

Name of Department: English Composition Program

Year: 2015-2016

Name of Preparer: Rachel N. Spear

Program Mission Statement

Francis Marion University’s Composition Program mission, through a required sequence of composition courses, is to instill first-year composition students with college-level composition skills that will prepare students for both academic and public contexts, enhancing critical thinking and rhetorical awareness to foster students’ ability to compose and communicate effectively in the twenty-first century and in various writing situations. Our current composition sequence consists of three courses, English 111 “Composition I,” English 112 “Composition II,” and English 200 “Writing for Disciplines”; however, former data collected through program assessment revealed that students’ argumentative, analysis, and writing transfer skills were low. As part of our program’s planned improvements, we interrogated our current composition program, closely examining the current sequence and performing a comparative analysis of other similar institutions’ composition programs. That examination revealed that the current sequence delayed instruction on analysis and argumentation, held repetition of course objectives, and resulted in transfer 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 and proposed 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 will be implemented fall 2016. This new sequence shifts from the current 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 will 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 will meet twice a week, provide supplemental individualized attention from professors and undergraduate tutors, and be 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 would 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 studio counterpart 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 is aimed at preparing students for college-level writing sooner in their academic careers, alleviating transfer issues that currently exist with our three-course sequence, and aligning Francis Marion with the disciplinary norm, it will also better account for the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) policies while positioning the university to account for the new Secondary South Carolina 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 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.
- Goal 2: The ability to read and listen with understanding and comprehension.
- Goal 3: The ability to use technology to locate, organize, document, present, and analyze information and ideas.
- Goal 9: The ability to reason logically and think critically in order to develop problem-solving skills and to make informed and responsible choices.

Executive Summary of Report

This report includes an overview of Francis Marion University's Composition Program and our assessment process and outcomes for the 2015-2016 academic year. During this academic year, we used previous data to develop and propose a new composition sequence. This sequence was passed on February 16, 2016, to be implemented fall 2016. Thus, in many ways, this report serves as a transitional report, reporting on our current composition sequence while keeping our new sequence at the forefront. In this report, we include data on our composition program through both direct and indirect assessment that reveals insight into student performance and student attitudes as well as into our program itself.

Indirect assessment is based on student attitude surveys for all three current composition courses. The survey results are generally consistent with data from previous years with some marks related to research skills and strategies being down this year. The direct assessment of student

writing consisted of a portfolio-based pilot assessment method that links to student learning outcomes for that final course in both the current sequence and new sequence. As part of this pilot, we develop 7 measures that map to our current English 200 course and to our future English 102 course. Doing so reveals data for our current sequence while enabling us to examine how to strengthen our future assessment methods for that new sequence. We did not meet 6 out of the 7 targets, revealing that student portfolios are weak in skills related to analysis, argumentative writing, and transfer knowledge. These three weaknesses are in line with data from previous years and serve as driving forces for our proposal of our new composition sequence – which is aimed at stressing analysis, argument, and transfer knowledge earlier. Thus, both direct and indirect assessment results affirm our move to the new composition sequence. In addition, the new composition courses are capped at 15 students per section, which is aimed at improving our program outcomes as well by allowing more individual attention and instruction.

This new sequence is part of our planned action items for programmatic improvements, and connected to this, we have and will continue to have faculty pedagogical workshops and to upload faculty resources that assist faculty in transitioning to this sequence and in strengthening instruction on analysis, argument, and transfer knowledge.

All composition courses covered in this report are general education courses and tie closely into 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*. For the purpose of this report, see Appendix A to review the SLOs for the three courses of the current sequence and Appendix B for the SLOs of the new sequence.

The following report, in many ways, serves as a transitional report, collecting and reporting on our current sequence through a pilot assessment method while keeping our new sequence at the forefront of our programmatic assessment. Because of this, it is necessary to take the SLOs from both the current and new sequences into account. To explain, the report and our assessment method will focus on current courses, primarily English 200, while simultaneously structured in a way that will provide insight into the development of our assessment methods and/or baselines for our new sequence.

Below are the SLOs for the final course in both the program's current and new sequence.

Student Learning Outcomes for the **current** sequence's **ENG 200** course

1. Write in specialized genres for specific audiences.
2. Compare and contrast how different communities, including academic discourse communities, discuss and respond to a similar topic or issue.
3. Describe how genres shape reading, writing, and research.
4. Reflect on transferring knowledge about genre and composition to writing in other contexts.

Student Learning Outcomes for the **new** sequence's **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

In order to take both the current and new sequence into account, the above SLOs from their respective sequence were considered when developing the below assessment measures. Each measure is mapped to its corresponding SLO for one or both of the sequences.

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 200, SLO 2]

[ENG 102, SLO 5]

Measure 2: The portfolio demonstrates that student can create a reasoned and well-supported ARGUMENT.

[ENG 200, SLO 1]

[ENG 102, SLO 4]

Measure 3: The portfolio demonstrates that student can produce writing for a specific AUDIENCE.

[ENG 200, SLO 1]

[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 TRANSFER KNOWLEDGE, describing the process of composition in other contexts, conveying rhetorical awareness and transfer skills.

[ENG 200, SLO 4 and SLO 3]

[ENG 102, SLO 7]

Measure 7: The portfolio demonstrates student’s developed VOICE and STYLE, employing appropriate rhetorical and persuasive strategies and conventions.

[ENG 102, SLO 6]

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 direct assessment.

Assessment Methods

This academic year, we performed both direct and indirect assessment through administering a student writing assessment as well as student attitude surveys. For the former, we piloted a portfolio-based assessment with four sections of English 200 in order to yield information about the current sequence as well as help us in better structuring our assessment methods for our new program. Thus, the data yielded through this pilot will not only offer programmatic data about the current sequence but also serve as a sort of baseline for comparison of students' completion of the composition sequence.

1. Student Writing Assessment

The portfolio-based English 200 pilot consisted of collecting writing portfolios from 12 randomly selected students out of 4 sections of the course in Spring 2016. The total number of portfolios assessed was 46 (instead of 48, due to one incomplete portfolio pulled and one plagiarized portfolio pulled prior to the assessment).

Each of these 46 portfolios consisted of one reflection essay and one revised 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.

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. 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, assessors participated in a norming session. Also, when the two readers' scores for two or more measures had more than a one-point deviation, the portfolio had a third reader score the portfolio. Out of the 46 portfolios, 7 portfolios needed a third reader. We had 6 English faculty members participate in this student writing assessment.

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

2. Writing Attitude Surveys

The composition program conducted a writing attitude survey among all students taking a composition course in the fall 2015 semester. This survey was completed by 973 students, or about 73% of fall composition students. The responses to key items were compared with survey results from past years, indicating differences below this year's data.

Assessment Results

1. Student Writing Assessment

Below are results to the Student Writing Assessment, the direct assessment that was a portfolio-based pilot with the current sequence while taking the new sequence into account. Since this is a pilot and since we are in the process of restructuring the composition program and a new process for its assessment methods, we do not have a baseline. When possible, we will draw comparisons from previous year's data. For the purpose of this report, we will use 75% as a benchmark for direct assessment, calculating by averaging the scores from the readers and identifying those averages that are greater than two on the four-point scale. For the indirect assessment, we take the highest and second highest marks into consideration when calculating percentages while making note of the highest mark when particularly revealing with where our program could make improvements.

In addition, 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 setting baselines and benchmarks to use in subsequent assessments of our new sequence.

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 200, SLO 2]

[ENG 102, SLO 5]

- A) RESULTS: 65% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 30 of the 46 had an average score of greater than two on the 4-point scale.
- B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target benchmark was not met. This might be due to the challenges that surface with a variety of students' reflection about discourse communities; however, it might also be to the lack of students' familiarity with the term itself. Another factor that might weigh into the lower percentage might be assessors looking for explicit use of the term; thus, in future years, we will stress whether or not using the term in their portfolio is required.

Measure 2: The portfolio demonstrates that student can create a reasoned and well-supported ARGUMENT.

[ENG 200, SLO 1]

[ENG 102, SLO 4]

- A) RESULTS: 59% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 27 of the 46 had an average score of greater than two on the 4-point scale.
- B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target benchmark was not met. This might be due to the different assignments with each section. While the prompt stresses that essays should be researched and sourced, that prompt does not specify that the essay should be an argument. We will revise the

prompt for future assessments. Not meeting the benchmark might also be due to portfolios being weak with reasoned and well-supported arguments.

Measure 3: The portfolio demonstrates that student can produce writing for a specific AUDIENCE.

[ENG 200, SLO 1]

[ENG 102, SLO 4]

- A) RESULTS: 63% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 29 of the 46 had an average score of greater than two on the 4-point scale.
- B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target benchmark was not met. This might be due to the different assignments with each section and an inability to know who the intended audience was unless students specified in their reflection letter. We will consider revising the prompt for future assessments.

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: 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.
- B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target benchmark was not met. While we are close to meeting this benchmark, we need to focus more on integrating sources. Also, it might apply to the whether or not sources are appropriate for that writing situation.

Measure 5: The portfolio demonstrates that student can DOCUMENT appropriate SOURCES correctly and effectively.

[ENG 102, SLO 3 and SLO 2]

- A) RESULTS: 76% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 35 of the 46 had an average score of greater than two on the 4-point scale.
- B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target benchmark was met.

Measure 6: The portfolio demonstrates student’s TRANSFER KNOWLEDGE, describing the process of composition in other contexts, conveying rhetorical awareness and transfer skills.

[ENG 200, SLO 4 and SLO 3]
[ENG 102, SLO 7]

- A) RESULTS: 52% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 24 of the 46 had an average score of greater than two on the 4-point scale.
- B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target benchmark was not met. This might be students’ inability to explain their transfer knowledge. It might also indicate that students need assistance with transferring their knowledge in other composition contexts.

Measure 7: The portfolio demonstrates student’s developed VOICE and STYLE, employing appropriate rhetorical and persuasive strategies and conventions.

[ENG 102, SLO 6]

- A) RESULTS: 59% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 27 of the 46 had an average score of greater than two on the 4-point scale.
- B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target benchmark was not met. This might be due to students needing more instruction and assignments needing more emphasis on developing voice and style that includes variety of sentence structure and sophisticated and appropriate rhetorical strategies.

2. Writing Attitude Surveys

Below are results for responses to key items on the Writing Attitude Surveys, the indirect assessment that is administered each fall to all composition students. Baselines currently rely on data from previous year as comparative marks, and like direct assessment, benchmarks are in the process of being set for the new program. Similar to the above direct assessment, we offer corresponding keys to relate back to the English 200 and English 102 course SLOs when applicable. Note that not every SLO will be keyed below; rather, both the direct and indirect assessments cover all SLOs and even go beyond the SLOs to offer other informative data.

To what extent did your instructor’s comments help you to improve your writing?

[ENG 200, SLO 1 and SLO 2]
[ENG 102, SLO 4, SLO 5, SLO 6, and SLO 7]

- A) RESULTS:
 - English 111: 93% always or often
 - English 112: 94% always or often
 - English 200: 85% always or often
- B) DISCUSSION: Marks in 111 went up 1%, in 112 went up 4%, but in 200 went down 8% from last year’s data.

How would you rate your confidence in your ability to analyze arguments?

[ENG 200, SLO 2]

[ENG 102, SLO 4 and SLO 5]

A) RESULTS:

English 112: 82% very or mostly confident

B) DISCUSSION: While marks are the same from last year, the “very” confident mark is only 29%

How would you rate your confidence in your ability to write persuasive arguments?

[ENG 102, SLO 4]

A) RESULTS:

English 112: 78% very or mostly confident

B) DISCUSSION: While marks are the same from last year, the “very” confident mark is only 33%

Did your English 111 coursework improve your understanding of the role of audience when writing?

A) RESULTS:

English 111: 92% yes

B) DISCUSSION: Mark is similar to last year’s

How would you rate your confidence in your ability to cite sources using MLA documentation style?

A) RESULTS:

English 112: 64% very or mostly confident

B) DISCUSSION: Mark is down 3% from last year and only at 29% stating “very” confident

How would you rate your confidence in your ability to locate sources using the library’s catalog and databases?

A) RESULTS:

English 112: 54% very or mostly confident

B) DISCUSSION: Mark is down 5% from last year and only at 23% stating “very” confident

Do you feel that your research abilities improved in English 200?

A) RESULTS:

English 200: 79% yes

B) DISCUSSION: Mark is down 5% from last year

The following charts show 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 to improve your writing? (Percentages refer to those answering “yes.”)

	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.”)

	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 English 111 Lab? (Percentages refer to those answering “very” or “mostly satisfied.”)

Fall 2010	87%
Fall 2011	83%
Fall 2012	87%
Fall 2013	86%
Fall 2014	81%
Fall 2015	86%

If you took English 111, to what extent do you feel that English 111 prepared you for English 112? (Percentages refer to those answering “very well” or “somewhat.”)

Fall 2008	85%
Fall 2009	91%
Fall 2010	98%
Fall 2011	91%
Fall 2012	95%
Fall 2013	91%
Fall 2014	84%
Fall 2015	90%

If you took English 200, to what extent do you feel that English 112 prepared you for English 200? (Percentages refer to those answering “very well” or “somewhat.”)

Fall 2008	91%
Fall 2009	86%
Fall 2010	92%
Fall 2011	90%
Fall 2012	92%
Fall 2013	92%
Fall 2014	90%
Fall 2015	89%

Action Items

Based on the analysis of our assessment data, the items below are our action items as part of our planned improvements:

1. With this year's Student Writing Assessment, we learned that 6 out of the 7 targets were not met (Measures 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7). The lowest marks related to analysis, argument, and transfer – all of which are the driving force for a change in our composition sequence. Thus, we are currently addressing this by having passed this sequence change and beginning to implement it in fall 2016. This sequence change and the structure of the courses focus more on analysis, argument, and transfer skills.
2. In addition to changing the sequence, we will also add resources to the composition blackboard related to these student learning outcomes. Specifically, we will add resources for faculty to aid in teaching discourse community analysis, argument, and integration of sources (to help with Measures 1, 2, 3, and 4).
3. We will also add sample assignments to the faculty blackboard site in efforts to help faculty with ideas of how to incorporate assignments that ask students to analyze and apply their transfer knowledge, giving students more practice with applying their composition skills in various composition contexts, and that aid students in developing their voice and style (to help with Measures 6 and 7).
4. While we met Measure 5 related to documenting sources, our indirect assessment continues to indicate that students lack confidence in their research abilities and strategies – from finding and evaluating sources to citing sources. Due to this, we will continue to focus on teaching strategies and faculty resources for teaching researching and documentation.
5. Another needed action item is related to the prompt for our student writing assessment. We learned in this pilot that clarification and revision is needed in a couple spots on the prompt itself. Specifically, we will specify that the included paper must be an argument. Also, We will revise the prompt to clarify that students need to state who their audience is in their portfolio reflection letter; doing so will make their intended audience explicit, whereas the implicit factor might have been affected the scoring.
6. We have clarified our instructions to indicate that students' portfolios need to show either both the application and use of terms or just the application of their ability without making direct reference to terminology (i.e., discourse communities, rhetorical strategies, audience, etc.). The prompt did not specify, and some students did not make overt references to their analyses of discourse communities, which might have weighed into the scoring process.
7. We have implemented an assessment method for the new composition sequence that focuses on the course outcomes while highlighting skills related to revision and reflection.

Appendix

Please find the below additional materials attached:

Appendix A: Current Three-Course Sequence (ENG 111, ENG 112, and ENG 200)

Appendix B: COMPOSITION 101/101E/102 SEQUENCE

Appendix C: ENGL 200 Exam (Pilot) Prompt: Reflection Essay with Revised Essay

Appendix D: SLOs Rubric for Pilot Portfolio Assessment

Appendix A:

Current Three-Course Sequence (ENG 111, ENG 112, and ENG 200):*

English 111

Course Overview:

Students in English 111 will write several papers, developing and revising multiple drafts. Early writing assignments in English 111 are written to readily defined individuals or groups and are usually supported by personal experiences. Subsequent assignments demand increasing awareness of audience, arrangement, style, and source material. Students will practice reading and interpreting texts written for general audiences. By the end of the course, student writing draws on ideas from course reading and other outside sources, and students gain more practice in close reading.

While the personal essay receives some attention in English 111, with special attention paid to structure, tone, and style, students also practice other forms of writing. The object is to make students aware of the wide range of writing genres and of the need to fit form and structure to situation and audience.

The Writing Center offers a special program, “Write on Target,” for English 111 students who would like to work regularly with a writing tutor. This program is described in detail under the “FMU Writing Center ‘Write on Target’ Program” section of this text.

Objectives:

Students in English 111 will write several different papers and practice many writing skills. Students will also benefit from the following course objectives.

In English 111, students will demonstrate the ability to

- Develop ideas
- Understand the writing of others
- Integrate their own ideas with those of others in writing
- Use comments of others to revise their writing
- Control surface features such as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling
- Write about and reflect on the strengths and weakness of their own reading and writing processes

English 111 Lab

In addition to meeting three hours a week for classroom instruction, all English 111 courses meet twice a week in the English 111 Lab, which is equipped with computers, printers, and resource books such as grammar handbooks and dictionaries. The lab, located in Founders Hall 114A, provides you with a space to complete writing assignments in the presence of undergraduate teaching assistants and instructors who are available to offer feedback as you work on assignments to enhance your writing and critical thinking skills and as you draft, revise, and edit your work. We believe the best way to improve writing is to write, and to do so in a setting that encourages invention, collaboration, and reflection. The lab is this kind of place.

On the first day of lab, either the English 111 Lab Coordinator or the Coordinator of First-Year Composition will introduce you to the English 111 Lab and will ask you to complete some required paperwork. Be prepared to see many people in the lab, as two English 111 classes attend the lab during the same assigned time slots (two fifty-minute sessions) each week.

English 112

Course Overview:

English 112 is a course in argumentation, emphasizing the analysis and production of argumentative texts—textual and/or visual. This course requires students to read critically, analyze the argumentative strategies of texts, critique arguments, become familiar with a wide range of rhetorical contexts for argument, identify fallacies, and communicate effectively with a variety of public audiences for a wide variety of purposes.

The traditional essay form is the vehicle of choice for most academic writing and receives considerable attention in English 112. In English 112, students also practice other forms of composition directed toward various public audiences. The object is to make students aware of the wide range of communication types and of the need to fit form, structure, style, and rhetorical strategies to situation and audience.

In English 112, students practice gathering information from the library and other sources beyond the classroom. They learn to incorporate that information effectively into their writing. The practice of research skills and MLA documentation serves as a background for their other research projects in English 200.

Students in English 112 will take a departmental 112 exam at the end of the course to demonstrate competency in their abilities to analyze and convey rhetorical awareness. Detailed information about the 112 final exam will be provided by your instructor at a later date.

Objectives:

Students in English 112 will write several different papers and practice many writing skills. Students will also benefit from the following course objectives.

In English 112, students will demonstrate the ability to

- Create reasoned and well-supported arguments for specific audiences
- Read and analyze arguments with an awareness of rhetorical situations, persuasive strategies, and their potential consequences
- Use multiple methods to find and evaluate information and ideas from a variety of media
- Document sources appropriately

English 200

Course Overview:

English 200 will build on the research and argumentation skills introduced in English 112 and will ask students to explore texts with greater depth and write projects that require the careful reading and integration of multiple sources.

Students will read, critique, and synthesize materials from a variety of longer and/or more complex sources than those read in English 112 and from a variety of disciplines. Students will write reasoned arguments which indicate their engagement in the subject and its relevance to their lives and the larger world outside of the academy.

Objectives:

In English 200, students will demonstrate the ability to

- Write in specialized genres for specific audiences
- Compare and contrast how different communities, including academic discourse communities, discuss and respond to a similar topic or issue
- Describe how genres shape reading, writing, and research
- Reflect on transferring knowledge about genre and composition to writing in other contexts

* Course overviews and objectives were pulled from our *Final Draft 2015-2016* publication.

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:

ENGL 200 Exam (Pilot) Prompt: Reflection Essay with Revised Essay 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 or a portion of the final exam of the course; the percentage weight is determined by each instructor.

You must submit (1) a **revised essay** from your ENG 200 course *and* (2) a 3-5 page **reflection essay**; the revised essay must include research or integrate sources and must include a works cited page. Both the reflection essay and revised essay will be submitted at your final exam.

- (1) The **revised essay** should be a substantial revision of a researched or sourced essay that includes a works cited page and was completed in ENG 200. You are encouraged to take “re-vision” to heart and to distance yourself from your essay to “see” your writing “again” (possibly rewriting introductions, reorganizing paragraphs, taking new risks with conclusions, bringing in stronger support, etc.).
- (2) The **reflection 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 and be organized with an introduction, conclusion, and the following three sections (clearly identified with headings):

Revision Efforts: explain your revision process for your chosen researched or sourced essay. To get started, consider your responses to the following prompts:

- Describe specific choices you made while revising (“re-envisioning”) the essay.
- What feedback did you take into consideration when revising?
- Provide textual evidence from the original essay and from the revision to demonstrate your improvements and incorporation of feedback.

Research Skills: describe your research process and use of sources. To get started, consider your responses to the following prompts:

- How would you explain your research methods and writing strategies for researched work?
- What are your goals and criteria when researching?
- What are your strengths and weaknesses with this essay and 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.
- What could you have done to improve your research process or integration of research?

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs): describe your progress at meeting *each* of the following goals of ENG 200 during the semester:

- **Write in specialized genres for specific audiences.** Consider these questions to get started:
 - Throughout the course, what genres have you written in, and what audiences have you written for?
 - What about the audience affected the decisions you made about your writing?

- **Compare and contrast how different communities, including academic discourse communities, discuss and respond to a similar topic or issue.** Consider this question to get started:
 - What specific features might you examine to determine how a specific discourse community responds to or discusses a topic compared to other discourse communities?

- **Describe how genres shape reading, writing, and research.** Consider these questions to get started:
 - How, in the class, did genre shape your reading, writing, and research?
 - How did you read different course materials?
 - How did those ways of reading impact your understanding of the course and its material?
 - When were you particularly attuned to genre when reading, writing, and/or researching?

- **Reflect on transferring knowledge about genre and composition to writing in other contexts.** Consider these questions to get started:
 - What composition skills have you seen strengthen over the course of the semester?
 - How might you apply the knowledge and skills you've acquired in English 200 in other contexts (classes, jobs, personal life, etc.) in the future?
 - In what areas are you most confident?
 - What do you wish to continue to work on as you further develop your analysis and composition skills?

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 use specific examples from your work in ENG 200 as evidence.

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 each.

Student Learning Outcomes for ENG 200

1. Write in specialized genres for specific audiences.
2. Compare and contrast how different communities, including academic discourse communities, discuss and respond to a similar topic or issue.
3. Describe how genres shape reading, writing, and research.
4. Reflect on transferring knowledge about genre and composition to writing in other contexts.

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.

[200, SLO2]

[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.

[200, SLO1]

[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.

[200, SLO1]

[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 TRANSFER KNOWLEDGE, describing the process of composition in other contexts, conveying rhetorical awareness and transfer skills.

[200, SLO4 and SLO3]

[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.

Measure 7: 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.