

(1) The **reflective argument essay** should be a developed, thesis-driven essay that makes an argument about your growth in the course. This self-analysis should explore your successes and challenges throughout the course as well as your ability to transfer the skills you gained in ENG 102 to other writing contexts beyond the course. You should set up claims and support them with evidence. Your audience for this essay is the English Department in general, and you should never state your instructor's name in your essay. You should organize your essay with an introduction and conclusion while addressing the three sections below:

<u>Rhetoric</u>: address your engagement with rhetoric. To get started, consider your responses to the following questions:
* How did your knowledge of rhetorical situations affect your reading and analysis of others' arguments?
* What rhetorical strategies did you employ in your own writing, and why?
* When writing, how do you engage with others' discussions of or responses to issues or topics?
* When revising your composition pieces, where and how did you focus on specific choices related to your language, style, and sentence structure?
* Who is your intended audience in your selected paper that you are submitting as a part of this exam? How did your intended audience affect the rhetorical choices that you made? Be specific.

<u>Genre</u>: expand on how genre affects your composition process. To get started, consider your responses to the following questions:
* How has genre, audience, and purpose affected your reading, composition process, and/or writing decisions?
* When, how, and why were you particularly attuned to genre when reading, writing, and/or researching?
* How comfortable are you in developing well-supported arguments for specific genres and specific audiences, and why?

- How might you apply the knowledge and skills you've acquired in English 102 in other writing (or composition) contexts (classes, jobs, personal life, etc.) in the future? Describe your abilities and confidence to compose in other contexts? What other genres might you encounter in those situations? Be specific, and explain the process that you might take for a couple specific contexts you might encounter in future courses, careers, or other situations outside of school.

Research: address your research process and integration of sources. To get started, consider your responses to the following questions:

- How would you explain your research methods and writing strategies for researched work? What strategies do you draw on when writing requires research?
- What are your goals, criteria, and/or process when researching?
- When and how do you rely on primary and secondary research?
- When and how do you integrate others' ideas into your original argument?
- How do you determine what research methods are appropriate and what sources to rely on, draw from, or integrate into your writing?
- What are your strengths and weaknesses with your selected paper that you are submitting as well as with research writing in general?
- Give an example from one of your essays that demonstrates your ability to integrate a source and explain why that example illustrates your research abilities.

The questions provided above are meant as a guide to help you generate ideas. Do not organize your essay as a disconnected list of answers to the questions listed above. Rather, allow these questions to inform the development and selection of your ideas, organizing them into a cohesive thesis-driven essay. Since this is an argument about your growth in the course, you should establish reasons and support those reasons with evidence based of your ENG 102 course work and/or experience. (You might consider citing your own papers to prove your claim(s), or you might consider drawing specifics from course readings or course conversations.)

(2) The **selected, polished paper** from your ENG 102 course that integrates sources and contains a works cited should demonstrate your ability to synthesize multiple sources into an original paper that conveys your developed voice and style as a writer. While this paper should be a polished representation of your research and composition abilities, your individual instructor might ask that you revise, possibly rewriting introductions, reorganizing paragraphs, taking new risks with conclusions, bringing in stronger support, or reworking for a different genre or audience. Please follow your instructor's guidelines.

Before writing, you should brainstorm and map out your ideas. You might consider re-reading the course student learning outcomes associated with English 102 as part of your invention process.

Appendix D:

SLOs Rubric for Pilot Portfolio Assessment

Portfolios are read and assessed based on the below criteria, created from the course student learning outcomes. Scores are assigned based on the portfolio as a whole, taking each essay into consideration when assigning marks for the portfolio.

Notes: Reflective essays should demonstrate students' argument skills while reflecting on their composition growth; thus, students' selected paper that includes research need not be an argument. Terms such as "discourse community" need not be explicit in essays to satisfy below measures; rather, students should convey an understanding through articulation or application. In addition, due to students' selecting papers from various assignments/instructors, measures often include the phrase "as appropriate" to allow assessors the ability to discern whether the student met a particular measure based on what would be appropriate for that student's particular paper's purpose.

Student Learning Outcomes for **ENG 102**
1. Read and analyze arguments with an awareness of rhetorical situations, exploring persuasive strategies and possible consequences
2. Understand primary and secondary research and use multiple methods to find and evaluate information from a variety of sources
3. Summarize and synthesize multiple sources, integrating others' ideas into original arguments, documenting appropriately
4. Create reasoned and well-supported arguments for specific audiences and in specialized genres
5. Compare and contrast how different communities, including academic discourse communities, discuss and respond to a similar topic or issue
6. Develop and refine voice and style
7. Reflect on and articulate one's own composition choices, conveying rhetorical awareness and ability to transfer skills

Measure 1: The portfolio demonstrates student's successful capability to engage with one or more DISCOURSE COMMUNITIES' discussions and responses to an issue or topic.
[102, SLO5]

4- Excels. Student demonstrates thorough awareness of the ongoing discussions regarding relevant topics and clearly and effectively connects their ideas to the ongoing discussions.
3- Satisfies the measure. Student demonstrates some awareness of ongoing discussions of relevant topics and connects ideas to the ongoing discussions with minor errors.
2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student demonstrates minimal awareness of ongoing discussions of relevant topics and makes few connections to the ongoing discussions.
1- Fails to satisfy the measure. Student does not demonstrate awareness of ongoing discussions of relevant topics and/or does not make connections to the ongoing discussions.

Measure 2: The portfolio demonstrates that student can create a reasoned and well-supported ARGUMENT.
[102, SLO4]

4- Excels. Student establishes clear, knowledgeable, precise claims and thoroughly supports those claims with valid and specific evidence.
3- Satisfies the measure. Student establishes clear claims and adequately supports those claims with valid and specific evidence.
2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student establishes claims and provides some support for those claims with valid evidence.
1- Fails to satisfy the measure. Student fails to establish claims and/or does not support the claims with valid evidence.

Measure 3: The portfolio demonstrates that student can produce writing for a specific AUDIENCE.
[102, SLO4]

4- Excels. Student shows consideration of writing to appeal to a specific audience, making effective rhetorical moves within the composition.
3- Satisfies the measure. Student demonstrates an awareness of writing for a specific audience, attempting to make rhetorical moves within the composition, yet those moves need minor improvements to make them effective for that audience.
2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student makes an attempt to consider a specific audience, but the attempt is incomplete or confusing or falls short.
1- Fails to satisfy the measure. Student shows no attempt at considering a specific audience, or any attempt conveyed is confusing or hindering to the composition.

Measure 4: The portfolio demonstrates that student can INTEGRATE SOURCES from primary and secondary sources as appropriate.
[102, SLO3 and SLO2]

4- Excels. Student integrates sources from primary and/or secondary sources, mixing in quotes/paraphrases, including attributions and lead-ins, and clearly distinguishing between external sources and student's own ideas.
3- Satisfies the measure. Student integrates sources from primary and/or secondary sources, being clear between external source and student's own ideas and also relying on a combination of quotes and paraphrases; however, student may not always include clear attributions and/or lead-ins and/or may need minor improvements with source integration and synthesis.
2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student integrates sources from primary and/or secondary sources, yet student may not always be clear between external source and student's own ideas and may also lack a mixture of quotes and paraphrases; student's attempt at attributions and/or lead-ins may be missing or confusing.
1- Fails to satisfy the measure. Student shows little to no evidence of integration of sources and/or the integration present lacks clarity and/or substantial development and/or the insertion of appropriate material might be confusing and/or awkward and/or disconnection from argument.

Measure 5: The portfolio demonstrates that student can DOCUMENT appropriate SOURCES correctly and effectively.
[102, SLO3 and SLO2]

4- Excels. Student demonstrates correct and effective citations of appropriate sources, conveying proper knowledge of the appropriate style (MLA, APA, Chicago, etc.).

3- Satisfies the measure. Student demonstrates satisfactory skills in citing appropriate sources, conveying proper knowledge of the appropriate style (MLA, APA, Chicago, etc.) with minor errors. These errors do not hinder reader's understanding of cited material.

2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student shows an attempt at citing sources, yet those citations are often incomplete, missing, or confusing, or the sources cited are inappropriate for the writing task.

1- Fails to satisfy the measure. Student shows little to no attempt at citing appropriate sources, including citations that are either substantially incorrect or missing completely. Or most or all the sources used are inappropriate for the writing task.

Measure 6: The portfolio demonstrates student's developed VOICE and STYLE, employing appropriate rhetorical and persuasive strategies and conventions.
[102, SLO6]

4- Excels. Student demonstrates effective control of stylistic conventions through the use of features such as varied sentence structure, smooth transitions, and appropriate tone and word choice.

3- Satisfies the measure. Student demonstrates awareness of stylistic conventions through the use of features such as varied sentence structure, smooth transitions, and appropriate tone and word choice.

2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student shows some awareness of stylistic conventions through the use of features such as sentence structure, transitions, and appropriate tone and word choice, but the demonstration of these attributes is uneven.

1- Fails to satisfy the measure. Student shows little to no awareness of stylistic conventions and/or student's voice and style interferes with the clarity or reading of the text.

Measure 7: The portfolio demonstrates student's TRANSFER KNOWLEDGE, describing the process of composition in other contexts, conveying rhetorical awareness and transfer skills.
[102, SLO7]

4- Excels. Student articulates different steps of the writing process and provides a nuanced discussion of the applications of the rhetorical situation (writer, audience, genre, and purpose) to other courses or contexts.

3- Satisfies the measure. Student discusses the writing process and/or the possible applications of the rhetorical situation (writer, audience, genre, and purpose) to other courses or contexts.

2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student discusses some aspects of the writing process and/or defines or attempts to discuss how the rhetorical situation is applicable to other courses or contexts.

1- Fails to satisfy the measure. Student does not demonstrate an understanding of the writing process or the application of the rhetorical situation.

Appendix E:

2016-2017 ENG 102 Portfolio Pilot Comparison
to 2015-2016 ENG 200 Portfolio Pilot

	Discourse Communities	Argument	Audience	Integrate Sources	Document Sources	Voice/Style	Transfer
2015-2016: Pilot ENG 200 Assessment (46 Portfolios)							
Average Score of Greater than 2	30	27	29	34	35	27	24
*Percentage When Avg Score > 2	65	59	63	74	76	59	52
Average Score of 2.5 or Greater	30	26	29	32	33	27	22
Percentage When Avg Score 2.5 or >	65	57	63	70	72	59	48

	Discourse Communities	Argument	Audience	Integrate Sources	Document Sources	Voice/Style	Transfer
2016-2017: Pilot ENG 102 Assessment (75 Portfolios)							
Average Score of Greater than 2	63	60	58	56	59	58	60
Percentage When Avg Score > 2	84	80	77	75	79	77	80
Average Score of 2.5 or Greater	62	60	58	54	58	57	59
*Percentage When Avg Score 2.5 or >	83	80	77	72	77	76	79

* The highlighted line is the data included in their respective IE reports. For comparison purposes, refer to the last line of each chart. The scoring for every measure went up with the change in sequence.