

Name of Program/Department:	English Composition Program / Department of English, Modern Languages, and Philosophy
Academic Year:	2020-2021
Name of Preparer:	Rachel N. Spear, PhD, Composition Coordinator and Associate 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 composition sequence, implemented fall 2016. The 2020-2021 academic year is our fifth year of implementation and third 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 the program mission and program goals in mind.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

FMU’s Composition Program holds four primary goals:

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

These four programmatic goals are closely tied with several of FMU's General Education goals and requirements. The two most overt goals (or portions of those) are listed below:

Goal 1: The ability to compose effectively with rhetorical awareness, integrate relevant research when appropriate, and produce developed, insightful arguments. [Note: The composition program divided this goal into three measures for assessment purposes: 1a, the ability to compose effectively with rhetorical awareness; 1b, the ability to integrate relevant research when appropriate; and 1c, the ability to produce developed, insightful arguments.]

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 third year of a two-year assessment procedure that rotates assessments between English 101/101E one year and 102 courses the next. This procedure was developed based on a two-year pilot during our program's transitional years, meaning that the demographic consisted of students who began their composition requirements with the former sequence. Thus, data collected during those years assisted to strengthen our program and programmatic assessment while we only have data for two years prior under our approved assessment procedure.

This year's direct assessment was focused on English 102 and relied on an end-of-the-semester portfolio, 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.

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 36 sections of English 102, totaling 108 portfolios. The assessment involved randomly selected students

from each section, where students and sections are anonymized. We will use the past years' assessments as baseline data while making comparisons at general levels when possible; exact comparisons are limited due to our two-year rotation and our 2016 programmatic restructuring. **For the purpose of this report, we will use 75% as a benchmark for the direct assessment and will use previous years' results as general baselines. Future targets remain in the process of being created.**

Procedures: The end-of-the-semester English 102 assessment consisted of collecting essays from 108 randomly selected students out of 36 sections of English 102 and 102-Honors in spring 2021. These sections were taught by 16 different faculty. (Out of the 36 sections, 2 sections are not included, due to the faculty either neglecting to submit papers or submitting papers that did not follow our department procedure.) The assessment relied on the English 102 Assessment Procedure (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 12 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 papers were dispersed systemically to avoid two readers scoring the exact same set of portfolios. Furthermore, prior to the scoring, all 12 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 paper had a third reader score it. Out of the 108 portfolios, 6 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 2.49 or greater on the four-point scale.

Assessing 108 portfolios was decided because that number represents over 20% of our English 102 composition students, which is 517 students, from the semester the essays were collected.

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 years' assessments may be made, but exact comparisons will be limited due to the sequence change and previous years of piloting the procedure.

Procedures: The composition program conducted a writing attitude survey among students taking a composition course in the fall 2021 semester. This survey was completed by 283 students out of our 677 fall composition students, or about 42% of the students. Specifically, we had 33 students in ENGL 101E, 230 students in ENG 101, and 20 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. Similar to our direct assessment, exact comparisons are limited due to our 2016 programmatic restructuring. **For the purpose of this report, we will use 75% as a benchmark and will use last year's results as the primary baselines. Targets remain in the process of being created.** 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. We will rely on previous years of data since the implementation as general baselines and will use these to focus on establishing more concrete baselines as our program matures. Thus, when possible, we will draw general comparisons from the applicable previous years' data. As previously stated, we will use 75% as the benchmark, and to calculate percentages, we averaged the scores from the readers and identified those averages that are 2.49 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: 86% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 93 of the 108 had an average score of 2.49 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion is needed. This percentage is comparable to the 2018-2019 mark.

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

- A) RESULTS: 80% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 86 of the 108 had an average score of 2.49 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion is needed. This percentage is comparable to previous years' data, which was 82% and 80% during 2018-2019 and 2016-2018 respectively.

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

- A) RESULTS: 84% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 91 of the 108 had an average score of 2.49 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion is needed. This percentage is up by 2% from the 2018-2019 data,

which was up by 5% from the 2016-2017 data. Thus, we continue to see improvement in this area.

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

- A) RESULTS: 81% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 87 of the 108 had an average score of 2.49 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion is needed. There was a decrease by 5% since the 2018-2019 data, but that data had increased 14% since 2016-2017. Thus, this dip is of no immediate concern.

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

- A) RESULTS: 80% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 86 of the 108 had an average score of 2.49 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion is needed. There was a 2% increase since the 2018-2019 data.

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

- A) RESULTS: 82% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 89 of the 108 had an average score of 2.49 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion is needed. There was a decrease by 3% since the 2018-2019 data, but that data had increased 9% since 2016-2017. Thus, this dip is of no immediate concern.

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: 74% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 80 of the 108 had an average score of 2.49 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was not met. However, this number is so close to that benchmark that there is no immediate concern. There is a 7% decrease since the 2018-2019 data, so we should pay attention to any patterns while also reminding faculty the importance of transfer knowledge. In addition, the committee may want to review the measure and portfolio prompt to determine whether both are asking students to convey this skill, as the issue may very well be connected to wording.

The seven measures and data results show that students are meeting most the SLOs affiliated to our ENG 102 course. While one of the seven measures did not the benchmark of 75% this academic year, all of them were above the 70% which is worthy to note. When comparing data to the academic years 2018-2019 and 2016-2017, which directly assessed ENG 102, we saw the

biggest dip with students' ability to convey transfer knowledge (Measures 7). The deviation may be due to the wording in the prompt itself; however, it should be monitored to ensure that the program is successful in preparing students for composition beyond their composition courses.

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 the surveys for our current composition sequence in 2016-2017, revised some questions in 2017 for clarification, and shortened them, converting them to an electronic format, for this 2020-2021 academic year.

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 the past years' assessments, primarily last year's results, as comparative marks when possible. The benchmark will be an average of 75% for the purpose of this report when a survey question maps directly to a course SLO. Targets are in the process of being set.

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:	97%
English 101:	98%
English 102:	100%

B) DISCUSSION: All classes indicate that students are benefiting from their instructors' feedback. Compared to last year's data, this year's 98% average increased by about 2%.

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:	85%
English 101:	87%
English 102:	85%

- B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are comparable to last year’s data. Specifically, this year’s average is 86% whereas the past two years’ averages have been 81% and 84% respectively; thus, we saw a 5% increase from last year.

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: | 91% |
| English 101: | 94% |
| English 102: | 100% |

- B) DISCUSSION: The average for the courses is 95%, which is a 10% increase from the past two years’ 85% average. The 85% ranges are similar to previous years’ data. Thus, this seems to be a lot higher for this particular question.

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: | 97% |
| English 101: | 97% |
| English 102: | 100% |

- B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are higher than last year’s data. The average for all three courses is about 98%, which is an increase of 7% from 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: | 97% |
| English 101: | 99.6% |
| English 102: | 100% |

- B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are higher than previous years’ data, averaging to be 99% (whereas the past three year’s data has been 91%, 89%, and 91%).

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: 76%
English 101: 80%
English 102: 85%

B) DISCUSSION: The average from this year's data is about 80%, which is comparable to previous years' data, which has been 80%, 77%, and 80%.

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: 91%
English 101: 96%
English 102: 95%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are higher than previous years' data. Specifically, this year's average is 94% compared to the last three years' marks of 89%, 87%, and 87%. Thus, the data this year indicates that students are learning and applying various research methods at a high rate in their composition courses.

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

[ENG 102, SLO 3]

- A) RESULTS:
English 101E: 97%
English 101: 89%
English 102: 90%

B) DISCUSSION: The results show that students are summarizing others' ideas at a strong percentage. The average is about 92%, which is a 13% increase from last year's data. This is substantially stronger when looking at the past couple of years' data, demonstrating that our department's action items dedicated to summary were effective.

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: 67%
English 101: 78%

English 102: 75%

- B) DISCUSSION: The average is 73%, which is a 5% increase from last year’s average. However, these numbers are still lower than desired and will be addressed in this year’s action items.

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: 85%
English 101: 89%
English 102: 85%

- B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year’s. This year’s results indicate an average of 86%, which is a 1% increase from last year.

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: 64%
English 101: 78%
English 102: 80%

- B) DISCUSSION: While this average remains lower than we’d like at 74%, we did see an 8% increase and 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: 100%
English 101: 98%
English 102: 95%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are up 6% from last year’s data with this year’s average being 98%. This is particularly interesting since our direct assessment mark related to transfer knowledge was at 74%. Thus, students are transferring their skills into other contexts more than that direct mark convey.

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: 90%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last years’ data with a small 2% deviation over the past couple of years. This 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	94%	90%	85%
Completed a rough draft	100%	87%	65%
Participated in a peer-review process	64%	73%	75%
Reviewed feedback from peer or instructor	91%	86%	95%
Made revisions that went beyond correcting grammar	88%	84%	90%
Visited the Writing Center for assistance	27%	20%	30%
Edited my work for grammatical and mechanical errors	97%	87%	85%
Proofread my work	91%	92%	90%
Read my work out loud	55%	57%	40%
Reflected on writing and/or writing process after completing it	67%	78%	75%

B) DISCUSSION: Not every item on the chart maps to the course SLOs. The ones that do map to course SLOs show that students continue to engage in process-based writing at high percentages in their composition courses. Numbers are similar to last year’s data or have slight changes. The percentage that extends to our course SLOs relates to students’ reflection about their writing processes or products, and we saw increases across the board for that particular item. We will continue to work on improvements. In addition, the item related to

visiting the Writing Center saw a decrease—perhaps due to Covid-19 and social distancing measures (despite the online availability of tutors).

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

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

A) RESULTS:

English 101E: 94%
English 101: 98%
English 102: 100%
Average: 97%

B) DISCUSSION: This average is up 3% from last year. Previous data revealed this average to be 94% last year and 89% three years prior. Thus, it is worth noting that this is the highest it has been this past decade; see the below cart of the former sequence:

	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: 79%
English 101: 93%
English 102: 100%
Average: 91%

B) DISCUSSION: While the average is up about 4% from last year, the ENG 101E average saw about a 10% decrease from last year. Data from former years (2010-2015), which is charted below, indicate that numbers are 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: 91%

B) DISCUSSION: The writing studio component is part of the ENG 101E course, which students self-select. Since this curriculum is newer, there are only four previous years 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, the general results have been within the general range related to our previous structure while being on that higher end of the spectrum. This particular year, the results are at its highest.

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: 91%

B) DISCUSSION: This is comparable to last year’s data, being the highest it has been since our implementation of the new sequence. Thus, the number shows 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%

English 101: 97%

English 102: 90%

Average: 95%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year’s data. These numbers are high and are indicative that students recognize the value of the small class size. 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.	72%	66%	65%
The small class size helped because it allowed more group work during our class.	24%	28%	40%
The small class size helped to make me feel more a part of a writing community.	33%	45%	45%
The small class size helped because it played a role in the amount of feedback I obtained from my peers and professor.	61%	75.85%	70%
The small class size helped because it allowed more time to work on my specific needs.	52%	62%	45%
The small class size helped me in other ways not listed above.	27%	30%	25%
I do not believe that the small class size played any role in my writing and learning experiences.	09%	08%	15%

B) DISCUSSION: Students continue to 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. An average of 11% (which is a 3% increase from last year’s data) noted that the class size was unimportant in their learning and writing experiences; thus, about 89% view the small class as being highly valuable. This slight drop is insignificant, especially considering the additional logistics associated with COVID-19, meaning that classes might have been online, might have performed less group work, etc.

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: 91%
English 101: 99%

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 95%, which

is a 3% increase from last year. Previous years' averages were 90% (2018-2019), 92% (2017-2018) and 89% (2016-2017). This is the fifth year of implementation and the fifth 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 that corresponds directly to a course SLO averaged above 75%, three survey questions fell below that mark and should be noted—the one related to confidence in students' ability to write with effective rhetorical strategies, the one related to confidence in writing sound argumentative thesis statements, and the one that inquired whether students reflected on their writing after the fact. Thus, these 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 2020-2021 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 2020-2021 assessment data. These planned action items will be carried out the next academic year after being reviewed by both our First-Year Writing Advisory Committee and department in early fall.

Action Items Based on the 2020-2021 Assessment Results:

Our assessment data this year reveals that program initiatives were beneficial while conveying what areas could use some improvement. Specifically, we met 6 of the 7 measures in our direct assessment, and when analyzing our indirect assessment data, we recognized three areas for improvement. Thus, based on our direct and indirect 2020-2021 assessment results, we have identified the below action items as part of our planned improvements for this upcoming year:

1. Our direct assessment revealed that we did not meet the benchmark for Measure 7 (Transfer Knowledge). We will continue to add faculty resources to our Composition Blackboard site and will remind faculty to incorporate assignments that allow students to practice transferring their knowledge. Furthermore, FWAC may revisit the portfolio prompt to see if rewording it would be beneficial. In addition, FWAC may explore articles related to teaching transfer and may use that article as the basis for a future pedagogy workshop.
2. Our indirect assessment continues to reveal that students continue to lack confidence in their ability to write with effective "rhetorical strategies." This has been an action item the past four years despite our efforts of revising the survey question and making faculty aware that the term may have to be explained to students. We will continue to work with faculty to find

ways that might improve students' comfort levels and will continue to solicit activities or resources that we could add to our shared faculty Blackboard site. In addition, FWAC may revisit that survey question to see if editing it or providing a couple samples prior would aid.

3. Our indirect assessment, again, indicates that students feel as if they reflected on their writing and/or writing process at a lower percentage than desired. However, we did see an increase. We will continue to encourage faculty to share their reflective assignments and will inquire to see how they think FWAC could assist them in integrating reflection beyond that final English 102 course reflection. FWAC started developing materials this academic year, but due to canceling our spring pedagogy workshop, sharing those materials with faculty was put on hold. Thus, efforts will resume fall 2021.
4. Our indirect assessment revealed that students continue to possess lower confidence levels with their composition of argumentative thesis statements. While FWAC began efforts in creating faculty resources that may easily be appropriated and integrated into courses, those efforts to share those resources in a workshop was delayed until fall 2021. Thus, we will continue to encourage faculty to share activities that allow students to question, revise, and strengthen thesis statements during the revision phase in efforts to increase their confidence and will continue to develop materials for a fall 2021 workshop.
5. Last year's direct assessment on ENG 101 met the benchmark for three of the seven measures. Thus, those four action items related solely to English 101 (measures 3, argument; 4, reference; 5, document sources; and 6, analysis) will carry over to next year's 101 direct assessment.
6. The 2018-2019 direct assessment of ENG 102 revealed that all measures were met; thus, no action item related to that direct assessment carried over this year.
7. We recognize that COVID-19, social distancing, and an increase in online instruction this year may have affected students and faculty in varying ways. This academic year was the first year to roll out our shortened student attitude survey in an electronic format. The participation rate was lower than desired; thus, a programmatic goal will be to increase that.
8. While we began conversations about online instruction, FWAC will continue to explore how they might better assist any future online composition instruction in efforts to strengthen both faculty and student experiences with virtual platforms and their online experiences.

Executive Summary of Report

This report includes an overview of Francis Marion University's Composition Program's assessment process and outcomes for the 2020-2021 academic year.

In 2016, we implemented our current 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 the program changes while assessment results since have shown that our implementation and changes have been successful.

This 2020-2021 academic year's assessment is the third year 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.

This year, our direct assessment reveals that we met 6 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 beneficial; however, these 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 transfer knowledge, 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 based on our action items and goals.

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.

Appendix

Please find the below additional materials attached:

- Appendix A: FMU's General Education and the Composition Program: Academic year 2020-2021
- Appendix B: COMPOSITION 101/101E/102 SEQUENCE
- Appendix C: ENG 102: Rhetoric, Genre, and Research – Program Assessment Procedure
- Appendix D: SLOs and Rubric for ENG 102 Assessment
- Appendix E: 2020-2021 Improvements and Initiatives

Appendix A:

FMU’s General Education and the Composition Program: Academic Year 2020-2021

Submitted by
Rachel N. Spear, PhD

Coordinator of Composition and Associate 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 is one General Education goal to which the composition program is closely linked:

Goal 1: The ability to compose effectively with rhetorical awareness, integrate relevant research when appropriate, and produce developed, insightful arguments. [Note: The composition program divided this goal into three measures: 1a, the ability to compose effectively with rhetorical awareness; 1b, the ability to integrate relevant research when appropriate; and 1c, the ability to produce developed, insightful arguments.]

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 2020-2021, the program pulled from indirect and direct assessments. Specifically, 283 composition students, or about 42% of fall composition students taking any composition course, participated in a writing attitude survey. In addition, we performed a direct assessment of our ENGL 102. Our end-of-the-semester direct assessment of ENGL 102 consisted of 108 randomly selected portfolios from 36 sections of ENG 102. For a complete explanation of the assessment methods, refer to the English Composition Program’s Institutional Effectiveness Report: Academic Year 2020-2021. 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 108 randomly selected papers based on the below measures:

- Goal-GE-SLO 1a: The portfolio demonstrates the student’s ability to compose effectively with rhetorical awareness.
- Goal-GE-SLO 1b: The portfolio demonstrates the student’s ability to integrate relevant research when appropriate.
- Goal-GE-SLO 1c: The portfolio demonstrates the student’s ability to produce developed, insightful arguments.

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. Since this is a new General Education goal, and thus, our first time assessing it, baselines are not yet available. With this year’s direct assessment being on English 102, our assessment of this general education goal looks at portfolios at the sequence conclusion (whereas the years that assess English 101 offers mid-way insight). The benchmark for the general education goal is set at 75%. The assessment method and process mirrored our programmatic assessment; in addition, it was also grouped into our examination of whether or not a third reader was needed.

GE-SLO 1a: The portfolio demonstrates the student’s ability to compose effectively with rhetorical awareness.

- A) RESULTS: 85% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 92 out of the 108 portfolios 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 is the first time we have assessed this goal; thus, baselines are in process.

GE-SLO 1b: The portfolio demonstrates the student’s ability to integrate relevant research when appropriate.

- A) RESULTS: 82% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 88 out of the 108 portfolios 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 is the first time we have assessed this goal; thus, baselines are in process.

GE-SLO 1c: The portfolio demonstrates the student’s ability to produce developed, insightful arguments.

- A) RESULTS: 81% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 87 out of the 108 portfolios 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 is the first time we have assessed this goal; thus, baselines are in process.

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 or 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:

Rhetoric: 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.

Genre: 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 on 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:

2020-2021 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 “common read” for students in efforts to build community and offer experiential learning opportunities. In the fall, the supplemental text was *The Dark Net* by Benjamin Percy, and the spring’s text was Rebecca Skloot’s *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Slacks*. Due to the pandemic, no author or event connected to the author was held; however, social media posts shared students’ work connected to the common read.
2. Similar to last year, we celebrated the National Day on Writing in October, albeit on a smaller scale and solely virtual due to the pandemic.
3. 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. Our awards ceremony was held in April to honor these writers and other selected writers. Due to the pandemic, space was limited to one guest per student.
4. We held our second “Flash Image Contest” for students to submit photos to be considered for our *Final Draft* cover image. We were able to award that individual a \$50 monetary award in addition to becoming the cover photo.
5. Again, our selected students and their pieces will be published in next year’s composition program’s text titled *Final Draft*.
6. Due to an acquisition (Top Hat purchased Fountainhead), FWAC voted to remain with Top Hat as its publisher and to convert *Final Draft* to an electronic format, which will maintain the cost for students while doubling our royalties.
7. We held a fall pedagogical workshop related to online pedagogy titled “The Pandemic Made Me Do It.” Our spring workshop, which was aimed at sharing FWAC-created resources related to our action items, was postponed to fall 2021.
8. We worked with campus technology to create a report that will easily pull pass/fail/withdrawal numbers along with other useful programmatic data.
9. We converted our student attitude surveys to an electronic format.
10. Now that the program has had a couple years with the new assessment, the program will work on establishing future targets.