Name of Program/Department:	English Composition Program / Department of English, Modern Languages, and Philosophy
Academic Year:	2021-2022
Name of Preparer:	Catherine C. England, PhD, Interim 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 2021-2022 academic year is our sixth year of implementation and forth 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 fourth 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 101 and relied on an end-of-the-semester paper, keeping the below **ENG 101** Student Learning Outcomes at its forefront:

Student Learning Outcomes
In **ENG 101**, students will demonstrate the ability to
- Understand 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

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 27 sections of English 101, totaling 109 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 109 randomly selected students out of 27 sections of English 101, 101E, and 101-Honors in fall 2021. These sections were taught by 21 different faculty. 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 10 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, papers were dispersed systemically to avoid two readers scoring the exact same set of papers. Furthermore, prior to the scoring, all 10 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 109 essays, 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 2.1 or greater on the four-point scale.

109 essays were assessed because that number represents about 26% of our English 101 composition students from the semester that the essays were collected, which 412 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 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 a slight revision on previous years, which aimed to both clarify certain questions and shorten the survey overall to increase the likelihood of implementation by instructors and completion by students. Fall 2021 marked the second year this survey was distributed online to student. This survey was completed by 402 students out of our initial 776 fall composition students – or perhaps more importantly, 402 out of the 482 students who remained by mid-semester. Thus, 52% of students who were originally enrolled participated, or -- more tellingly -- 83% of the students who remained in the program after the mid-semester. Specifically, we had 78 students in ENGL 101E, 262 students in ENG 101, and 62 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.

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: 82% of the papers successfully met this measure. Specifically, 89 of the 109 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 2019-2020; this year's 2021-2022 percentage is 4% higher than that year.

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

[101, SLO2]

1. A) RESULTS: 73% of the papers successfully met this measure. Specifically, 80 of the 109 had an average score of 2.1 or greater on the 4-point scale.

2. B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was not met. ENG 101's last direct assessment was 2019-2020 (a year that saw a 1% decrease); this year's 2021-2022 percentage is down another 4% from that year. We are only slightly below our benchmark; nevertheless, we will communicate with faculty the importance of clear organization in elements such as thesis statements and topic sentences as throughout the writing process from outlining to revision.

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

1. A) RESULTS: 62% of the papers successfully met this measure. Specifically, 67 of the 109 had an average score of 2.1 or greater on the 4-point scale.

2. B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was not met. The percentage went down 7% in 2019-2020 from the 2017-2018 data, and now, it is down another 9% from 2019-2020 data. This percentage may be lower due to some courses deemphasis on argumentation until later in the semester. Or, it may be due to each course's submission of different assignments, which may vary in level and type of argument. Or, it may be a clear indicator of the years of learning loss due to the pandemic. Faculty will be made aware of this trend and encouraged to emphasize argumentation more in their 101 classes and take a step-by-step approach to helping students achieve arguments.

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

1. A) RESULTS: 67% of the papers successfully met this measure. Specifically, 73 of the 109 had an average score of 2.1 or greater on the 4-point scale.

2. B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was not met. This benchmark is down 5% from 2019-2020. This percentage was also down another 10% in 2017-2018. This percentage may be lower due to each course's submission of different assignments, which may vary in level and type of "text" references. This measure might be lower because of instructor emphasis on other skills or because of poor student reading comprehension, making their references unclear. Faculty will be made aware of this trend and encouraged to emphasize reference and perhaps consider the use of templates to help students more clearly integrate references to sources in their texts.

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

A) RESULTS: 73% of the papers successfully met this measure. Specifically, 80 of the 109 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 3% from 2019-2020, and was also up 12% in the 2017-2018 data, a trend of 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. Also, instructors may be prioritizing other concerns in 101 over the skill of documentation. 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: 70% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 76 of the 109 had an average score of 2.1 or greater on the 4-point scale.

B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was not met. Data shows a 6% increase on the 2019-2020 data. There was also a 3% increase in the 2017-2018 data. This shows an upward trend overall as our instructors learn and discuss the best ways to teach analysis, which we can continue to do.

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

A) RESULTS: 73% of the portfolios successfully met this measure. Specifically, 80 of the 109 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 year's data saw a 10% decrease from 2019-2020. This shows that students are struggling with the basic mechanics of writing, which may due to larger trends related to learning loss during the pandemic, fewer essays (or less feedback) given to students during the pandemic, as well as the long-term trend of decreased quality reading in students. Faculty will be informed about this trend, so that we can encourage attention to revision and the promotion of the Writing Center (and Write on Target), for example.

The seven measures and data results show that currently students are struggling to meet most of the SLOs affiliated to our ENG 101 course. While three out of the seven measures met the benchmarks of 75% in 2019-2020, only one of the seven was successfully met this year. All but 2 measures of the 6 that "failed" were within 5 percentage points of our benchmark. Notably, we saw two substantial decreases (Measures 3 and 7 [argument and surface features]), which decreased 9% and 10% respectively. Overall, this lower assessment may be due to changes in faculty and assessment culture since this was the first year under a new Interim Coordinators, and so, it is possible that "harder" scoring became accidentally more of a norm due to new leadership. Even more likely, these lower scores are likely a result of the well-documented learning loss that many of our students experienced during the pandemic (which included disrupted school schedules, oversized high school classrooms, stress, etc.).

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:

Average Scores for 101E and 101

	English 101E	English 101	Difference
Measure 1 (Audience)	2.68	3.10	.42
Measure 2 (Organization)	2.36	2.80	.44
Measure 3 (Argumentation)	2.43	2.64	.21
Measure 4 (Reference)	2.26	2.69	.43
Measure 5 (Documentation)	1.78	2.44	.66
Measure 6 (Analysis)	2.34	2.66	.32
Measure 7 (Surface Features)	2.49	3.38	.89

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 average scores on all measures, yet the course is not drastically different and the averages are usually within a half a point. The chart indicates that the largest disparity between the two cohorts is in surface features (Measure 7) and documentation (Measure 5) – unlike in 2019-2020 when the analysis measure (Measure 6) showed the greatest difference. This year's data shows 101E students struggling particularly with detail-orientated measures that could result from that cohort having had less writing experience or less vigorous writing expectations and/or feedback in the past.

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 and again in 2020 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.

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: 90%
       English 101:   87%
       English 102:   94%
       Average: 90%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers this year were as good as or higher than last year. Last year's average was 85% overall, and this year's was 90% (which continues an upward swing compared to the previous two years as well).

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:	99%
English 101:	94%
English 102:	95%
Average:	96%

B) DISCUSSION: The numbers for this year are similar to last year. The average is one point higher overall than last year and continues an upward trend of the past several years.

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:	100%
English 101:	100%
English 102:	100%
Average:	100%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers this year reach an all-time high. Previous years averaged at 99%, 91%, 89%, and 91%.

How confident are in you in your ability to use a handbook or another reputable resource (e.g. PurdueOWL) to cite sources correctly using the 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:	82%
English 101:	97%
English 102:	89%
Average:	89%

B) DISCUSSION: The average from this year's data is 89% with our new wording of this question and brings up the average 9 points from about 80%, Last year the wording was: How confident are you in your ability to use a handbook to cite sources correctly using MLA documentation style? This new wording seems to better capture how documentation is taught, particularly in 101 and 101E.

Did your coursework affirm or improve your understanding and application of various research methods related to either primary and/or secondary sources?
(Percentages calculated on answers that indicate course improved understanding and application of various research methods.)
[ENG 102, SLO 2]

A) RESULTS:
English 101E: 96%
English 101:   93%
English 102:   94%
Average: 94%

B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar this year to last year. Both years the average was 94%. The three previous years' marks were 89%, 87%, and 87%. Thus, the new wording that was used this year and the combination of multiple survey questions into one question reveals similar results all while making the survey shorter and more efficient.

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: 79%
English 101:   85%
English 102:   92%
Average: 85%

B) DISCUSSION: Last year's average was about 92%, which is a 13% increase from last year's data, but this year, we saw a lower average of 85%, but this is not surprising considering that direct assessment showed that students are struggling currently with some of our academic goals. Earlier years were lower so moving down to 85% is not alarming in terms of long-term history. Also, 85% is still well above our benchmark of 75%.

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: 73%
       English 101:   79%
       English 102:   87%
       Average: 80%

    B) DISCUSSION: The average is 80%, which is 7 points higher than last year and shows particular improvement in 101E (67% last year to 73% this year). This builds on a 5% increase from the previous year.

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: 86%
       English 101:   86%
       English 102:   97%
       Average: 90%

    B) DISCUSSION: This year's average is 90%, which is 4 points higher than last year and continues to build on previous slight increases.

Writers can use numerous rhetorical strategies such as description of a person or place, comparison, definition, analysis, or the persuasive combination of logos, ethos, and pathos. How would you rate your confidence in your ability to identify 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: 79%
       English 101:   81%
       English 102:   85%
       Average: 82%

    B) DISCUSSION: Last year's average was 74%, but this year's is 82%, which passes our benchmark comfortably. One reason for this increase may be that the question was reworded, which particularly helped 101E students whose numbers rose from 64% to 79%. The old wording was: How would you rate your confidence in your ability to write with effective rhetorical strategies?

How helpful have you found the knowledge from this composition class when you are writing for other classes (exams, essays, presentations) or for other contexts outside of class? (Percentages calculated based on "very helpful" and "somewhat helpful" answers.)
[ENG 102, SLO 7]

    A) RESULTS:
        English 101E: 100%
        English 101:   97%
        English 102:   98%
        Average: 98%

    B) DISCUSSION: Number this year are similar to last year's; both year's averages were 98%.

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:   98%

    B) DISCUSSION: Number were higher this year with an 8% increase, which builds upon previous years' some increases. This question indicates that students are, indeed, developing skills that they recognize can transfer beyond their course.

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

    A) RESULTS:
        English 101E: 100%
        English 101:   100%
        English 102:   100%
        Average: 100%

    B) DISCUSSION: This year's average has reached an all-time high and builds on many previous years' increases. While students struggled in direct assessment, this survey question shows they still feel the courses are helping them improve even if the quality of their writing has room for improvement. The high marks of this year are particularly reassuring knowing that many more students participated in the survey this year than last, and thus the numbers for this year are more representative. 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: 96%
   English 101:   88%
   English 102:   92%
   Average: 92%

B) DISCUSSION: The average this year is up overall this year. In particular, students are very satisfied with 101E (now at 96% instead of last year's 79%). Though averages for 101 and 102 are a little down (93% to 88% and 100% to 92%), which may show that the 4-hour course for Covid-affected students is a particularly appreciated. Nevertheless, looking at the long-term, averages are still part of an upward trend. 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: 95%

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%. Last year the average was a high 91%,, but this year reaches a new high of 95% which confirms the notion that students are particularly appreciative of the support of

101E at this time. Those this appreciate does not necessarily relate to higher direct assessment scores.

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: 92%

    B) DISCUSSION: This is comparable to last two years' data, but with a one percent increase 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, particularly at this time.

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: 95%
    English 101:   96%
    English 102:   98%
    Average: 96%

    B) DISCUSSION: Numbers are similar to last year's data, though there is a one percent increase overall. 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.

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: 100%
    English 101:   100%
    Average: 100%

    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 rose by 5% to 100%, which builds upon multiple years' increases. 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 very positive. These positive attitudes are particularly important to see this year when students are struggling more in direct assessment – perhaps because of Covid learning loss – but the same students are nevertheless eager to report good fit, learning, and practice of various important skills in their composition classes. This year all survey questions examined in detail averaged above 75%, which is a real point of pride considering the large sample of students who participated this year. Last year, three questions fell below the 75% mark. The improvements may also be partially due to some of the reworded questions as well.

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 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 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, our student survey was larger and more representative and revealed good results. On the other hand, our direct assessment revealed areas where students continue to struggle with academic goals even as their attitudes toward the composition courses are positive overall. Thus, based on our direct and indirect 2021-2022 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 six of the seven measures (or measures 2-7 on the topics of organization, argument, reference, documentation, analysis, and surface features). FWAC should consider how these low marks in a majority of areas may have been affected by a too rigorous assessment culture, for example. FWAC should also consider how these low scores may have been influence by Covid learning loss, which so many of our students have experience now for multiple years. FWAC should consider other, broader trends in student behaviors and learning as we consider how best to support students in the years to come with their academic goals. It should be noted that students have struggled in some of these areas in past reports, and that in

some areas of struggle, there is improvement with both documentation and analysis even though we are not yet meeting the benchmark. This improvement in analysis may be a result of a recent FWAC pedagogy workshop. The most significant decreases were in surface features and argumentation, so FWAC may want to consider those areas as they prioritize where to devote the most resources.

2. FWAC should consider how the very positive feelings discovered in the student survey toward 101E currently might reveal student need for added support, and consider how to bring 101E-like support into other courses and/or consider offering more 101E courses in the near future.

3. We recognize that COVID-19, social distancing, and an increase in online instruction this year may have affected students and faculty in varying ways. We should continue to learn about these influences and consider ways to mitigate their influence on student performance. For instance, we may want to consider how changing reading habits are affecting students' abilities to summarize, analyze, engage, etc.

4. This year, FWAC took a new path with *Final Draft*, making it an in-house print or etext, and we need to continue to support the efficient creation and effective use of this text in our composition classes, and consider how it may even help student performance.

5. Since the new two-course composition sequence is now quite established as is the assessment procedure, targets should be set for English 101 in future.

Executive Summary of Report

This report includes an overview of Francis Marion University's Composition Program's assessment process and outcomes for the 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 academic year's assessment is the fourth 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.

This year, our direct assessment reveals that we met 1 out of our 7 benchmarks. This year, our indirect assessment shows that students' attitude towards their writing courses are, again, very positive. Based on this year's direct and indirect assessment results, our action items for next year will focus dealing with the fall-out of Covid learning loss.

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 2021-2022

Appendix B: COMPOSITION 101/101E/102 SEQUENCE

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

Appendix D: SLOs & Rubric for ENG 101 Pilot Assessment

Appendix E: 2021-2022 Improvements and Initiatives

Appendix A:

FMU's General Education and the Composition Program: Academic Year 2021-2022

Submitted by
Catherine C. England, PhD

Interim 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 2021-2022, the program pulled from indirect and direct assessments. Specifically, 402 composition students, or about 83% of fall composition students taking any composition course, participated in a writing attitude survey. In addition, we performed a direct assessment of our ENGL 101. Our end-of-the-semester direct assessment of ENGL 101 consisted of 109 randomly selected portfolios. For a complete explanation of the assessment methods, refer to the English Composition Program's Institutional Effectiveness Report: Academic Year 2021-2022. 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 109 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 relatively General Education goal, and thus, our first time assessing it for English 101, baselines are not yet available. 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: 80% of the student papers successfully met this measure, or 87 out of 109 had an average score of 2.5 or greater on the 4-point scale.
B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was met. There was a 5% decrease from last year's assessment of 102, but overall, students are still doing well with this measure even in English 101. Because this is the first year, we have assessed it for 101, we are still working to establish baselines for that course, which as a more introductory course, we would expect to achieve lower scores than English 102.

GE-SLO 1b: The portfolio demonstrates the student's ability to integrate relevant research when appropriate.
A) RESULTS: 55% of the student papers successfully met this measure. Specifically, 60 out of 109 papers had an average score of 2.5 or greater on a 4-point scale.
B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was not met. While 82% of students in English 102 achieved this measure last year, we have to expect a much lower score for 101, which does not focus as much on research and is an introductory course. Since this is our first time assessing this measure for 101, we are still forming expectations for what is normal for 101.

GE-SLO 1c: The portfolio demonstrates the student's ability to produce developed, insightful arguments.
A) RESULTS: 56% of student papers successfully met this measure. Specifically, 61 out of 109 papers had an average score of 2.5 or greater on a 4-point scale.
B) BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENT AND DISCUSSION: The benchmark was not met. This is the first time we have assessed this goal for 101; thus, baselines are in process. This score was lower than that which was achieved by 102 students last year (81% successfully met the measure), but again, we would expect a lower score from a more introductory class.

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 via Email to the Composition Coordinator by 5pm on

Friday, 10 December

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

Faculty should be prepared to submit unmarked copies of an *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 students for each ENG 101 or ENG 101E section. UPDATE: For Fall 2021, pull the papers of the THIRD, SIXTH, and TENTH students on your roll in *each composition course* – except those classes that are *entirely* duel enrollment courses. Please pull their papers and remove identifiers (such as names/course/section numbers) and submit a selected essay from each student for program assessment. If you do not have a complete, academically honest paper from one of the selected students, pull a paper from the next student in that particular course and section on your roll alphabetically. For example, if student no. 10 has no paper to turn in, submit one for student no. 11. If you come to the end of your roll for that course, then go back to no. 1. If chosen, do submit papers for DE students in "regular" composition classes.

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.

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

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

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

Appendix D:

SLOs & Rubric for ENG 101 Pilot Assessment

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

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

Student Learning Outcomes for **ENG 101**

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:

2021-2022 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; these "common reads" for students help build community. In the fall, the supplemental text was *Suicide Woods* by Benjamin Percy, and the spring's "common read author" was Kelly Link. Due to the pandemic, Percy will visit campus in Fall 2022 when we will revisit his writing. In lieu of an in-person visit with Link, we had a Zoom event that featured many positive student interactions with the author.

2. Similar to last year, we celebrated the National Day on Writing in October. 237 students participated in the 15-Minute-Write, which is over a 100 more than participated the previous year.

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. We hosted the event outside for the first time to allow more guests to attend, and the event was enthusiastically attended by student families.

4. We held our first-ever themed cover image contest for *Final Draft* (submitted images needed to be inspired by Kelly Link's writings). We were able to award the winner a $50 monetary award in addition to featuring her art on the cover of *Final Draft: 2022-2023.*

5. Again, our selected students and their writing will be published in next year's composition program's text titled *Final Draft*. We also streamlined the student essay selection process to make more efficient use of faculty time.

6. FWAC had an ongoing discussion about the future format of *Final Draft* and after research, discussion, a faculty survey, and a whole-department vote, we decided to offer an inexpensive, yet attractive in-house printing of the text to be sold through the bookstore as well as free, pdf that instructors could distribute to students through Blackboard (these new formats replace a technologically difficult and expensive version of *Final Draft* that was offered last year through *Top Hat*). This new version of *Final Draft* was distributed to faculty in early June.

7. We held a fall pedagogical workshop on analysis and a spring workshop focused on reflection; both featured multiple faculty speakers.

8. We continued our work with campus technology to create reports that will easily pull pass/fail/withdrawal numbers along with other useful programmatic data. This data was gathered, analyzed, and shared with FWAC in the fall and spring semesters.

9. We slightly shortened the student attitude survey in order to increase the number of students who completed it and to make it easier to complete on a phone. This effort successfully led to an increase in participation from 283 students to 403 students or 83%.

10. We analyzed the usage levels over several years for all our recommended textbooks for English 101 and 102, and then, we revised our lists in order to better reflect the texts faculty actually use. Desk copies were ordered for all recommended texts and made available in our new "book room" located in Founders Hall in a currently unoccupied office.

11. We revised the direct assessment prompt for English 102 in order to add greater clarity to the portfolio prompt. This revised version will be used for the first time in Spring 2023.

12. We applied for and received federal grant money to fund 15 laptops and a charging station for the Writing Studio. This new technology is now installed and ready for faculty to use to make the Studio a more current and flexible teaching space.

13. The program's leadership was smoothly changed as Catherine England and Ben Hilb became the Interim Composition Coordinator and Interim Assistant Composition Coordinator respectively.