Name of Program/Department:	English Composition Program / Department of English, Modern Languages, and Philosophy
Academic Year:	2017-2018
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.

Our mission is in line with our new composition sequence, implemented fall 2016. The 2017-2018 academic year is our second year of implementation and continued to be a year of transition and piloting. Our program's new sequence consists of the below two-course sequence:

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

This 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 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, this sequence fosters more opportunities for instructor feedback, individualized attention, and cooperative learning.

Our composition sequence was designed with our program mission statement and program goals in mind.

Executive Summary of Report

This report includes an overview of Francis Marion University's Composition Program's assessment process and outcomes for the 2017-2018 academic year.

In 2016, we implemented our new composition sequence, aimed at enhancing our composition program and students' learning and as part of last year's planned improvements. Our assessment 2015-2016 assessment affirmed our program changes while our 2016-2017 assessment results proved that our implementation and changes were successful. Specifically, the 2016-2017 assessment revealed that 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 the previous year. Last year's indirect assessment showed that students' attitude towards their writing courses were generally positive. Specific survey results generally showed an increase from (or similarity with) previous years' data (when possible comparisons could be made). Such improvements implied that our switch to the new two-course composition sequence and its respective changes were successful. I mention the 2016-2017 assessment results in detail as that year was year one of a two-year pilot with our assessment procedures. Thus, like last year, this year's 2017-2018 report is based on a pilot assessment, and again, we acknowledge that data collected in this year's report will not relate solely to our new sequence by nature of the transition from our former sequence to this new one. 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 an end-of-the-semester paper, assessed based on measures that links to the student learning outcomes for the English 101 course. Specifically, our direct assessment this year used 7 measures that map to our English 101 course student learning objectives. This pilot was developed by our First-Year Writing Advisory Committee (with last year's portfolio-based pilot of English 102 in mind). While exact comparisons to previous years' findings are not possible, some general comparisons may be made when possible and applicable.

This year, our direct assessment revealed that we met 5 out of our 7 targets. We did not meet Measure 5 (related to documenting sources) or Measure 6 (related to analysis). This year, our indirect assessment shows that students' attitude towards their writing courses are, again, generally positive. Survey results also show a continued lack in confidence regarding development of thesis statements. Action items from last year (focusing on the integration of sources, thesis statements, reflection on writing, and persuasive rhetorical strategies) proved fruitful, as this year's data shows slight increases; however, all action items will be carried over for this upcoming academic year. Based on this year's direct and indirect assessment results, our action items for next year will focus on analysis, documenting sources, thesis statements, and reflection. 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.

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. The two most overt goals (or portions of those) are listed below:

Goal 1: The ability to write and speak English clearly, logically, creatively, and effectively. [Note: The composition program does not assess speaking 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 assessment report of these general education goals is attached as an appendix (see Appendix A).

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, see Appendix B.

Similar to last year's report, this report, in many ways, recognizes that our program is in its transitional years, where our new sequence has started but students from the former sequence are continuing to satisfy their composition requirements. Thus, the data is not pure data related solely to our new sequence, and this year, we continued to work on piloting assessment procedures that will, in turn, strengthen our program and programmatic assessment.

Specifically, last academic year, we piloted a portfolio-based assessment for English 102, and this 2017-2018 academic year, we piloted an assessment procedure for English 101. The ENG 101 pilot assessment relied on an end-of-the semester paper from that 101 course and kept the below **ENG 101** Student Learning Outcomes at its forefront:

1. Understand rhetorical situations, analyzing audience and purpose in order to compose in multiple genres
2. Develop ideas and content appropriate to specific rhetorical situations, establishing control of thesis, paragraphs, and larger organization of the essay

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

These SLOs are mapped to our below assessment measures, which were used for our direct assessment of English 101 papers:

Measure 1: The paper demonstrates the student can produce writing for a specific AUDIENCE.
[101, SLO1 and SLO6]

Measure 2: The paper demonstrates the student's ability to ORGANIZE content.
[101, SLO2]

Measure 3: The paper demonstrates the student can create an ARGUMENT.
[101, SLO6 and SLO1]

Measure 4: The paper demonstrates the student's ability to REFERENCE at least one text (visual or textual) or rhetorical situation.
[101, SLO5]

Measure 5: The paper demonstrates the student's ability to DOCUMENT appropriate SOURCES correctly.
[101, SLO5]

Measure 6: The paper demonstrates the students' ability to ANALYZE material effectively and appropriately.
[101, SLO1 and SLO6]

Measure 7: The paper demonstrates that student can control SURFACE FEATURES such as syntax, grammar, and punctuation.
[101, SLO7]

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 this year's program's direct assessment.

Together, the two pilots provide insight into the development of our assessment methods and baselines for our new composition sequence. In addition, these past two academic years enabled our First-Year Writing Advisory Committee the chance to review our piloted assessment

procedure, proposing a two-year assessment procedure alternating between assessing English 101 and English 102 based on the pilots; this procedure was voted into place by the English Department on March 8, 2018, to be implemented fall 2018.

Assessment Methods

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 an end-of-semester paper with 18 sections of English 101, totaling 90 essays. This pilot consisted of both English 101 and English 101E, where papers where coded and decoded for assessment purposes. The pilot offered insight into long-term planning while serving as a baseline and offering comparisons when applicable. Such comparisons can be made at general levels, but cannot be interrupted as exact because of our recent sequence change and restructuring of the composition program. Furthermore, this year's pilot with last 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 end-of-the-semester English 101 pilot consisted of collecting essays from 90 randomly selected students out of 18 sections of English 101, 101E, and 101Honors in fall 2017. These sections were taught by 10 different faculty, all of whom volunteered to participate and relied on the English 101 Pilot Assessment Procedure (see Appendix C), which was created and approved by the First-Year Writing Advisory Committee (FWAC).

Students' and sections' identifiers (names and section numbers) were removed in preparation for a blind scoring; thus, readers did not know the names of students or their respective instructors or section numbers. In addition, essays were coded to remove their respective course for the assessment and decoded for analyses purposes; thus, assessors had no way of knowing whether the essay was from English 101, English 101E, or English 101-Honors. For the sake of assessing, the honors section became a part of English 101, and decoding allowed comparisons to be made between English 101 and its "extended" version, English 101E.

We had 8 English faculty members participate in the assessment of the submitted essays. Each paper 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 8 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 essay had a third reader score the portfolio. Out of the 90 essays, 4 essays needed a third reader for the programmatic assessment. The measures and rubric were created and 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.

We intend to use the results of this year's pilot assessment coupled with last year's pilot 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 relied on student surveys that connect to and extend beyond our student learning objectives, allowing us to gather indirect programmatic data. Some survey questions were revised slightly from last year's survey. Again, comparisons may be made while keeping in mind that the sequence change and pilots make exact comparisons impossible. All revisions were reviewed and approved by FWAC before the surveys were distributed.

Procedures: The composition program conducted a writing attitude survey among students taking a composition course in the fall 2017 semester. This survey was completed by 556 students out of our 779 fall composition students, or about 71% of the students. Specifically, we had 141 students in ENGL 101E, 286 students in ENG 101, and 129 students in ENG 102 take the survey. The responses to key items were compared with survey results from last year's data primarily, indicating differences when possible and applicable. However, with the development of our new sequence, we recognize that exact comparisons across the years are impossible and that even last year's data included a large number of students transitioning from the former sequence. Significant questions from this year's survey are included in this report.

In addition to adding insight to our program, responses to applicable survey questions also aid in improving our program's directed-self placement method, which was implemented with the new sequence in 2016 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. *Direct Assessment: Student Writing Assessment*

Below are results to the Student Writing Assessment, the direct assessment that was an end-of-the-semester paper pilot. Since this is a pilot created after the recent restructuring of our composition program, we do not have baselines or benchmarks for this new sequence. Rather, when possible, we will draw general comparisons from the previous year's data. As previously stated, we will use 75% as a target, and to calculate percentages, we averaged the scores from the readers and identified those averages that are 2.5 or greater on the four-point scale. This assessment will look at the coded essays (which includes both English 101 and English 101E) essays as one group. Afterwards, the report will analyze the decoded essays to draw comparisons between English 101 and English 101E for programmatic purposes.

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.

Measure 1: The paper demonstrates the student can produce writing for a specific AUDIENCE.
[101, SLO1 and SLO6]
    A) RESULTS: 77% of the essays successfully met this measure. Specifically, 69of the 90 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 77%, our assessment indicates that English 101 results are similar to English 102 results (assessed 2016-2017) while recognizing the different levels affiliated with each course. Exact comparison cannot be made.

Measure 2: The paper demonstrates the student's ability to ORGANIZE content.
[101, SLO2]
    A) RESULTS: 78% of the essays successfully met this measure. Specifically, 70 of the 90 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
    B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target was met. Comparison to last year's English 102 is not possible, nor is comparison to previous years' data due to the new sequence being implemented in 2016.

Measure 3: The paper demonstrates the student can create an ARGUMENT.
[101, SLO6 and SLO1]
    A) RESULTS: 78% of the essays successfully met this measure. Specifically, 70 of the 90 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 80%, English 101 results are similar to English 102 results (assessed 2016-2017). Exact comparison cannot be made.

Measure 4: The paper demonstrates the student's ability to REFERENCE at least one text (visual or textual) or rhetorical situation.
[101, SLO5]
    A) RESULTS: 82% of the essays successfully met this measure. Specifically, 74 of the 90 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
    B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target was met. Comparison to last year's English 102 is not possible, nor is comparison to previous years' data due to the new sequence being implemented in 2016. However, we may imagine that the English 101 "reference" measure precedes English 102's "integrate sources" measure, which last year was at 72%; thus, the higher percentage for 101 indicates preparation for that 102 measure, which may have a decrease due to increased level of difficulty.

Measure 5: The paper demonstrates the student's ability to DOCUMENT appropriate SOURCES correctly.
[101, SLO5]

A) RESULTS: 58% of the essays successfully met this measure. Specifically, 52 of the 90 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.

B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target was not met. In addition, compared to last year's 77%, indicates that English 101 results are weaker than the English 102 results (assessed 2016-2017). Exact comparison cannot be made, but this year's lower percentage may be due to assessors examining essays at levels higher than a first-semester composition course instead of the SLO's "introductory" level. We will continue to watch this measure and consider revising it to stress the SLO's introductory component related to documentation.

Measure 6: The paper demonstrates the students' ability to ANALYZE material effectively and appropriately.
[101, SLO1 and SLO6]

A) RESULTS: 61% of the essays successfully met this measure. Specifically, 55 of the 90 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.

B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target was not met. Comparison to last year's data is not possible, nor is comparison to previous years' data due to the new sequence being implemented in 2016. However, knowing that the new sequence focused more on analysis, the low percentage shows that that continues to need work. The low percentage may be the result of variation in assignments and assessors' interpretation of amount of and kinds of analysis that essays needed. We will continue to watch this measure while considering ways to strengthen instruction of analysis.

Measure 7: The paper demonstrates that student can control SURFACE FEATURES such as syntax, grammar, and punctuation.
[101, SLO7]

A) RESULTS: 81% of the essays successfully met this measure. Specifically, 73 of the 90 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.

B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target was met. Comparison to last year's English 102 is not possible, nor is comparison to previous years' data due to the new sequence being implemented in 2016.

The seven measures and data results show that students are generally meeting the SLOs affiliated to our ENG 101 course. Five out of the seven measures met the target of 75% this academic year. The two measure not met include Measure 5 (related to documenting sources) and Measure 6 (related to analysis).

After looking at the complete (coded) data for our direct assessment, decoding the data allows for a closer look at the ENG 101 course and the ENG 101E course. The below chart offers a comparative:

2017-2018 Assessment of 101 and 101E	Combined	101	+/-	101E	+/-	Comparison
Measure 1: Audience	77%	84%	+7	69%	-8	15% diff
Measure 2: Organize	78%	82%	+4	73%	-5	09% diff
Measure 3: Argument	78%	82%	+4	73%	-5	09% diff
Measure 4: Reference	82%	87%	+5	78%	-4	09% diff
Measure 5: Document Sources	58%	62%	+4	53%	-5	09% diff
Measure 6: Analysis	61%	73%	+12	49%	-12	24% diff
Measure 7: Surface Features	81%	87%	+6	76%	-5	09% diff

This chart is not meant to determine whether or not ENG 101 and ENG 101E met the measures separately. Rather, decoding and examining the courses separately offers more insight into our program. When examining the chart, it is clear that the ENG 101E cohort holds lower percentages across the board, yet the course is not drastically different and holding its own. The chart indicates that the largest disparity between the two cohorts is that analysis measure (Measure 6); the chart also shows a higher disparity related to audience (Measure 1). Furthermore, neither ENG 101 nor ENG 101E met Measure 5 (Document Sources) or Measure 6 (Analysis). Thus, focusing more on analysis and audience in ENG 101E will prove beneficial while simultaneously focusing on documentation.

2. *Indirect Assessment: 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 we began using them in the 2016-2017 academic year, some questions were revised in 2017 for clarification. 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 benchmarks are in the process of being set.

In addition, the report includes corresponding keys to relate back to the English 101 and 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 SLOs to offer informative data about our recently implemented courses, the directed self-placement method, and the writing studio component—all of which reveal insight and possible areas for improvement.

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: 95.03%
        English 101:   93.7%
        English 102:   92.25%

B) DISCUSSION: The extended version of that first semester course, again, ENG 101E, indicated the highest assistance in their instructor's feedback helping. All classes indicate that students are benefiting from their instructors feedback. Compared to last year's data, each class had an increase, although not significant. The average between the three is at 93.66%.

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: 79.28%
English 101:   85.31%
English 102:   82.95%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are comparable to last year's data. Specifically, last year's survey indicated 83.72%, 81.31%, 80.87% respectively. This year's survey results indicate that 28.37%, 36.01%, and 41.86% identify as "very" confident respectively in ENG 101E, ENG 101, and ENG 102, which averages to about 35%. This average is similar to last year's; however, 101E saw a 4% decline while the other two classes saw increases.

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: 81.56%
English 101:   85.32%
English 102:   82.94%

B) DISCUSSION: The average for the courses is 83%, a 3% increase from last year's average. We saw over a 9% increase in ENG 102 while the other courses fluctuated by about 3% in either direction.

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: 88.65%
English 101:   89.86%
English 102:   88.37%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year's data. The average for all three courses is about 89%, which is the same average for last year.

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: 90.07%
        English 101:   89.4%
        English 102:   93.65%

    B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are not significantly different from last year's data; however, we did see a slight increase. Specifically, the average this year is 91.04% compared to last year's average on 87.96% (equating to about a 3% increase). Both ENG 101 and ENG 102 saw an increase of over 5%.

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: 77.14%
        English 101:   80.07%
        English 102:   83.72%

    B) DISCUSSION: While the wording of this survey question was revised, last year's survey had similar, although slightly lower, results. The average from this year's data is about 80%, which shows a 5% increase.

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: 86.53%
        English 101:   83.22%
        English 102:   91.47%

    B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year's data. Both averages are 87%. Thus, the data this year indicates that students are learning and applying various research methods at a high rate in all of their composition courses, and that percentage has been highest in ENG 102 both years, which is the course that emphasizes research and research methods more.

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: 80.25%
         English 101:   86.71%
         English 102:   89.15%

       B) DISCUSSION: The results show that students are summarizing others' ideas at a high percentage. The average is about 85%, which is about a 3% increase from last year.

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: 67.14%
         English 101:   76.57%
         English 102:   85.28%

       B) DISCUSSION: This year's average is about 76%, which is similar to last year's average. We saw increases connected to ENG 101 and ENG 102, but about a 13% decline related to ENG 101E.

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: 62.86%
         English 101:   70.28%
         English 102:   79.84%

       B) DISCUSSION: The average is about the same as last year's data, being about 71% this year (1% higher than last year). We saw a 10% increase in ENG 102. However, we will continue to highlight the need to work 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: 79.19%
English 101:   86.01%
English 102:   84.54%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year's. This year's results indicate an average of 83%, which is an insignificant increase of 1%.

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

A) RESULTS:
English 101E: 53.58%
English 101:   63.99%
English 102:   72.87%

B) DISCUSSION: We revised the survey question for this year, and we still see numbers being lower than we'd like. This may be due to students' not understanding what is meant by "rhetorical strategies" 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: 95%
English 101:   94.41%
English 102:   92.25%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year's data with this year's average being 93.89% (about 2% higher than last year's average). The "very helpful" category results were at 57.86%, 51.75%, and 60.47% 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:   93.79%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers show an increase from last year's data. The "very useful" category results were at 78.29%. This is about a 13% increase from last year's data. 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	83.69%	81.82%	79.84%
Completed a rough draft	84.4%	93.01%	90.7%
Participated in a peer-review process	88.65%	76.22%	86.05%
Reviewed feedback from peer or instructor	88.65%	89.51%	88.37%
Made revisions that went beyond correcting grammar	80.85%	83.22%	77.52%
Visited the Writing Center for assistance	41.13%	36.71%	34.11%
Edited my work for grammatical and mechanical errors	80.85%	82.87%	79.84%
Proofread my work	76.6%	84.97%	78.29%
Read my work out loud	43.97%	45.8%	38.76%
Reflected on writing and/or writing process after completing it	62.41%	60.49%	62.79%

B) DISCUSSION: 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. Numbers are similar to last year's data. The lowest percentage that extends to our course SLOs relates to students' reflection about their writing processes or products with marks of 62.41%, 60.49%, and 63.79% respectively; thus, we continue to see that there is room for improvement.

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: 85.82%

English 101:   92.31%
English 102:   89.15%
Average: 89%

B) DISCUSSION: Slight variations exist within each course from last year's results. However, the average remains at 89% this year, which is the same average from last year's results and similar to previous years' data related to our former sequence (chart below):

	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: 75%
English 101:   86.37%
English 102:   83.72%
Average: 81.7%

B) DISCUSSION: While the average is similar to last year's (which was 80.31%), we saw a decrease related to ENG 101E (which was 86.82% last year). ENG 101 increased from 81.58%, and ENG 102 increased from 72.51%. Data from former years (2010-2015), which is charted below, indicate that numbers are comparable with that 75% being on the lower end of satisfaction:

	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: 80.65%

B) DISCUSSION: The writing studio component is part of the ENG 101E course, which students self-selected. Since this curriculum is new, there is only one previous year of data for comparison; however, our former sequence did have its own course ENG 111 which had a writing lab requirement; data for the past seven years (2010-2015, 2016) ranges from 81% to 87%. Thus, while the writing studio as a self-selection option is new and while this year's data is about 4% lower than last year's data, which was at 85%, the results this year are within the general range of attitudes related to our previous structure.

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: 76.59%

B) DISCUSSION: This is about 7% lower than last year's data. The number does not raise a concern, as it still 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: 97.83%
English 101:   99.65%
English 102:   96.12%
Average: 97.87%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year's data. Again, while these numbers are high and are indicative that students recognize the value of the small class size, the percentages related to "greatly helped" were high, respectively being 69.06%, 77.39%, and 73.64%. I should note that the ENG 101E did drop from last year's 81% mark related to "greatly helped"; however, the drop combined with the "somewhat helped" mark kept the number similar to last year's data. The overall average continues to convey that our switch to smaller class sizes is successful from students' perspectives.

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

A) RESULTS:

	ENG 101E	ENG 101	ENG 102
The small class size helped because it gave me more time to work with my professor.	69.50%	71.68%	75.97%

The small class size helped because it allowed more group work during our class.	56.03%	50.35%	51.94%
The small class size helped to make me feel more a part of a writing community.	43.97%	48.95%	44.96%
The small class size helped because it played a role in the amount of feedback I obtained from my peers and professor.	72.34%	78.67%	71.32%
The small class size helped because it allowed more time to work on my specific needs.	58.87	61.54%	58.14%
The small class size helped me in other ways not listed above.	34.04%	31.16%	33.33%
I do not believe that the small class size played any role in my writing and learning experiences.	08.51%	07.69%	05.43%

B) DISCUSSION: Students overwhelmingly value the small class and view it as being instrumental in their experience—from playing roles in the amount of feedback to more individualized attention. Only an average of 7.21% noted that the class size was unimportant in their learning and writing experiences; thus, about 93% view the small class as being highly valuable.

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: 89.93%
English 101:   94.14%

B) DISCUSSION: Students self-selected into either English 101E/101L or English 101, and again, students overwhelmingly felt as if their selection was the best fit for their success as a writer. This is the second year of implementation and the second year that students have overwhelmingly felt as if their self-placement was successful. Last year, the average was 88.7% whereas this year, the average is 92.04%, which is about a 3.3% increase.

Action Items

This section will cover improvements made this 2017-2018 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 2017-2018 initiatives, 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 the analysis of this year's assessment data. These planned action items will be carried out the next academic year.

2017-2018 Improvements and Initiatives:

Below is a list of our program improvements and initiatives that occurred this academic year based on former assessment results and planned action items aimed at improvement:

1. Related to the fall 2016 implementation of our two-semester composition sequence, it was vital to review students' who had not yet met their composition requirements, emailing them to ensure that students and advisors were aware of how students' outstanding composition requirements and how to fulfill those as it relates to our new sequence.

2. 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 Chaon's *You Remind Me of Me* and Haigh's *Baker Towers*. The authors met with our composition students during the Pee Dee Fiction and Poetry Festival. In the spring, the supplemental text was *Black Man in a White Coat* by Damon Tweedy, who was the Hunter Series Speaker, and students were able to discuss the book with her at the colloquium and lecture.

3. As part of the Hunter Series, three faculty (Clemons, England, and Spear) worked with four ENG 102 students to oversee a student-led "Poster and Panel Session" where their undergraduate researched posters inspired by Tweedy's text were shared with the public.

4. The First-Year Writing Advisory Committee finalized and approved the end-of-the-semester pilot for English 101 to serve as a possibility and basis for our assessment method.

5. The First-Year Writing Advisory Committee revised all pilot assessment documents, presented them to the department, who voted and approved our two-year assessment procedure on March 8, 2018. This procedure will begin fall 2018.

6. We are continuing to add faculty instructional resources on our shared Composition Studies Blackboard site, including but not limited to sample assignments, supplemental readings, and helpful websites. Last year, we had an action item of adding resources to help with researching, writing thesis statements, and incorporating reflection-based writing.

7. Similar to last year, we celebrated the National Day on Writing in October by overseeing a campus-wide event where faculty and students could pause and write for 15 minutes. We had 13 faculty members across 5 disciplines participate.

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. We held an awards ceremony and reception in April to honor these 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 publish their writing in next year's *Final Draft* text. The eight featured authors and one symposium winner were recognized at our departmental awards ceremony alongside our award recipients.

10. As part of last year's action items, we held a fall pedagogical workshop related to reflection appropriately titled "On Reflection" (10/2017), and our spring workshop was in response to faculty's requests and titled "Active Learning" (02/2018). Twelve faculty attended October's workshop, and eleven attended in February.

11. In response to changes with publishers' textbooks, we had two "Lunch & Learns" where Cengage and Pearson spoke to our faculty about their new adoption innovations.

12. In conjunction with survey data, the First-Year Writing Advisory Committee voted to remove the required text *Prentice Hall Reference Guide* and will begin reviewing cheaper manual options in efforts to put together a list of recommended manual options.

Action Items Based on the 2017-2018 Assessment Results:

Our assessment data this year reveals that program initiatives were successful. Specifically, we met 5 of the 7 measures. Based on our direct and indirect 2017-2018 assessment results, we have identified the below action items as part of our planned improvements for this upcoming year:

1. In our direct assessment, we did not meet our target of Measure 5, related to students' ability to document appropriate sources. Thus, we will look at the wording of that measure and will focus on finding and adding resources for faculty that aid documenting sources. In addition, committee efforts of creating a list of recommended writing manuals will help.

2. We did not meet our target of Measure 6, related to students' ability to analyze material effectively and appropriately. We will focus on adding additional resources for faculty to help with their teaching of analysis and will explore holding a faculty workshop related to analysis.

3. Our indirect assessment this year revealed that students continue to lack confidence in creating thesis statements; thus, to continue to help improve that area, we will continue to add faculty resources on writing thesis statements, in general, and on writing argumentative thesis statements. This particular action item carries over from last year's action items, where last year's assessment data showed similar marks. Specifically, student surveys in 2017-2018 show that 76% of students feel confident in the ability to write thesis statements while about 71% feel confident with their argumentative thesis statements. The previous year's data indicated students' confidence at about 77% and 70% respectively.

4. 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 60.5%-64% depending on

the course); thus, we will continue to add faculty resources to our shared Blackboard related to reflection. This action item carries over from last year. We did hold a pedagogical workshop related to reflection and did see an improvement in percentages, but we will continue to work with faculty on ways to improve connections to reflection.

5. Our indirect assessment from this year again shows that students lack confidence in their "ability to write with effective rhetorical strategies." This was an action item last year, which led us to revising the survey question for clarify. Despite the revision, students' continue to indicate a lack in confidence (ranging from about 54%-73%). Thus, we will continue to work with faculty to improve students' comfort levels with their ability to write with effective rhetorical strategies and will solicit activities or resources that we could add to our shared faculty Blackboard site.

6. Last year's direct assessment indicated that the ENG 102 Measure 4, related to integrating sources was not met. Specifically, 72% of the English 102 portfolios successfully met this measure. Since we performed a direct assessment on ENG 101 this academic year, we will carry over this action item and will review the results the next time we directly assess ENG 102. In the interim, we will continue to add resources for faculty that aid in the integration of sources and will solicit activities that faculty use to teach the integration of sources.

7. When decoding the direct assessment to compare the ENG 101 and ENG 101E cohorts, percentages related to ENG 101E were generally lower. The larger disparities related to analysis and audience. Thus, we will make sure that faculty are aware of this and will work with ENG 101E faculty to see what resources we could add to our shared faculty space.

Appendix

Please find the below additional materials attached:

Appendix A: FMU's General Education and the Composition Program: Academic year 2017-2018

Appendix B: COMPOSITION 101/101E/102 SEQUENCE

Appendix C: ENG 101 – Analysis and Argument – Pilot Assessment Procedure: Collection of End-of-the-Semester Paper from ENG 101/101E Courses

Appendix D: SLOs Rubric for ENG 101 Pilot Assessment

Appendix A:

FMU's General Education and the Composition Program:
Academic Year 2017-2018

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.

While we recognize FMU's Composition Program's vital role in FMU's General Education requirements and view its four programmatic goals as being tied to these goals, there are two General Education goals to which the composition program is closely linked:

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

Program Assessment and
Extension to General Education Goals

Our Composition Program goals unfold in conjunction with individual course student learning outcomes. In the academic year 2017-2018, the program pulled from indirect and direct assessments. Specifically, 556 composition students, or about 71% of fall composition students taking any composition course, participated in a writing attitude survey. In addition, we performed a direct assessment of our ENG 101. Our end-of-the-semester direct assessment of ENG 101 consisted of 90 randomly selected papers from 18 sections of ENG 101. For a complete explanation of the assessment methods, refer to the English Composition Program's

Institutional Effectiveness Report: Academic Year 2017-2018. That report also contains the program's mission as well as the results of direct and indirect assessment.

In order to assess the above General Education goals, our First-Year Advisory Committee created and assessed those same 90 randomly selected essays based on the below measures:
- GE-SLO 1a: The paper(s) demonstrate(s) that the student can write English clearly, logically, and effectively.
- GE-SLO 1b: The paper(s) demonstrate(s) that the student can write English creatively (or stylistically).
- GE-SLO 9: The paper(s) convey(s) that the student can reason logically and critically in relation to their research and composition skills.

Again, papers were scored on a 4-point scale where 4 excelled at meeting the SLO, 3 satisfied the SLO, 2 partially met the SLO, and 1 failed to meet the SLO. With this being our pilot year to assess the General Education goals in this manner, we do not yet have baselines and will use this pilot to establish such. In addition, we recognize that this assessment does not account for the different layers in which the paper may be assessed in relation to the General Education goals and that the data may be skewed, limiting the assessment in this manner. As a result, we are making our target lower than our program target, setting it at 70%. The assessment method mirrored our programmatic assessment. When two or more scores deviated by more than one point, the essay had a third read; seven essays had third reads.

GE-SLO 1a: The paper(s) demonstrate(s) that the student can write English clearly, logically, and effectively.
A) RESULTS: 77% of the essays successfully met this measure. Specifically, 69 out of the 90 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target was met. No discussion needed.

GE-SLO 1b: The paper(s) demonstrate(s) that the student can write English creatively (or stylistically).
A) RESULTS: 43% of the essays successfully met this measure. Specifically, 39 out of the 90 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 particular SLO 1 was divided into an (a) and (b) category by the committee as we thought that it might be hard for assessors to accurately assess based on that "creatively" wording. However, there may also be some correlation to students' lack in confidence to write with "effective rhetorical strategies" (something we saw with the indirect assessment of the program). We will continue to watch this to determine whether or not we feel as if we can assess this measure accurately. In addition, action items related to helping to improve students' ability to write with effective rhetorical strategies extends to this and will double as an action item related to this GE-SLO 1b as well.

GE-SLO 9: The paper(s) convey(s) that the student can reason logically and critically in relation to their research and composition skills.
A) RESULTS: 73% of the essays successfully met this measure. Specifically, 66 out of the 90 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
B) TARGET ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The target was met. No discussion needed.

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, analyze, and create 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, analyze, and create 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 101: Analysis and Argument – Pilot Assessment Procedure: Collection of End-of-the-Semester Paper from ENG 101/101E Courses

Unmarked Copies Due to the Composition Coordinator by ___ [Friday of exams]___

This guide is for English faculty teaching English 101 or English 101E to aid in the collection of papers for our program assessment. The selected and submitted end-of-the-semester paper does not have to be the final exam of your course, but it (or its revision) could become either the final exam of the course <u>or</u> a portion of the final exam upon your discretion. The percentage weight of that paper is determined by each instructor.

Faculty should be prepared to submit unmarked copies of one *end-of-the-semester paper* from their English 101 courses. To be considered as an end-of-the-semester paper, it should have been completed by the student after week 10 of the course. These papers may be final products or revised versions of an earlier paper. If you are asking students to revise the paper (as part of your course), then we ask that that revision is the version that you submit for program assessment purposes.

Between week 10 and week 15, you will receive a list of randomly selected student names for each ENG 101 or ENG 101E section. Those names are the students for whom you will pull papers; next, you will remove identifiers (such as names/course/section numbers) and submit a selected essay from each student for program assessment. On that list of randomly selected students, you will have at least two alternate names in case any randomly selected name/paper is not available, incomplete, or plagiarized. If you need more alternates, contact the Composition Coordinator.

When you submit your section's papers, we ask that you attach your assignment *and* a cover sheet to the top of each paper. Doing so will clarify the assignment's purpose and intended audience for our assessors. Additional submission instructions will be provided at a later date.

When selecting what paper you will use for program assessment, we ask that you abide by the requirements below to help us standardize our program assessment. Thus, the submitted papers should demonstrate the student's ability to
- Develop ideas and content appropriate to a specific rhetorical situation;
- Establish a strong thesis and developed paragraphs within the larger organization of the essay;
- Analyze material (another text or rhetorical situation) as appropriate;
- Create an argument that conveys developed content and employs research methods as appropriate; and
- Rely on rhetorical writing strategies which highlight control of surface features such as syntax, grammar, and punctuation.

If you have any question as to whether or not your selected assignment would be an appropriate option for this program assessment or if you have difficulty in selecting the assignment, please feel free to talk with one of the composition coordinators or any member of our First-Year Writing Advisory Committee. We will happily listen to any concerns and advise which of your already in-place assignments may fit best.

Appendix D:

SLOs Rubric for ENG 101 Pilot Assessment

Papers are read and assessed based on the below criteria, created from the course student learning outcomes. Scores are assigned to the paper based on (at least) two assessors' blind reviews.

Note: Due to various assignments and instructors, measures often include the phrase "as appropriate" to allow assessors to discern whether the student met a particular measure based on what would be appropriate for that student's particular paper's purpose, audience, and assignment.

Student Learning Outcomes for **ENG 101**

8. Understand rhetorical situations, analyzing audience and purpose in order to compose in multiple genres
9. Develop ideas and content appropriate to specific rhetorical situations, establishing control of thesis, paragraphs, and larger organization of the essay
10. Develop drafts and revise writing based on feedback from others, recognizing that writing involves collaboration with others
11. Write about and reflect on the strengths and weakness of their own reading and writing processes
12. Understand and employ research methods at an introductory level, documenting sources appropriately
13. Read, analyze, and create arguments with an awareness of rhetorical situations, exploring persuasive strategies and possible consequences
14. Enhance language skills, establishing control of surface features such as syntax, grammar, and punctuation

Measure 1: The paper demonstrates the student can produce writing for a specific AUDIENCE.
[101, SLO1 and SLO6]

> **4-** Excels. Student appeals to a specific audience, making effective rhetorical moves within the composition.
> **3-** Satisfies the measure. Student demonstrates a general 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.
> **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 2: The paper demonstrates the student's ability to ORGANIZE content.
[101, SLO2]

> **4-** Excels. Student demonstrates the ability to develop an essay that has a clear beginning, middle, and end. Each idea flows logically to the next and fits logically into the whole. Student's writing demonstrates discernable organizational patterns appropriate to the subject and the purpose.

3- Satisfies the measure. Student demonstrates the ability to develop an essay that has a clear beginning, middle, and end. Most ideas flow logically and fit logically into the whole. Student's writing demonstrates some organizational patterns appropriate to the subject and the purpose.

2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student demonstrates the ability to develop an essay that has a beginning, middle, and end. Some ideas flow logically and fit logically into the whole. Student's writing may not demonstrate the use of organizational patterns appropriate to the subject and the purpose.

1- Fails to satisfy the measure. Student does not demonstrate the ability to develop an essay with a clear beginning, middle, and end. Ideas do not flow logically and/or logically fit into the whole. Organization patterns are not appropriate for audience and purpose.

Measure 3: The paper demonstrates the student can create an ARGUMENT.
[101, SLO6 and SLO1]

4- Excels. Student establishes clear, insightful claims that construct a well-reasoned argument and thoroughly supports those claims with appropriate and specific evidence.

3- Satisfies the measure. Student establishes clear claims that develop the argument and adequately supports those claims with appropriate and specific evidence.

2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student establishes claims that partially develop the argument and/or offers claims that may be confusing or may rely on underdeveloped evidence.

1- Fails to satisfy the measure. Student fails to establish claims that develop the argument and/or does not support the claims with appropriate evidence.

Measure 4: The paper demonstrates the student's ability to REFERENCE at least one text (visual or textual) or rhetorical situation.
[101, SLO5]

4- Excels. Student references at least one text (visual or textual) or rhetorical situation, clearly and effectively, and engages with and integrates that text or situation appropriately (as deemed by paper's purpose or assignment). In doing so, student conveys effective skills related to working with sources at an introductory level.

3- Satisfies the measure. Student references at least one text (visual or textual) or rhetorical situation adequately (as deemed by paper's purpose or assignment). Student's engagement with or integration of text or situation conveys satisfactory skills, but lacks polish or development.

2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student attempts to reference at least one text (visual or textual) or rhetorical situation (as deemed appropriate by paper's purpose or assignment), yet engagement with or integration of text or situation is muddled or underdeveloped, negatively affecting the readability of paper or distinction of voice or purpose.

1- Fails to satisfy the measure. Student shows little to no evidence of referencing at least one text (visual or textual) or rhetorical situation (as deemed appropriate by paper's purpose or assignment) or little to no engagement with text or situation.

Measure 5: The paper demonstrates the student's ability to DOCUMENT appropriate SOURCES correctly.
[101, SLO5]

4- Excels. Student demonstrates correct and effective citations of appropriate sources (as deemed by paper's purpose or assignment), 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 and convey introductory skills for documenting appropriate sources.

2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student shows an attempt at citing appropriate sources, yet citations are incomplete or confusing, or some of the sources cited are inappropriate for the writing task or purpose.

1- Fails to satisfy the measure. Student shows little to no attempt at citing appropriate sources (when paper's purpose or assignment calls for such); citations are either substantially incorrect or missing completely, or most or all the sources used are inappropriate for the writing task.

Measure 6: The paper demonstrates the students' ability to ANALYZE material effectively and appropriately.
[101, SLO1 and SLO6]

4- Excels. Student effectively analyzes material in a persuasive and thoughtful fashion (as appropriate to paper's purpose or writing task).

3- Satisfies the measure. Student effectively analyzes material in a somewhat persuasive fashion but may lack insight.

2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student shows some analysis of material, but that analysis relies too heavily on summary or description or is at times inappropriate to the paper's purpose or writing task.

1- Fails to satisfy the measure. Student shows little to no analysis of material or that analysis is ineffective and/or inaccurate.

Measure 7: The paper demonstrates that student can control SURFACE FEATURES such as syntax, grammar, and punctuation.
[101, SLO7]

4- Excels. Student demonstrates consistent and effective control of grammar and punctuation while usually displaying sophisticated syntax.

3- Satisfies the measure. Student demonstrates mostly effective control of grammar and punctuation while often displaying sophisticated syntax.

2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student demonstrates only minor control of grammar and punctuation and/or often uses unclear or simplistic syntax.

1- Fails to satisfy the measure. Student does not demonstrate control of grammar and punctuation and/or consistently uses extremely unclear or simplistic syntax.