

Name of Program/Department:	English Composition Program / Department of English, Modern Languages, and Philosophy
Academic Year:	2019-2020
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 new composition sequence, implemented fall 2016. The 2019-2020 academic year is our fourth year of implementation and second 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.

Executive Summary of Report

This report includes an overview of Francis Marion University’s Composition Program’s assessment process and outcomes for the 2019-2020 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. 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 last academic year. Last year's 2018-2019 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 the previous three academic years generally showed an increase from (or similarity with) previous years' data (when possible comparisons could be made).

This 2019-2020 academic year's assessment is the second 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 paper, assessed and based on measures that link to the student learning outcomes for the English 101 course. Specifically, our ENG 101 direct assessment uses 7 measures that map to our English 101 course student learning objectives. While comparisons to previous findings are not exact, some general ones may be made when possible and applicable.

This year, our direct assessment revealed that we met 3 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, 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 writing arguments, referencing texts, analyzing texts, documenting sources, 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 second 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 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. Last year's assessment was the first year to include data where most students started and concluded their composition requirements with our new composition sequence; in addition, last year's assessment of English 102 started our two-year rotation assessment procedure.

This year's direct assessment was focused on English 101 and relied on an end-of-the-semester paper from the course, keeping the below **ENG 101** Student Learning Outcomes at its forefront:

1. Understand rhetorical situations, analyzing audience and purpose in order to compose in multiple genres
2. Develop ideas and content appropriate to specific rhetorical situations, establishing control of thesis, paragraphs, and larger organization of the essay
3. Develop drafts and revise writing based on feedback from others, recognizing that writing involves collaboration with others
4. Write about and reflect on the strengths and weakness of their own reading and writing processes

5. Understand and employ research methods at an introductory level, documenting sources appropriately
6. Read, analyze, and create arguments with an awareness of rhetorical situations, exploring persuasive strategies and possible consequences
7. Enhance language skills, establishing control of surface features such as syntax, grammar, and punctuation

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

Measure 1: The paper demonstrates the student can produce writing for a specific AUDIENCE.

[101, SLO1 and SLO6]

Measure 2: The paper demonstrates the student’s ability to ORGANIZE content.

[101, SLO2]

Measure 3: The paper demonstrates the student can create an ARGUMENT.

[101, SLO6 and SLO1]

Measure 4: The paper demonstrates the student’s ability to REFERENCE at least one text (visual or textual) or rhetorical situation.

[101, SLO5]

Measure 5: The paper demonstrates the student’s ability to DOCUMENT appropriate SOURCES correctly.

[101, SLO5]

Measure 6: The paper demonstrates the students’ ability to ANALYZE material effectively and appropriately.

[101, SLO1 and SLO6]

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

[101, SLO7]

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

Together, this year’s assessment and last 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 paper with 41 sections of English 101, totaling 115 papers. 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; 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 previous years' 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 101 assessment consisted of collecting essays from 115 randomly selected students out of 39 sections of English 101, 101E, and 101-Honors in fall 2019. These sections were taught by 20 different faculty. (Out of the 41 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. In addition, two essays were pulled during assessment for not meeting the requirements. Such glitches are minor when reviewing the assessment data.) The assessment relied on the English 101 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. In addition, essays were coded to remove their respective course for the assessment and decoded for analyses purposes; thus, assessors had no way of knowing whether the essay was from English 101, English 101E, or English 101-Honors. For the sake of assessing, the honors section became a part of English 101, and decoding allowed comparisons to be made between English 101 and its "extended" version, English 101E.

We had 11 English faculty members participate in the assessment. Each paper was read and scored by a minimum of two English faculty using the seven indicated measures and the four-point scoring rubric (where 4 is the highest). In addition, second readers did not have access to first readers' scores, and the papers were dispersed systemically to avoid two readers scoring the exact same set of papers. Furthermore, prior to the scoring, all 11 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 115 essays, 9 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 2.1 or greater on the four-point scale. This is different from last year's 2.49 or greater average, but not significantly enough to recalculate last year's data; this number was changed in order to capture essays that averaged 2.333 as well.

The 115 essays was decided because that number represents about 20% of our English 101 composition students from the semester that the essays were collected, which 541 students.

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 2019 semester. This survey was completed by 513 students out of our 741 fall composition students, or about 69% of the students. Specifically, we had 121 students in ENGL 101E, 323 students in ENG 101, and 69 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 the 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 four 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 paper. We will rely on previous years of data as general baselines and will use this year’s data with last year’s and 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 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 2.1 or greater on the four-point scale.

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

A) RESULTS: 78% of the papers successfully met this measure. Specifically, 90 of the 115 had an average score of 2.1 or greater on the 4-point scale.

- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion needed. ENG 101's last direct assessment was 2017-2018; this year's 2019-2020 percentage is an insignificant 1% higher than that year.

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

- A) RESULTS: 77% of the papers successfully met this measure. Specifically, 89 of the 115 had an average score of 2.1 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion needed. ENG 101's last direct assessment was 2017-2018; this year's 2019-2020 percentage is down 1% from that year.

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

- A) RESULTS: 71% of the papers successfully met this measure. Specifically, 82 of the 115 had an average score of 2.1 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was not met. This percentage is down 7% from the 2017-2018 data. This percentage may be lower due to each course's submission of different assignments, which may vary in level and type of argument. We will pay attention to this measure to see if this is a trend with 101 and work to strengthen the outcome by making faculty aware of this decrease.

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

- A) RESULTS: 72% of the papers successfully met this measure. Specifically, 83 of the 115 had an average score of 2.1 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was not met. This percentage is down 10% from the 2017-2018 data. This percentage may be lower due to each course's submission of different assignments, which may vary in level and type of "text" references. We will pay attention to this measure to see if this is a trend with 101 and work to strengthen the outcome by making faculty aware of this dip.

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

- A) RESULTS: 70% of the papers successfully met this measure. Specifically, 80 of the 115 had an average score of 2.1 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was not met. However, it is up 12% from the 2017-2018 data, showing progress. The lower percentages may be due to assessors examining essays at levels higher than a first-semester composition course instead of the SLO's "introductory" level. We will continue to watch this measure and consider revising it to stress the SLO's introductory component related to documentation.

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

- A) RESULTS: 64% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 74 of the 115 had an average score of 2.1 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was not met. While this is 3% higher than the 2017-2019 data, knowing that the new sequence focuses more on analysis, the low percentage shows that that continues to need work. The lower percentages may be the result of variation in assignments and assessors’ interpretation of amount of and kinds of analysis that essays needed. We will continue to watch this measure while considering ways to strengthen instruction of analysis.

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

- A) RESULTS: 83% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 96 of the 115 had an average score of 2.1 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion needed. ENG 101’s last direct assessment was 2017-2018; this year’s 2019-2020 percentage is up 2% from that year’s results.

The seven measures and data results show that students are meeting the some of the SLOs affiliated to our ENG 101 course. While three out of the seven measures met the benchmarks of 75% this academic year, most of them were near or above the 70% range with one being lower. Data was compared to the academic year 2017-2018 data, which directly assessed ENG 101. We saw two substantial decreases (Measures 3 and 4) and two substantial increases with (Measures 5 and 6). These deviations may be due to variation in assignments; however, they should be monitored to ensure that the program is successful in preparing students for English 102.

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

2019-2020 Assessment of 101 and 101E	Combined	101	+/-	101E	+/-	Comparison
Measure 1: Audience	78%	80%	+2	74%	-4	06% diff
Measure 2: Organize	77%	80%	+3	71%	-6	09% diff
Measure 3: Argument	71%	74%	+3	65%	-6	09% diff
Measure 4: Reference	72%	72%	+0	74%	+2	02% diff
Measure 5: Document Sources	70%	68%	-2	74%	+4	06% diff
Measure 6: Analysis	64%	68%	+4	56%	-8	12% diff
Measure 7: Surface Features	83%	85%	+2	79%	-4	06% diff

This chart is not meant to determine whether or not ENG 101 and ENG 101E met the measures separately. Rather, decoding and examining the courses separately offers more insight into our program. When examining the chart, it is clear that the ENG 101E cohort holds lower percentages with most measures, yet the course is not drastically different and holding its own. The chart indicates that the largest disparity between the two cohorts is that analysis measure (Measure 6), but that deviation is down significantly from the 2017-2018’s 24% difference. In

fact, all deviations either remained or improved from that 2017-2018 data. Furthermore, the lowest percentages in 101 or 101E fall under Measure 3 (Argument), Measure 5 (Document Sources), and Measure 6 (Analysis); both courses would benefit with additional focuses on analysis, argument, and documenting sources.

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 the past years' assessment, 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 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:	95.87%
English 101:	95.67%
English 102:	95.65%

- B) DISCUSSION: All classes indicate that students are benefiting from their instructors' feedback. Compared to last year's data, this year's 96% average increased by about 4%.

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:	78.51%
English 101:	80.5%
English 102:	84.06%

- B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are comparable to last year’s data. Specifically, last year’s survey indicated 79.40%, 83.13%, and 88.66% respectively. This year’s average is 81% whereas last year’s was 84%. While this is a decrease, it remains similar to previous years’ numbers.

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: | 84.29% |
| English 101: | 87.93% |
| English 102: | 81.16% |

- B) DISCUSSION: The average for the courses is 85%, which is the same as last year’s average. The ranges are similar to previous years’ data.

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: | 93.50% |
| English 102: | 88.41% |

- B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year’s data. The average for all three courses is about 91%, which is an insignificant increase of 1% 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: | 89.26% |
| English 101: | 94.74% |
| English 102: | 88.41% |

- B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are not significantly different from previous years’ data, averaging to be 91% (whereas last year’s average was 89% and the year prior was 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:	74.38%
English 101:	82.97%
English 102:	85.51%

- B) DISCUSSION: The average from this year’s data is about 81%, which shows a 3% fluctuation among the past two year’s data. Specifically, last year’s average was 77% and the year prior was 80%. The data related to this year’s English 102 is up by about 10%.

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:	87.60%
English 101:	88.23%
English 102:	91.30%

- B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year’s data with about a 4% increase in 102 and a 2% increase in the average of the three. Specifically, this year’s average is 89% compared to the last two year’s 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; the years’ slight fluctuation in English 102, which focuses on research and research methods, is not a current concern.

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:	75.55%
English 101:	85.45%
English 102:	76.81%

- B) DISCUSSION: The results show that students are summarizing others’ ideas at a decent percentage. The average is about 79%, which is the same as last year’s average; however, English 102 saw about a 10% decrease. While the average is fine, we will highlight the need to work with our 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:	78.51%
English 101:	77.09%
English 102:	79.71%

B) DISCUSSION: This year’s average is about 78%, which is the same as last year’s average.

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:	66.12%
English 101:	74.61%
English 102:	63.77%

B) DISCUSSION: The average went down by 7% from last year and is 68% this year. We saw 6% and 14% decreases respectively in ENG 101E and 102.

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:	81.82%
English 101:	87.31%
English 102:	85.51%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year’s. This year’s results indicate an average of 85%, which is a 2% increase from last year. Both ENG 101 and 102 saw small increases whereas ENG 101E had a 3% decrease.

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:	61.99%
English 101:	69.97%

English 102: 66.67%

- B) DISCUSSION: While this average remains lower than we'd like at 66%, 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 and may reassess how to revise this survey question again.

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: 90.08%
 English 101: 92.88%
 English 102: 94.20%

- B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year's data with this year's average being 92%. The "very helpful" category results were at 51.24%, 60.68%, and 59.42% respectively. With ENG 102's emphasis on students' ability to transfer and apply knowledge beyond their composition courses, there is room for improvement. However, there is no concern with these results.

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

[ENG 102, SLO 7]

- A) RESULTS:
 English 102: 94.2%

- B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year's data with an insignificant 2% increase. 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	86.78%	83.59%	79.71%

Completed a rough draft	78.51%	84.83%	72.46%
Participated in a peer-review process	60.33%	84.52%	63.77%
Reviewed feedback from peer or instructor	76.03%	90.71%	72.46%
Made revisions that went beyond correcting grammar	71.90%	82.97%	76.81%
Visited the Writing Center for assistance	33.88%	28.17%	17.39%
Edited my work for grammatical and mechanical errors	80.99%	83.59%	78.26%
Proofread my work	78.51%	82.97%	71.01%
Read my work out loud	44.63%	43.96%	39.13%
Reflected on writing and/or writing process after completing it	52.89%	58.51%	53.62%

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. The lowest percentage that extends to our course SLOs relates to students’ reflection about their writing processes or products with marks of 52.89%, 58.51%, and 53.62% respectively with the average of 55%; 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: 95.97%
 English 101: 94.74%
 English 102: 91.30%
 Average: 94%

B) DISCUSSION: This average is up 5% from the past three years. Again, the average remains at 89% this year for a third year in a row. While the average is higher, it is worth noting that ENG 102 had about a 7% increase this year. In addition, it’s also 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: 88.43%
 English 101: 88.54%
 English 102: 86.96%
 Average: 87.98%

B) DISCUSSION: While the average is up about 2% from last year, the ENG 102 average saw a 3% increase from year. Data from former years (2010-2015), which is charted below, indicate that numbers are comparable with that 88% 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: 85.12%

B) DISCUSSION: The writing studio component is part of the ENG 101E course, which students self-selected. Since this curriculum is new, there are only three 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 and while this year’s data is similar to last year’s data, the results are within the general range 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: 90.09%

B) DISCUSSION: This is about 7% increase from last year’s data and is 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: 96.69%
 English 101: 96.90%
 English 102: 98.55%
 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” continue to be impressively high, respectively being 76.03%, 82.97%, and 79.71%. 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.	68.60%	74.30%	79.71%
The small class size helped because it allowed more group work during our class.	40.50%	58.17%	43.48%
The small class size helped to make me feel more a part of a writing community.	40.50%	44.89%	44.93%
The small class size helped because it played a role in the amount of feedback I obtained from my peers and professor.	58.68%	75.85%	62.32%
The small class size helped because it allowed more time to work on my specific needs.	59.60%	62.54%	46.38%
The small class size helped me in other ways not listed above.	39.67%	36.84%	43.48%
I do not believe that the small class size played any role in my writing and learning experiences.	07.44%	07.74%	08.70%

- B) DISCUSSION: Students overwhelmingly value the small class and view it as being instrumental in their experience—from playing roles in the amount of feedback to more individualized attention. Only an average of 8% (which is the same average as last year’s data) 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: 93.33%

English 101: 91.37%

- 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 92% whereas previous years’ averages were 90% (2018-2019), 92% (2017-2018) and 89% (2016-2017). This is the fourth year of implementation and the fourth 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 2019-2020 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 2019-2020 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 2019-2020 Assessment Results:

Our assessment data this year reveals that program initiatives were beneficial while conveying what areas could use some improvement. Specifically, we met 3 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 2019-2020 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 3 (Argument). We will continue to add faculty resources to our Composition Blackboard site for faculty. In addition, we will work with faculty to create handouts or worksheets, such as a color-coded sample argument, that faculty could incorporate into their courses if desired.
2. Our direct assessment revealed that we did not meet the benchmark for Measure 4 (Reference). We will examine the assessment procedure and rubric to see if revising this is needed. In addition, we will explore to find samples of ways to reference texts and/or create in-house handouts/worksheets, encouraging faculty to bring those samples into classes.
3. Our direct assessment revealed that we did not meet the benchmark for Measure 5 (Document Sources). We will continue to add faculty resources to our Composition Blackboard site. In addition, we will work with the Writing Center and/or publishers of the various textbooks to see if they have and/or could create worksheets and/or quizzes that may be integrated into courses if desired. While most publishers do, we would like to simplify the process for faculty who would want to experiment with incorporating such.
4. Our direct assessment revealed that we did not meet the benchmark for Measure 6 (Analysis). We held faculty pedagogy workshops on analysis in 2018-2019 and on analysis and summary in 2019-2020 and will inquire more with faculty where they see students struggling with analysis in their classrooms. We will use that data to aid in building additional faculty resources; one possible resource may be creating a unit or units on analysis that faculty may bring into their classrooms and easily appropriate if desired.
5. Our indirect assessment continues to reveal that students continue to lack confidence in their ability to write with effective “rhetorical strategies.” This was an action item the past three years despite our efforts of revising the survey question, making faculty aware that the term may have to be explained to students. We will continue to work with faculty to improve students’ comfort levels, continuing to solicit activities or resources that we could add to our shared faculty Blackboard site. In addition, we will discuss having our First-Year Writing Committee make a handout with examples of commonly used rhetorical strategies.
6. 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 (ranging from 53%-59% depending on the course). This action item carries over from the past three years despite a fall 2017 faculty workshop and faculty resources that encourage reflection. We will continue to encourage faculty to share their reflective assignments and will inquire to see how they think

the First-Year Writing Advisory Committee (FWAC) could assist them in integrating reflection beyond that final English 102 course reflection. FWAC will also explore including ways to include reflective assignments into our composition textbook, *Final Draft*.

7. Our indirect assessment revealed that students continue to possess lower confidence levels with their composition of argumentative thesis statements. This links to our direct assessment measure related to composing an argument, and we will explore handouts and/or other faculty resources that may easily be appropriated and integrated into courses; we will also 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.
8. Last year's direct assessment on ENG 102 met the benchmark for all seven measures. Thus, no action item related solely to English 102 carries over to next year's 102 direct assessment.
9. We recognize that COVID-19 and FMU's shift to online instruction after Spring Break may have decreased the amount of faculty resources shared and/or uploaded related to last year's action items. In addition, we also recognize that faculty worked hard to create pedagogical materials for their conversion to online instruction. We will encourage faculty to share materials that they may not have had the opportunity to share this past spring as well as to upload any video/resource that may easily work for multiple instructors if they are willing.
10. We will also work with faculty to inquire how the First-Year Writing Advisory Committee might better assist any future online composition instruction in efforts to strengthen both faculty and student experiences with virtual platforms and their online experiences.

Appendix

Please find the below additional materials attached:

Appendix A: FMU's General Education and the Composition Program: Academic year 2019-2020

Appendix B: COMPOSITION 101/101E/102 SEQUENCE

Appendix C: ENG 101: Analysis and Argument – Program Assessment Procedure

Appendix D: SLOs and Rubric for ENG 101 Assessment

Appendix E: 2019-2020 Improvements and Initiatives

Appendix A:

FMU’s General Education and the Composition Program: Academic Year 2019-2020

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 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 2019-2020, the program pulled from indirect and direct assessments. Specifically, 513 composition students, or about 69% of fall composition students taking any composition course, participated in a writing attitude survey. In addition, we performed a direct assessment of our ENG 101. Our end-of-the-semester direct assessment of ENG 101 consisted of 115 randomly selected papers from 39 sections of ENG 101. For a complete explanation of the assessment methods, refer to the English Composition Program’s Institutional Effectiveness Report: Academic Year 2019-2020. 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 115 randomly selected papers 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. We piloted this method of assessing the General Education goals in 2017-2018 and are still in the process of establishing baselines, using previous years' data for general comparisons. Furthermore, results are flawed due to the fact that this year's direct assessment focuses on English 101 whereas English 102 completes the general education requirement. However, assessment of English 101 yields insight mid-way through the general education composition requirement knowing that the 102 direct assessment years will look at the general education curriculum at its conclusion. 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 and was grouped into our examination of whether or not a third reader was needed.

GE-SLO 1a: The paper(s) demonstrate(s) that the student can write English clearly, logically, and effectively.

- A) RESULTS: 80% of the essays successfully met this measure. Specifically, 92 out of the 115 had an average score of 2.1 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion needed. This increased by 3% from the 2017-2018 year's data.

GE-SLO 1b: The paper(s) demonstrate(s) that the student can write English creatively (or stylistically).

- A) RESULTS: 58% of the essays successfully met this measure. Specifically, 67 out of the 115 had an average score of 2.1 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was not met. However, due to the emphasis on the word "creatively" in the general education goal, knowing that that is problematic, the committee is not concerned about the lower score. We anticipate that this general education goal will be revised to remove that wording. That being said, we will also work with our faculty to encourage them to help students' take stylistic risks. This increased by 15% from the 2017-2018 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: 73% of the essays successfully met this measure. Specifically, 84 out of the 115 had an average score of 2.1 or greater on the 4-point scale.
- B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. No discussion needed. This increased by 1% from the 2017-2018 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 101: Analysis and Argument – Program Assessment Procedure: Collection of End-of-the-Semester Paper from ENG 101/101E Courses

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

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

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

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

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

When selecting what paper you will use for program assessment, we ask that you abide by the requirements below to help us standardize our program assessment. Thus, the submitted papers should demonstrate the student's ability to

- Develop ideas and content appropriate to a specific rhetorical situation;
- Establish a strong thesis and developed paragraphs within the larger organization of the essay;
- Analyze material (another text or rhetorical situation) as appropriate;
- Create an argument that conveys developed content and employs research methods as appropriate; and
- Rely on rhetorical writing strategies which highlight control of surface features such as syntax, grammar, and punctuation.

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

Appendix D:

SLOs and Rubric for ENG 101 Assessment

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

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

Student Learning Outcomes for ENG 101

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

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

4- Excels. Student appeals to a specific audience, making effective rhetorical moves within the composition.

3- Satisfies the measure. Student demonstrates a general awareness of writing for a specific audience, attempting to make rhetorical moves within the composition, yet those moves need minor improvements to make them effective for that audience.

2- Partially satisfies the measure. Student makes an attempt to consider a specific audience, but the attempt is incomplete or confusing.

1- Fails to satisfy the measure. Student shows no attempt at considering a specific audience, or any attempt conveyed is confusing or hindering to the composition.

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

4- Excels. Student demonstrates the ability to develop an essay that has a clear beginning, middle, and end. Each idea flows logically to the next and fits logically

into the whole. Student's writing demonstrates discernable organizational patterns appropriate to the subject and the purpose.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4- Excels. Student demonstrates correct and effective citations of appropriate sources (as deemed by paper's purpose or assignment), conveying proper knowledge of the appropriate style (MLA, APA, Chicago, etc.).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix E:

2019-2020 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 *An American Marriage: A Novel* by Tayari Jones, and the spring’s text was Craig Grossi’s *Craig & Fred: A Marine, A Stray Dog, and How They Rescued Each Other*. The authors met with our composition students during the fall Pee Dee Fiction and Poetry Festival and the spring Hunter Series, where students co-moderated the colloquium at the latter event.
2. As part of the Hunter Series, four faculty helped in preparing students to co-moderate the event’s afternoon colloquium, which gave them practice in public speaking and professionalism. Efforts were funded by an internal REAL grant awarded to three members of our First-Year Writing Advisory Committee (Drs. England, Hilb, and Fallon) who partnered with the chair of the Hunter Committee, Dr. Smolen-Morton, with these efforts.
3. We continue to add faculty instructional resources on our shared Composition Studies Blackboard site, including but not limited to sample assignments, supplemental readings, and helpful websites.
4. 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 16 faculty members across 5 disciplines participate.
5. 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 and reception in April to honor these writers were canceled due to COVID-19; however, we virtually recognized these students and the students selected to be published *Final Draft* on our department’s Facebook page, mailed them their certificates, and checks (if applicable).
6. We held our first “Flash Image Contest” for students to submit photos to be considered for our *Final Draft* cover image. We had about 16 posts on that social media thread, and our First-Year Writing Advisory Committee (FWAC) selected the winner. We were able to award that individual as well as last year’s winner of our image contest \$50 and will continue to award our image winners with a cash prize. In addition, FWAC decided the “Flash Image Contest” on social media was preferred over last year’s traditional image contest, disseminating flyers, etc.

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 as well as the three ward-winning essays.
8. As part of last year's action items, we held a fall pedagogical workshop related to summary and analysis (10/2019), and our spring workshop was a guest speaker (Dr. Jesse Sargent) from Psychology who spoke on cognitive psychology (02/2020). The former workshop was coordinated by Dr. Catherine England while the latter one was initiated and organized by her; both were FWAC initiatives, and both were well attended.
9. Thinking about the influx of dual enrollment courses, initial conversations to standardize and create materials occurred in the fall, drafting a common syllabus that was piloted in the spring. However, that pilot was interrupted due to COVID-19 and will be revised and returned to at a later date.
10. All composition courses moved to virtual instruction after spring break due to COVID-19, and with this move, we were able to work with our colleagues to make sure that courses maintained the same level of rigor while adapting to the situation, displaying compassion, and remaining flexible to students' needs.