Name of Program/Department:	English Composition Program / Department of English, Modern Languages, and Philosophy
Academic Year:	2018-2019
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 2018-2019 academic year is our third year of implementation and first year of implementing our two-year assessment procedure, voted on by the department and approved spring 2018. Our composition program 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 2018-2019 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 2015-2016 assessment affirmed our program changes while the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 assessment results proved that our implementation and changes were successful. Specifically, the 2016-2017 assessment revealed that we met 6 of the 7 benchmarks, and the one benchmark that was not met (Measure 4, on integration of sources) went up by 2% the following year. The 2018-2018 assessment revealed we met 5 of the 7 benchmarks; the two not met included Measure 5 (related to documenting sources) and Measure 6 (related to analysis). Indirect assessments for both 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 academic years generally showed an increase from (or similarity with) previous years' data (when possible comparisons could be made). I mention the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 assessment results in detail as these two years were part of a two-year pilot assessment that led to the two-year assessment procedure implemented this academic year.

To explain, this 2018-2019 academic year's assessment is part of a two-year assessment procedure developed by our First-Year Writing Advisory Committee and approved by the department (rotating direct assessment between our composition courses each year). This 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). This year's direct assessment of student writing consists of an end-of-the-semester portfolio, assessed and based on measures that link to the student learning outcomes for the English 102 course. Specifically, our ENG 102 direct assessment uses 7 measures that map to our English 102 course student learning objectives. While comparisons to previous years' findings are not exact, some general comparisons may be made when possible and applicable.

This year, our direct assessment revealed that we met 7 out of our 7 benchmarks. This year, our indirect assessment shows that students' attitude towards their writing courses are, again, generally positive. Action items from last year (focusing on analysis, documenting sources, thesis statements, rhetorical strategies, and reflection) proved fruitful, as this year's data shows slight increases; however, some action items will be carried over this upcoming academic year. Based on this year's direct and indirect assessment results, our action items for next year will focus on summarizing, crafting argumentative thesis statements, writing with effective rhetorical strategies, and reflecting on writing processes. 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.

This year is the first of a two-year assessment procedure that rotates assessments between English 101/101E and 102 courses. This procedure was developed based on the past two years, where we piloted the procedure and which we referred to as transitional years; those years consisted of students from the former sequence are continuing to satisfy their composition requirements. Thus, the past two years of data did not yield pure data; rather, they assisted in strengthening our program and programmatic assessment. This academic year's assessment is what we consider to include data where most students started and concluded their composition requirements with our new composition sequence. Our two-year rotation assessment will assess English 101 and 101E one year and English 102 the next.

This year's direct assessment was focused on English 102 and relief on a portfolio of papers, keeping the below **ENG 102** Student Learning Outcomes at its forefront:

1. Read and analyze arguments with an awareness of rhetorical situations, exploring persuasive strategies and possible consequences
2. Understand primary and secondary research and use multiple methods to find and evaluate information from a variety of sources
3. Summarize and synthesize multiple sources, integrating others' ideas into original arguments, documenting appropriately

4. Create reasoned and well-supported arguments for specific audiences and in specialized genres
5. Compare and contrast how different communities, including academic discourse communities, discuss and respond to a similar topic or issue
6. Develop and refine voice and style
7. Reflect on and articulate one's own composition choices, conveying rhetorical awareness and ability to transfer skills

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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, this year's assessment and next year's assessment will look at the entire sequence.

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 relied on an end-of-semester portfolio with 35 sections of English 102, totaling 72 portfolios. The assessment involved randomly selected students from each section, where students and sections are anonymized. We will use the past two years' and pilot assessments as baseline data while making comparisons at general levels when possible; comparisons cannot be interrupted as exact because of the 2016 restructuring of the composition program and sequence change. **For the purpose of this report, we will use 75% as a benchmark 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. Future targets are still in the process of being created.**

Procedures: The end-of-the-semester English 102 assessment consisted of collecting portfolios from 72 randomly selected students out of 35 sections of English 102 and 102Honors in spring 2018. These sections were taught by 21 different faculty. (Out of the 35 sections, 5 sections are not included, due to three faculty either neglecting to submit portfolios or submitting portfolios that did not follow our department prompt. With this being our first full assessment, such glitches were anticipated and are minor when reviewing the assessment data.) The assessment relied on the English 102 Assessment Prompt (see Appendix C), which was created and approved by the First-Year Writing Advisory Committee (FWAC).

Students' names and section identifiers were removed in preparation for a blind scoring; thus, readers did not know the names of students or their respective instructors or section numbers.

We had 9 English faculty members participate in the assessment. Each portfolio was read and scored by a minimum of two English faculty using the seven indicated measures and the four-point scoring rubric (where 4 is the highest). In addition, second readers did not have access to first readers' scores, and the portfolios were dispersed systemically to avoid two readers scoring the exact same set of portfolios. Furthermore, prior to the scoring, all 9 assessors participated in a norming session. Also, when the two readers' scores had more than a one-point deviation for more than two measures, the portfolio had a third reader score the portfolio. Out of the 72 essays, 4 portfolios 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.

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. Similarly, comparisons to the previous pilot assessments may be made, but exact comparisons are impossible due to the sequence change and previous years of piloting procedure.

Procedures: The composition program conducted a writing attitude survey among students taking a composition course in the fall 2018 semester. This survey was completed by 588 students out

of our 788 fall composition students, or about 75% of the students. Specifically, we had 165 students in ENGL 101E, 326 students in ENG 101, and 97 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 some students transitioning from the former sequence. **Furthermore, data from these three years will help to determine baselines and targets. For the purpose of this report, we will use last year as the primary baseline, will have an average benchmark of 75%, and will continue to work on future targets.** Significant comparisons, observations, and 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 portfolio. Since the last two years were part of an assessment pilot, we will rely on the last years' of data as general baselines and will use this year's data coupled with the pilot's data to focus on establishing more concrete baselines as our program matures. Thus, 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.

> **Measure 1: The portfolio demonstrates student's successful ability to engage with one or more DISCOURSE COMMUNITIES' discussions and responses to an issue or topic.** [102, SLO5]
>   A) RESULTS: 85% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 61 of the 72 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
>   B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion needed. ENG 102's last direct assessment was 2016-2017; this year's 2018-2019 percentage is up 2% this year.

> **Measure 2: The portfolio demonstrates that student can create a reasoned and well-supported ARGUMENT.** [102, SLO4]
>   A) RESULTS: 82% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 59 of the 72 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
>   B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion needed. ENG 102's last direct assessment was 2016-2017; this year's 2018-2019 percentage is up 2% this year.

Measure 3: The portfolio demonstrates that student can produce writing for a specific AUDIENCE. [102, SLO4]
   A) RESULTS: 82% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 59 of the 72 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
   B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion needed. ENG 102's last direct assessment was 2016-2017; this year's 2018-2019 percentage is up 5% this year.

Measure 4: The portfolio demonstrates that student can INTEGRATE SOURCES from primary and secondary sources as appropriate. [102, SLO3 and SLO2]
   A) RESULTS: 86% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 62 of the 72 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
   B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion needed. ENG 102's last direct assessment was 2016-2017; this year's 2018-2019 percentage is up 14% this year.

Measure 5: The portfolio demonstrates that student can DOCUMENT appropriate SOURCES correctly and effectively. [102, SLO3 and SLO2]
   A) RESULTS: 78% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 56 of the 72 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
   B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion needed. ENG 102's last direct assessment was 2016-2017; this year's 2018-2019 percentage is down 1% this year, which is not a significant enough decrease to cause concern.

Measure 6: The portfolio demonstrates student's developed VOICE and STYLE, employing appropriate rhetorical and persuasive strategies and conventions. [102, SLO6]
   A) RESULTS: 85% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 61 of the 72 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
   B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion needed. ENG 102's last direct assessment was 2016-2017; this year's 2018-2019 percentage is up 9% this year.

Measure 7: The portfolio demonstrates student's TRANSFER KNOWLEDGE, describing the process of composition in other contexts, conveying rhetorical awareness and transfer skills. [102, SLO7]
   A) RESULTS: 81% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 58 of the 72 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
   B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion needed. ENG 102's last direct assessment was 2016-2017; this year's 2018-2019 percentage is up 2% this year.

The seven measures and data results show that students are meeting the SLOs affiliated to our ENG 102 course. Seven out of the seven measures met the benchmarks of 75% this academic year. Data was compared to the academic year 2017-2017 data, which directly assessed ENG 102. In general, we saw increases across most of the measures. The one measure that decreases

only decreased slightly. The increases were substantial and conveyed our sequence changes coupled with our actions items have been successful.

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 data from our pilot assessment as comparative marks when possible and primarily from last year. The benchmark will be an average of 75% for the purpose of this report when a survey question maps to a course SLO; however, more concrete benchmarks and targets 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: 96.97%
        English 101:   95.4%
        English 102:   83.51%

      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, data remains about the same with a decrease in ENG 102 (an 8.7% decrease). The average between the three is at 92% (which is similar to last year's average).

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: 79.40%
        English 101:   83.13%
        English 102:   88.66%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are comparable to last year's data. Specifically, last year's survey indicated 79.28%, 85.31%, 82.95% respectively. This year's survey results indicate that 37.58%, 37.12%, and 42.27% identify as "very" confident respectively in ENG 101E, ENG 101, and ENG 102, which averages to about 38.99%. This average is up 4% from last year's. In addition, the average of both "very" and "mostly" numbers averages to 83.73% (which is up about 1.2%). While these increases are not significant, they convey that our efforts related to focusing on analysis are paying off.

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: 87.88%
English 101:   88.34%
English 102:   79.38%

B) DISCUSSION: The average for the courses is 85%, a 2% increase from last year's average. We saw over a 4% decrease in ENG 102 while the other courses increased about 6% and 3% respectively.

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: 90.91%
English 101:   92.02%
English 102:   87.63%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year's data. The average for all three courses is about 90%, 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: 91. 52%
English 101:   88.96%
English 102:   87.63%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are not significantly different from last year's data; however, we did see a slight decrease in the average. Specifically, the average this year is 89.37% compared to last year's average on 91.04% (equating to about a 1.5% decrease).

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: 79.4%
English 101:   80.06%
English 102:   76.32%

B) DISCUSSION: The average from this year's data is about 77%, which shows a 3% decrease from last year's average. Both 101E and 101 stayed about the same whereas there was about 7.5% decrease in ENG 102.

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: 87.27%
English 101:   87.73%
English 102:   86.60%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year's data with about a 4% increase and decrease respectively in ENG 101 and 102. 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; however, we will monitor the decrease in ENG 102, as that is the class 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: 69.06%
English 101:   82.52%
English 102:   86.59%

B) DISCUSSION: The results show that students are summarizing others' ideas at a decent percentage. The average is about 79%, which is about a 6% decrease

from last year. The biggest decrease occurred in ENG 101E at 11%. While the average is fine, we will highlight the need to work with our lower-level students more with this skill in efforts to increase their confidence.

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

  A) RESULTS:
   English 101E: 80.61%
   English 101: 76.69%
   English 102: 77.32%

  B) DISCUSSION: This year's average is about 78%, which is 2% higher than last year's average. We saw s substantial increases connected to ENG 101E (13.5%), putting it more in line with the 2016-2017 data than last year's.

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: 72.12%
   English 101: 74.54%
   English 102: 78.35%

  B) DISCUSSION: The average went up 4% from last year and is 75% this year. We saw a 10% increase in ENG 101E and about a 4% increase in ENG 101.

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: 84.84%
   English 101: 82.82%
   English 102: 82.47%

  B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year's. This year's results indicate an average of 83%, which is the same average as last year although ENG 101E had a 5% increase while the other two courses had small decreases.

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: 66.67%
English 101:   67.79%
English 102:   69.07%

B) DISCUSSION: While this average remains lower than we'd like at 68%, we saw a 4.5% increase from last year's data. In addition, ENG 101E saw an 13% increase while ENG 101 increased by about 4%. We continue to think that the lower numbers may be due to students' not understanding what is meant by "rhetorical strategies" or lacking confidence in their abilities to employ specific rhetorical strategies. We will continue to consider how to help students better understand the term and make purposeful writing decisions.

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: 90.91%
English 101:   92.64%
English 102:   90.72%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year's data with this year's average being 91.4%. The "very helpful" category results were at 55.15%, 57.98%, and 52.58% respectively, seeing about an 8% decline in ENG 102. With ENG 102's emphasis on students' ability to transfer and apply knowledge beyond their composition courses, there is room for improvement. However, there is no concern with these results.

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

A) RESULTS:

English 102:   91.76%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year's data with an insignificant 2% decrease. The "very useful" category results this year were at 61.86%, which is closer to data two years ago but a decrease of about 16% 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	80.61%	84.66%	82.47%
Completed a rough draft	89.70%	83.44%	84.54%
Participated in a peer-review process	81.82%	76.38%	91.75%
Reviewed feedback from peer or instructor	81.21%	91.10%	84.54%
Made revisions that went beyond correcting grammar	75.76%	83.74%	75.26%
Visited the Writing Center for assistance	32.12%	30.37%	32.99%
Edited my work for grammatical and mechanical errors	82.42%	81.29%	74.23%
Proofread my work	83.03%	82.82%	79.38%
Read my work out loud	47.27%	41.10%	45.36%
Reflected on writing and/or writing process after completing it	63.03%	66.87%	55.67%

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 63.03%, 66.87%, and 55.67% respectively with the same average of 62%; thus, we continue to see that there is room for improvement particularly in ENG 102, where the course ends up a reflective-based assignment.

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: 89.70%
English 101:   92.64%
English 102:   83.51%
Average: 89%

B) DISCUSSION: Again, the average remains at 89% this year for a third year in a row. While the average is similar, it is worth noting that ENG 101E had a 4%

increase this year. In addition, it's also worth noting the similarities 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: 87.88%
   English 101:   87.42%
   English 102:   83.51%
   Average: 86.27%

B) DISCUSSION: While the average is up about 5% from last year, the ENG 102 average remained similar to last year's data while ENG 101E increased this year by about 13%. Data from former years (2010-2015), which is charted below, indicate that numbers are comparable with that 87% being on the higher 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: 86.06%

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 5.5% higher than last year's data, the results this year are within the

general range of attitudes related to our previous structure while being on that higher end of the spectrum.

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

A) RESULTS:
English 101E: 83.03%

B) DISCUSSION: This is about 6.5% increase from last year's data and more in line with data from 2016-2017 academic year. Thus, the number shows that students still view the studio useful in their ENG 101E course.

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

A) RESULTS:
English 101E: 98.18%
English 101:   98.77%
English 102:   94.85%
Average: 97%

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 impressively high, respectively being 76.97%, 80.37%, and 74.23%. I should note that the ENG 101E's "greatly helped" went up 8% from 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.	66.67%	73.62%	73.20%
The small class size helped because it allowed more group work during our class.	46.06%	49.69%	52.58%
The small class size helped to make me feel more a part of a writing community.	45.45%	45.71%	42.27%
The small class size helped because it played a role in the amount of feedback I obtained from my peers and professor.	66.67%	72.39%	58.76%

The small class size helped because it allowed more time to work on my specific needs.	58.79%	56.44%	53.61%
The small class size helped me in other ways not listed above.	36.97%	39.88%	29.90%
I do not believe that the small class size played any role in my writing and learning experiences.	07.88%	07.06%	09.28%

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. We did see a 13% drop in ENG 102 students' opinion related to how the smaller class related to the amount feedback they received from peers and their instructor; thus, we will monitor that to see if there is a pattern. Only an average of 8% noted that the class size was unimportant in their learning and writing experiences; thus, about 92% 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: 94.5%
English 101:   86.2%

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 year, the numbers average at 90% whereas previous years' averages were 92% (2017-2018) and 89% (2016-2017). This is the third year of implementation and the third year in a row that students have overwhelmingly felt as if their self-placement was successful.

The indirect assessment shows that students' attitudes towards the composition courses, their writing processes, and writing skills are generally positive. While most survey questions pulled averaged above 75% when corresponding directly to a course SLO, two survey questions fell below that mark and should be noted—the one related to confidence in students' ability to write with effective rhetorical strategies and the one that inquired whether students reflected on their writing after the fact. In addition, while the average of the survey questions relating to summarizing others' arguments and to developing their own argumentative thesis statements were 75% or above, these two questions had lower marks within at least one of the composition courses. Thus, these four survey questions will assist when developing this year's action items.

Action Items

While assessment data yields insight into areas for improvement, it is also worthy to reflect on the year's initiatives, which resulted in part based on the previous year's assessment results coupled with programmatic strategic plans. In doing so, the program captures an archive of the 2018-2019 improvements and initiatives (see Appendix E) while establishing a foundation for planned improvements. The below outlines the actions items that work to close the loop based on the analysis of this year's 2018-2019 assessment data. These planned action items will be carried out the next academic year.

Action Items Based on the 2018-2019 Assessment Results:

Our assessment data this year reveals that program initiatives were successful. Specifically, we met 7 of the 7 measures in our direct assessment. However, when analyzing our indirect assessment data, we recognized four areas where we could focus on improvement. Thus, based on our direct and indirect 2018-2019 assessment results, we have identified the below action items as part of our planned improvements for this upcoming year:

1. Our indirect assessment this year revealed that students continue to lack confidence in their ability to write with effective rhetorical strategies. This was an action item the past two years; we even revised the survey question slightly in attempts to enhance clarity. However, perhaps the phrase "rhetorical strategies" continues to skew data. Regardless, students continue to indicate a lack in confidence (ranging from about 67%-69%). 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. In addition, we will stress the need to breakdown the phrase and develop a comfort level in recognizing specific rhetorical strategies.

2. 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 56%-67% 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 the past two years. While we held a faculty workshop related to reflection in fall 2017 and have seen increases in percentages, we will continue to work with faculty on ways to improve connections to reflection. We may focus on sharing reflective assignments that may be altered and used throughout the semester.

3. While the average percentage related to creating argumentative thesis statements met the 75% benchmark, we recognize room for improvement with the numbers revealed in our indirect assessment. This particular action item carries over from the past two years. 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. In addition to resources, we will try to add activities that allow students to question, revise, and strengthen their thesis statements during their revision phases in efforts to increase their confidence.

4. Similarly, while the average related to students' confidence in summarizing exceeded the benchmark; particular course(s) had lower percentages. Thus, an action item will relate to

enhancing summary skills. We will plan on holding a pedagogical workshop related to summarizing (or possibly summarizing and analyzing) and/or add faculty resources on our shared site that would assist in focusing more on summary skills in the lower-level courses.

5. Last year's direct assessment on ENG 101 showed that two of the seven measures did not meet the benchmarks; specifically Measure 5 (related to documenting sources) and Measure 6 (related to analysis). Since we performed a direct assessment on ENG 102 this academic year, we will carry over these two action items and will review the results the next time we directly assess ENG 101. In the interim, we will continue to add resources for faculty that aid in documenting sources and analysis skills.

6. Two years ago, the ENG 102 Measure 4, related to integrating sources, did not meet the benchmark. Specifically, 72% of the English 102 portfolios successfully met this measure. This action item carried over, and this year's direct assessment showed an improvement by 14%, averaging at 86% successfully meeting that measure. While we saw a substantial increase, we recognize that documentation and integration of sources are of importance and will continue to solicit activities that faculty use to teach the integration of sources.

Appendix

Please find the below additional materials attached:

Appendix A: FMU's General Education and the Composition Program: Academic year 2018-2019

Appendix B: COMPOSITION 101/101E/102 SEQUENCE

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

Appendix D: SLOs and Rubric for Portfolio ENG 102 Assessment

Appendix E: 2018-2019 Improvements and Initiatives

Appendix A:

**FMU's General Education and the Composition Program:
Academic Year 2018-2019**

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 2018-2019, the program pulled from indirect and direct assessments. Specifically, 588 composition students, or about 75% of fall composition students taking any composition course, participated in a writing attitude survey. In addition, we performed a direct assessment of our ENG 102. Our end-of-the-semester direct assessment of ENG 102 consisted of 72 randomly selected portfolios from 35 sections of ENG 102. For a complete explanation of the assessment methods, refer to the English Composition Program's

Institutional Effectiveness Report: Academic Year 2018-2019. 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 72 randomly selected portfolios 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. Last year, we piloted this method of assessing the General Education goals; thus, we are still in the process of establishing baselines but will use last year's data for general comparisons. However, please note that any comparison is flawed due to the fact that last year was still a part of our two-year programmatic assessment pilot and that last year's direct assessment focused on English 101, whereas English 102 completes the general education requirements. Thus, last year's data gave insight mid-way through the general education composition requirement while this year's data reveals insight at its conclusion. In addition, we recognize that this assessment does not account for the different layers in which portfolios may be assessed in relation to the current General Education goals and that the data may be skewed as a result. Keeping these factors in mind, we are making our benchmark lower than our programmatic benchmark, setting it at 70%. The assessment method and process mirrored our programmatic assessment. In addition, when two or more scores deviated by more than one point, the portfolio had a third read; two portfolios had third reads.

GE-SLO 1a: The paper(s) demonstrate(s) that the student can write English clearly, logically, and effectively.
- A) RESULTS: 92% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 66 out of the 72 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion needed. This was a 15% increase from last year's data.

GE-SLO 1b: The paper(s) demonstrate(s) that the student can write English creatively (or stylistically).
- A) RESULTS: 79% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 57 out of the 72 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion needed. This was a 36% increase from last year's data.

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: 90% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 65 out of the 72 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion needed. This was a 17% increase from last year's data.

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

Due the day of the final exam

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

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

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

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

> <u>Genre</u>: expand on how genre affects your composition process. To get started, consider your responses to the following questions:
> - How has genre, audience, and purpose affected your reading, composition process, and/or writing decisions in and beyond English 102?

- When, how, and why were you particularly aware of genre when reading, writing, and/or researching? Think of specific examples or genres that you encountered in class. What did you learn about genre or analyzing genre, and how would you apply your knowledge or skills in other writing situations?
- How comfortable are you in developing well-supported arguments for specific genres and specific audiences, and why? Bring in specifics from your assignments.
- How might you apply the knowledge and skills you've acquired in English 102 in other writing (or composition) contexts (classes, jobs, personal life, etc.) in the future? Describe your abilities and confidence to compose in other contexts? What other genres might you encounter in those situations? Be specific, and explain the process that you might take for a couple of specific contexts you might encounter in future courses, careers, or other situations outside of school.

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

- How would you explain your research methods and writing strategies for researched work? What strategies do you draw on when writing requires research? What are your goals, criteria, and/or processes when researching? Consider elaborating on specifics related to your ENG 102 research projects.
- When and how do you rely on primary and secondary research? How did specific ENG 102 assignments inform or strengthen your understanding and application of different research methods?
- When and how do you integrate others' ideas into your original arguments? Examples?
- How do you determine what research methods are appropriate and what sources to rely on, draw from, or integrate into your writing?
- What are your strengths and weaknesses with your selected paper that you are submitting as well as with research writing in general? Be specific.
- Give an example from one of your essays that demonstrates your ability to integrate a source and explain why that example illustrates your research abilities.

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

(2) The **selected, polished paper** from your ENG 102 course that integrates sources and contains a works cited should demonstrate your ability to synthesize multiple sources into an original paper that conveys your developed voice and style as a writer. While

this paper should be a polished representation of your research and composition abilities, your individual instructor might ask that you revise an earlier draft. Please follow your instructor's guidelines.

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

Appendix D:

SLOs and Rubric for Portfolio ENG 102 Assessment

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

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

Student Learning Outcomes for **ENG 102**

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

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

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

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

4- Excels. Student establishes clear, 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 3: The portfolio demonstrates that student can produce writing for a specific AUDIENCE.
[102, SLO4]

4- Excels. Student appeals 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.
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 primary and/or secondary sources effectively, using quotes/paraphrases, including attributions and lead-ins, and clearly distinguishing between external sources and the student's own ideas.
3- Satisfies the measure. Student integrates primary and/or secondary sources, clearly distinguishing between external sources and the student's own ideas, although minor improvements with source integration, synthesis, or clear attributions are needed.
2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student integrates primary and/or secondary sources, yet the student may not always clearly distinguish between external sources and the student's own ideas and/or may rely too heavily on either quotes or 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; their integration lacks clarity; and/or the insertion of appropriate material might be confusing, substantially underdeveloped, or disconnected 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 knowledge of the appropriate style (MLA, APA, Chicago, etc.).
3- Satisfies the measure. Student demonstrates satisfactory skills in citing appropriate sources, conveying knowledge of the appropriate style (MLA, APA, Chicago, etc.) with minor errors. These errors do not hinder reader's understanding of cited material.
2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student shows an attempt at citing sources, yet those citations are often incomplete, missing, or confusing, or the sources cited are inappropriate for the writing task.
1- Fails to satisfy the measure. Student shows little to no attempt at citing appropriate sources, including citations that are either substantially incorrect or missing completely. Or most or all the sources used are inappropriate for the writing task.

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

4- Excels. Student demonstrates effective control of stylistic conventions through the use of features such as varied sentence structure, smooth transitions, and appropriate tone and word choice.
3- Satisfies the measure. Student demonstrates awareness of stylistic conventions through the use of features such as varied sentence structure, smooth transitions, and appropriate tone and word choice.
2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student shows some awareness of stylistic conventions through the use of features such as sentence structure, transitions, and appropriate tone and word choice, but the demonstration of these attributes is uneven.
1- Fails to satisfy the measure. Student shows little to no awareness of stylistic conventions and/or student's voice and style interferes with the clarity or reading of the text.

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

4- Excels. Student articulates different steps of the writing process and provides a nuanced discussion of the applications of the rhetorical situation (writer, audience, genre, and purpose) to other courses or contexts.
3- Satisfies the measure. Student discusses the writing process and/or the possible applications of the rhetorical situation (writer, audience, genre, and purpose) to other courses or contexts.
2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student discusses some aspects of the writing process and/or defines or attempts to discuss how the rhetorical situation is applicable to other courses or contexts.
1- Fails to satisfy the measure. Student does not discuss an understanding of the writing process or an application of the rhetorical situation.

Appendix E:

2018-2019 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. 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 Ng's *Little Fires Everywhere* and Lanham's *The Hone Place: Memoirs of a Colored Man's Love Affair with Nature*. An author and panel met with our composition students during the fall Pee Dee Fiction and Poetry Festival and the spring Hunter Series.

2. As part of the Hunter Series, faculty led students on a nature walk on campus, a visit to Huntington Beach, and a creation of a hugelkultur (raised garden bed) on campus. Efforts were primary co-organized by the First-Year Writing Advisory Committee and Hunter Committee, and primary faculty involved included Smolen-Morton, Clark, and Taylor.

3. The two-year assessment procedure (finalized and approved last spring) was implemented this fall 2018.

4. 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 analysis, writing thesis statements, and incorporating reflection-based writing.

5. 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 14 faculty members across 7 disciplines participate.

6. 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.

7. 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. *Final Draft*'s eight featured essays and one event that included four research-based posters and their respective authors were recognized at our departmental awards ceremony alongside our award recipients.

8. The First-Year Writing Advisory Committee finalized and facilitated an image contest for the cover of next year's *Final Draft*.

9. As part of last year's action items, we held a fall pedagogical workshop related to analysis and documentation (11/2018), and our spring workshop was in response to faculty's requests to focus on peer review strategies (02/2019). The latter workshop was part of a collaboration with the Computers & Resources Committee, which held a workshop on online peer-review the following week. All workshops were well attended.

10. In conjunction with survey data the last two years, the First-Year Writing Advisory Committee voted to remove the required text *Prentice Hall Reference Guide* last year and reviewed cheaper manual options this year, putting together a list of recommended manuals.

11. The First-Year Writing Advisory Committee continued to work on enhancing our program's website and virtual image, revising and updating our website, collecting images, etc.