Institutional Effectiveness Report

Program: Professional Writing, Department of English, Modern Languages, and Philosophy
              Francis Marion University
Year: 2018-2019
Prepared by: Christine Masters, Program Coordinator and Assistant Professor of Englisth
Date: May 31, 2019

Executive Summary

This report documents the Professional Writing program's assessment methods and results for the 2018-2019 academic year. The Professional Writing program directly assesses its Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) by evaluating student portfolios, analyzing sponsor feedback on internship sponsor surveys, and evaluating student progress on English 305, Business Writing, pre- and post-tests. The program indirectly assesses SLOs by analyzing student feedback on senior exit surveys. The benchmark, baseline, and target results for each of these methods are presented separately in the Methods and Results sections of this report. In the 2018-2019 academic year, benchmarks for SLOs 1 through 4 were met on all measures. Benchmarks for SLOs 5 and 6 were met on all measures except for the portfolio review, which showed that students need to improve their language and editing skills. After discussing the results and reflecting on ways to improve assessment practices, the report provides a list of action items to be accomplished during the coming year. The action items include developing new strategies for improving students' language, editing, and proofreading skills; revising the SLOs to address the kinds of professional habits that are mentioned in the internship sponsor survey; creating a new exit survey for Professional Writing majors that corresponds directly to the program's SLOs; and creating a more detailed rubric to assess student assignments. These action items will result in streamlined assessment practices as well as in improvements to the benchmark results for next year.

Mission Statement

The mission of the Professional Writing (PW) program at Francis Marion University is to offer a practical focus for students majoring or minoring in English. By pursuing this curriculum, students can acquire skills that help them to become better communicators and productive team members in the workforce.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

Because employers need effective communicators in their diverse environments, this program assists students in:

1. Developing communication skills and rhetorical strategies appropriate for business, industry, government, and non-profits, as well as further academic study
2. Sharpening organizational and analytical skills
3. Functioning as contributing members of project teams
4. Enhancing technological and visual media capabilities
5. Building and fostering connections with potential employers.

The PLOs align with the program mission statement by emphasizing the acquisition of practical skills that can be applied in professional settings.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

As students complete the course requirements in the Professional Writing program, they should demonstrate their abilities to:

1. Develop content appropriate to audiences in professional environments
2. Organize information logically and strategically
3. Design documents, both print and electronic, for usability and readability
4. Integrate visuals with text cohesively
5. Use clear language accurately and effectively
6. Edit texts for correctness, consistency, and readability.

The student learning outcomes specifically emphasize PLOs 1, 2 and 4, which address building skills in the areas of communication, rhetoric, organization, analysis, technology and visual media. While most PW courses provide students with opportunities to work on project teams, PLO 3 is not explicitly addressed by any single SLO. Similarly, many courses offer experiential learning opportunities with real-world clients, thereby providing students with opportunities to connect with future employers; however, PLO 5 is not specifically addressed in the SLOs.

Methods

The Professional Writing program directly assesses the following SLOs by evaluating student portfolios, by analyzing sponsor feedback on internship sponsor surveys, and by evaluating student progress on Business Writing (English 305) pre- and post-tests. The program indirectly assesses the SLOs by gathering student feedback on graduating seniors' exit surveys.

> SLO 1: Develop content appropriate to audiences in professional environments
> SLO 2: Organize information logically and strategically
> SLO 3: Design documents, both print and electronic, for usability and readability
> SLO 4: Integrate visuals with text cohesively
> SLO 5: Use clear language accurately and effectively
> SLO 6: Edit texts for correctness, consistency, and readability

The program coordinator analyzes the findings of three direct assessment methods (portfolio review, internship sponsor survey, and Business Writing pre/post-test) and one indirect assessment method (student exit surveys) in order to suggest possible actions. The following subsections describe these methods further, detailing the processes and people involved in conducting these assessment methods, explaining how the SLOs map to General Education Requirements, and identifying the baseline, benchmark, and target results for the SLOs.

Direct Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review

During the portfolio review process, members of the Professional Writing Advisory Committee score student portfolios for how well students meet each of the SLOs. Students begin to create these portfolios during English 405 and revise them as part of their applications for internships. At the end of the academic year, the program coordinator distributes an evaluation survey (see Appendix) for committee members to score internship application portfolios. The questions on the survey directly correspond to each of the Professional Writing programmatic SLOs. Portfolio scores can range from 1 to 5. The rubric is defined as follows: "5 = outstanding, 4 = above average, 3 = average, 2 = below average, 1 = poor." From the committee responses, the program coordinator calculates an average score for each SLO and also calculates the percentages of students who achieve ratings of "4" or "5" for each SLO.

Direct Assessment Method 2: Internship Sponsor Survey

The program coordinator asks internship sponsors to complete a sponsor evaluation survey (see Appendix) at the end of each student's internship. This survey is considered a method of *direct* rather than *indirect* assessment because it is an evaluation of a student's workplace performance by a qualified professional. The survey form has two sets of questions: 1) tailored questions that assess how well students met each objective listed on their individualized internship agreement, and 2) general questions that apply to all internships. Scores can range from 1 to 5, with the rubric defined as "5 is the highest score." Sponsors may also enter "N/A" if the item does not apply to that internship. The program coordinator compiles the scores from the general questions, calculates average scores for each SLO, and calculates the percentages of students who achieve ratings for each category.

Direct Assessment Method 3: Business Writing Pre- and Post-Test

The program coordinator asks each Business Writing instructor to administer a pre- and post-test each semester to all English 305, Business Writing, course sections. After comparing pre- and post-test scores, the program coordinator calculates which percentage of students scored higher on the post-test compared to the pre-test. This percentage, along with the numbers of students participating in either test, is presented in the IE report as an assessment measure for "SLO 1: Develop content appropriate to audiences in professional environments."

Indirect Assessment Method: Student Exit Surveys

The English department administers an exit survey as part of the course, English 496, Capstone. This course is required for all English majors. The survey is administered by the course instructor and contains questions focused on student experiences in the program. The Professional Writing program coordinator asks the Capstone instructor for copies of Professional Writing majors' surveys. The program coordinator then qualitatively summarizes these comments in the IE report.

General Education Goals

The Professional Writing programmatic SLOs address Francis Marion's General Education Goals 1, 3, and 9 as listed below.

Goal 1. The ability to write and speak English clearly, logically, creatively, and effectively. This goal is addressed by SLOs 5 and 6, both of which address language use and editing skills.

Goal 3. The ability to use technology to locate, organize, document, present, and analyze information and ideas. This goal is addressed explicitly by SLO 3, which assesses document design skills. This goal also is implied in all of the other SLOs because they can involve the use of technology, however, the proficiency with technology is not the main objective measured.

Goal 9. The ability to reason logically and think critically in order to develop problem-solving skills and to make informed and responsible choices. Students must reason logically, think critically, and apply problem solving skills in order to meet all of the SLOs.

Identification of Results

The results are identified in terms of baseline, benchmark, and target categories.

Baseline

Calculated as an average of the SLO results data from the previous three years (when available), the baseline results are listed according to the three direct assessment methods in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

Portfolio Reviews

The baseline scores for portfolio reviews have been calculated as both average scores for each SLO and as percentages of students achieving a rating of "4" or "5" on each of the SLOs (Table 1). The baseline is derived from evaluations of 11 students over the past three academic years. Last year, the committee did not conduct portfolio reviews because the sample of previously un-reviewed student portfolios was too small to be significant. The lowest baseline averages correspond to language (SLO 5) and editing

(SLO 6), with 70% and 68% of students receiving scores of 4 or 5 and average ratings of 3.85 out of 5 for those categories. Students had the highest baseline averages for content (SLO 1) and organization (SLO 2), with 89% of students receiving scores of 4 or 5 and receiving averages ratings in the 4.4-4.45 range for those categories.

Portfolio Reviews

SLO	Baseline		2017-18*	2017-16 (n=5)		2016-15 (n=6)	
	Average Rating	4 or 5		Average Rating	4 or 5	Average Rating	4 or 5
1 Content	4.40	89%	N/A	4.2	84%	4.6	93%
2 Organization	4.45	89%	N/A	4.3	80%	4.6	97%
3 Design	4.10	80%	N/A	3.9	76%	4.3	83%
4 Visuals	4.25	80%	N/A	4.2	76%	4.3	83%
5 Language	3.85	70%	N/A	3.6	60%	4.1	80%
6 Editing	3.85	68%	N/A	3.4	48%	4.3	87%

*Table 1. Professional Writing Program Baseline Results for Portfolio Reviews. Based on data from the past 3 years. *Note: The Professional Writing program did not have enough previously un-reviewed student portfolios from 2017-2018 to provide a meaningful sample for assessment purposes.*

Internship Sponsor Surveys

This baseline represents only one previous year of ratings. Prior to 2017-2018, a quantitative SLO analysis of internship sponsor surveys was not included in the IE Report. Note that last year's benchmark percentages were shown as both averages of SLO ratings and percentages of the same figure, calculated by converting the 1 to 5 rating scale into a percentage scale. For example, when the average student score for SLO 1 was 4.25, this number was divided by 5 to arrive at 85%. These percentages were compared with the previous year's portfolio ratings. However, this calculation method is different from the portfolio ratings calculation method where percentages represent how many students receive "4" or "5" ratings for each SLO. This year's report displays average ratings only. With the exception of one 3 on one of the SLO categories, last year's internship sponsor ratings all were 4s and 5s. See the current year's results in the Appendix for a list of internship sponsor survey questions and a mapping of these questions to the SLOs.

Internship Sponsor Surveys

SLO	Baseline (2017-2018, n=4)
	Average Rating
1 Content	4.25
2 Organization	4.75
3 Design	4.75
4 Visuals	4.33
5 Language	4.25
6 Editing	4.50

Table 2. Professional Writing Program Baseline Results for Internship Sponsor Surveys. Based on data from the past year. Only one year of data are shown because the sponsor surveys had not been mapped to SLOs prior to last year.

Business Writing Pre- and Post-Tests

The baseline scores for the Business Writing Pre- and Post-Test have been calculated as the percentage of students with improved scores on the post-test (Table 3). For example, in 2018-2018, 68%, or 70 out of 103 students improved their scores. Only students who take both tests are included in the report. Because the test reflects students' knowledge of business writing practices as a content or subject area, this assessment method is presented as evidence of students' abilities to "develop content appropriate to audiences in professional environments" (SLO 1).

Business Writing Pre- and Post-Test

SLO	Baseline	2017-18 (n=103)	2016-17 (n=50)	2015-16 (n=60)
1 Content	74%	68%	76%	78%

Table 3. Professional Writing Program Baseline Results for Business Writing Pre- and Post-Test. Percentage of students achieving a higher score on the post-test than on the pre-test. Based on the averages scores from the past 3 years. The number of students included in the assessment are indicated in the year column headings.

Exit Surveys

The indirect assessment method (student exit surveys) does not have a baseline score defined because the data from previous years' exit surveys have not been mapped to specific SLOs.

Benchmark

The program desires a benchmark result of at least 80% or 4.0 average ratings this year. This figure was identified as the target in last year's IE Report.

Target

Over the next three to five years, the program intends to achieve at least 4.0 average ratings or 80% achievement results for all SLO categories on any assessment method.

Assessment Results

The Professional Writing program completed direct assessments of its SLOs for the 2018-2019 academic year by evaluating portfolios, analyzing feedback on internship sponsor surveys, and evaluating student progress on Business Writing (English 305) pre- and post-tests. The program has completed an indirect assessment of the SLOs by gathering student feedback on graduating seniors' exit surveys. The SLOs assessed are:

> SLO 1: Develop content appropriate to audiences in professional environments
> SLO 2: Organize information logically and strategically
> SLO 3: Design documents, both print and electronic, for usability and readability
> SLO 4: Integrate visuals with text cohesively
> SLO 5: Use clear language accurately and effectively
> SLO 6: Edit texts for correctness, consistency, and readability.

The program had a total of 15 students who identified as Professional Writing majors during the 2018-2019 academic year. Of those students, five completed internships and were evaluated by three different workplace sponsors, four submitted portfolios that were reviewed by the Professional Writing Advisory Committee, four graduated, and five submitted exit surveys for English 496.

The following subsections present the results for each assessment method, discuss the relationship of these results to the benchmarks and targets, and indicate if the baseline, benchmark, and target results were achieved.

Direct Assessment Method 1: Portfolio Review

Four portfolios were reviewed by six Professional Writing committee members. The highest ratings were assigned to SLOs 1 and 2, which focus on content development and information organization; these categories had average ratings of 4.3 and 4.1, respectively. The lowest-rated categories were SLOs 5 and 6, which focus on using clear language and editing texts; these categories had average ratings of 3.7 and 3.1, respectively. The middle-range of ratings were reflected by SLOs 3 and 4, which focus on document design and integration of texts and visuals; these categories had average ratings of 4.0. Table 4 compares this year's benchmarks to the baseline and target ratings. A spreadsheet containing all of the review scores may be viewed in the Appendix.

Portfolio Reviews 2018-2019

SLO	Benchmark		Baseline		Target	
	Avg. Rating	% 4s & 5s	Avg. Rating	% 4s & 5s	Avg. Rating	% 4s & 5s
1 Content	4.3	83%	4.40	89%	4.0	80%
2 Organization	4.1	71%	4.45	89%	4.0	80%
3 Design	4.0	75%	4.10	80%	4.0	80%
4 Visuals	4.0	71%	4.25	80%	4.0	80%
5 Language	3.7	58%	3.85	70%	4.0	80%
6 Editing	3.1	38%	3.85	68%	4.0	80%

Table 4. Portfolio Benchmarks for 2018-2019 with the Baseline and Target Scores. Four students were rated by six professors.

The portfolio review benchmarks were lower than the baseline figures for all SLOs. However, average ratings for SLOs 1 through 4 were at or above the target average ratings. The only SLOs not meeting the target were SLOs 5 and 6, which concern language and editing skills. SLOs, 2 through 6, did not meet the target for the percentage of 4s and 5s awarded, however SLOs 1 through 4 met the target for average ratings. The Action Items section of this report further discusses these results.

Direct Assessment Method 2: Internship Sponsor Survey

In Fall 2018 and Spring 2019, a total five students completed internships at three different workplace sites. Overall, the SLOs ratings averaged at least 4.6 on a scale of 1-5, with 5 being highest. The highest average ratings (4.8 and 4.7) were for SLOs 5 and 6 respectively; both of these ratings measure student language and editing abilities. While all of the SLOs were rated as well-above average this year, the lowest average ratings were reflected in SLOs 2 and 3, which focus on organization and design. Both of these categories were rated at 4.6. The other SLO categories fell in the middle. See the Appendix for detailed response data, a list of survey questions, and a mapping of these questions to the SLOs.

Internship Sponsor Surveys 2018-2019

SLO	Benchmark	Baseline	Target
1 Content	4.65	4.25	4.0
2 Organization	4.60	4.75	4.0
3 Design	4.60	4.75	4.0
4 Visuals	4.67	4.33	4.0
5 Language	4.80	4.25	4.0
6 Editing	4.70	4.50	4.0

Table 5. Internship Sponsor Survey Benchmarks for 2018-2019 with the Baseline and Target Scores. Five students were rated by three internship sponsors.

All except for two of the categories (SLOs 2 and 3, both at 4.6) achieved benchmark scores that were higher than their baseline scores. All of the benchmarks exceeded the desired targets for this year.

Direct Assessment Method 3: Business Writing Pre- and Post-Test

During the 2018-2019 academic year, 139 students took a pre-test, a post-test, or both tests for English 305, Business Writing. These students represent all majors, not just Professional Writing. Of that group, 77 took both the pre- and post-test, and 87% scored higher on the post-test than they scored on the pre-test. Six students scored lower on the post-test than on the pre-test. Four students had no change in scores. See the Appendix for a list of test questions.

Business Writing Pre- and Post-Test

SLO	Benchmark	Baseline	Target
1 Content	87%	74%	80%

Table 6. Professional Writing Program 2018-2019 Benchmark Results for the Business Writing Pre- and Post-Test. Shown with the baseline and target results.

The benchmark for this year represents a 13% increase from the baseline and exceeds the target by 7%.

Indirect Assessment Method: Student Exit Surveys

Five Professional Writing students indicated on exit surveys that they planned to graduate during 2018 through December, 2019. Because the student exit surveys are administered as part of English 496 to all English majors, not just Professional Writing, the quantitative data from these surveys usually are summarized within the Liberal Arts IE Report. Many of the questions on this survey do not apply to the Professional Writing program because they concern the English department as a whole or they directly map to the Liberal Arts SLOs, not the Professional Writing SLOs. For these reasons, this report provides only a brief summary of the comments that directly concern the Professional Writing program.

Overall, students indicated that they valued their English courses, appreciated their advisors, and agreed that they are well-prepared for their careers. Professional Writing students suggested the following improvements:

- More opportunities to socialize with other students outside of class, perhaps by creating a student lounge
- "More major pieces to showcase in internship portfolios"
- "More roundtable sit-downs where students are informed about what jobs are available"
- One student would have become involved with Sigma Tau Delta if they had known about it
- "Have more things focused on Professional Writing majors, for example, adding elective courses for professional majors"
- "more courses, programs, and extra-curricular activities should be offered for Professional Writing majors."

Further discussion of the student exit survey indirect assessment method continues in the Action Item section. See the Appendix for a list of exit survey questions.

Action Items

This section provides further reflection on the results and presents suggestions for streamlining assessment methods and improving student performance.

Discussion

The most surprising result this year was the contrast between the portfolio ratings and the internship sponsor ratings for SLO 5 (language use) and SLO 6 (editing). In the portfolio review, these two categories scored the lowest, as they usually do every year. Yet, the students' internship supervisors scored these two categories highest. Students may be putting more care and effort into their on-the-job internship writing than they put into preparing their portfolios. The contrasting assessment results for SLOs 5 and 6 suggest that portfolios may not always reflect students' actual knowledge or abilities, especially if students do not take the time to carefully prepare their portfolios.

Because the portfolios used for programmatic assessment are prepared as part of student internship applications, most of the students' preparation work falls outside of the scope of a class. While English 405 usually has a portfolio assignment, students do not always take this class immediately before their internship. They typically update their portfolios, sometimes semesters after initially creating them in English 405. Asking students to produce internship application portfolios on their own, outside of the context of a course, can have drawbacks; students may not take enough initiative to produce high-quality portfolios if they are not being graded. The program coordinator also struggles to find time to work with students one-on-one to help them revise and edit their portfolios.

Rather than basing the direct assessment of student work on internship application portfolios, the Professional Writing program may consider other options. Any assignment from a required, 400-level course could be used for assessment. Pulling artifacts from a course instead of from internship application portfolios may also allow the program to measure learning outcomes across a slightly larger group of students—some courses include minors and collaterals who may not ever apply for an internship. If the program continues to use portfolios as the main artifact for direct assessment of student work, the program coordinator could ask the English 405 instructor (sometimes, they are the same person) to submit all finished portfolios from the students in that class instead of using the internship application portfolios for program assessment. As an alternative, a different assignment also could be chosen for assessment.

Another point to consider is that the accuracy and effectiveness of the portfolio review process could be improved by using a more detailed scoring rubric. Reviewers evaluate each SLO on a scale of 1 to 5 based on the descriptions of "5 = outstanding, 4 = above average, 3 = average, 2 = below average, 1 = poor." However, more criteria may be needed to ensure that all reviewers are on the same page. This year, one student (coded 18-b in the portfolio review data in the Appendix) was given a 5 for SLO 1 (content) by five different reviewers. Yet, that same student was given a 2 for SLO 1 by the sixth reviewer, representing a three-point difference. Including more criteria in the scoring rubric may eliminate these types of discrepancies. For example, the rubric could indicate the number of errors acceptable for each score option or describe the specific qualities that should correspond with each score option.

In addition to continuing the direct assessment of student work, the program also should continue to incorporate internship sponsor surveys into the IE Report. However, it should be noted that some of the survey questions address areas that do not easily fit into any of the SLO categories, for example:

- Cultivated professional habits such as taking initiative, anticipating and solving problems, and following through on communications and other activities
- Improved comprehension of software programs commonly used in developing print and online documents
- Tracked work progress by clarifying tasks completed, tasks remaining, problems, and potential solutions.
- Followed standard business practices and functioning as a contributing member of a team.

The SLOs could be modified so that they address these types of learning outcomes that are not always evident in student assignment artifacts. The revision also would result in the SLOs aligning more closely to some of the professional skills mentioned in the PLOs.

Both the portfolio reviews and internship sponsor surveys produce relevant data that address the SLOs, however, the Business Writing pre- and post-test assessment method has little impact on the understanding of how students are meeting programmatic SLOs. The Business Writing pre- and post-test measures improvement for only one specific course among many subject areas in the Professional Writing program. It is a multiple-choice test that assesses students' conceptual knowledge of business writing principles, and it does not holistically assess how well students actually apply this knowledge when producing documents or engaging in writing projects. Over the past year, the Professional Writing Advisory Committee has been discussing whether to map this test to all of the programmatic SLOs or only to the course SLOs. Yet, because the program already has two direct assessment measures, this test actually may not be needed for programmatic assessment.

Finally, addressing the feedback from students on the exit surveys, the program will continue to discuss ways to offer more elective courses and foster more social and professional experiences for students. So that the survey will be more useful next year and provide a measurement for indirect assessment, the program will develop its own exit survey to give Professional Writing majors. This form will have questions that map directly to the SLOs. The data from this survey will be used to establish a baseline for future years' indirect assessments.

Action Plan

The Professional Writing program will address the SLOs that did not meet the benchmark this year (SLOs 5 and 6) through the following action item:

1. Develop new strategies for improving students' language, editing, and proofreading skills. Specifically, the instructors who teach English 307, Foundations of Professional Writing, will improve its curriculum.

In addition, the Professional Writing Advisory Committee will:

2. Revise the SLOs to address the kinds of professional habits, teamwork, and building employer connections that are mentioned in the internship sponsor survey

3. Create a new exit survey for Professional Writing majors that corresponds directly to the program's SLOs and establishes a baseline for the indirect assessment method
4. Create a more detailed rubric or a better norming process to assess student assignments.

These action items will result in streamlined assessment practices as well as improvements to the benchmark results for next year.

Please contact Christine Masters (cmasters@fmarion.edu) if you have questions about this report.

Submitted to Rebecca Flannagan, Department Chair
May 31, 2019

Appendix

This appendix contains the data collection instruments a a summary of the results for the first two methods.

Portfolio Review Form

Professional Writing Portfolio Rating Form - 2019

Please check the name of the student that you are evaluating:
- ☐ Student Name
- ☐ Student Name
- ☐ Student Name
- ☐ Student Name

Please rate your assessment of the student's demonstrated level of expertise based on the internship portfolio that he or she prepared.

5 = Outstanding, 4 = Above average, 3 = Average, 2 = Below average, 1 = Poor

Student Learning Outcomes	Rating (1-5)
1. Develops content appropriate to audiences in professional environments.	
2. Organizes information logically and strategically.	
3. Designs documents, both print and electronic, for usability and readability.	
4. Integrates visuals with text cohesively.	
5. Uses clear language accurately and effectively.	
6. Edits texts for correctness, consistency, and readability.	

Additional Comments (optional):

Your Name:_____   Date:_____

Please return a form for each student to Christine Masters by April 30, 2019.

Portfolio Review Data

Reviewer	Student	SLO 1	SLO 2	SLO 3	SLO 4	SLO 5	SLO 6
R1	19-d	4	3	4	3	2	2
R1	18-b	5	4	4	5	5	5
R1	19-c	4	4	4	4	3	3
R1	19-b	5	5	4	5	5	4
R2	19-d	4	4	4	4	3	2
R2	18-b	5	5	5	5	4	4
R2	19-c	4	4	4	4	4	2
R2	19-b	5	5	5	5	4	3
R3	19-d	3	2	2	3	2	1
R3	18-b	2	2	3	3	3	3
R3	19-c	3	3	3	3	4	4
R3	19-b	4	3	3	4	3	2
R4	19-d	4	4	3	4	3	2
R4	18-b	5	4	5	5	4	4
R4	19-c	5	5	4	4	3	3
R4	19-b	5	5	5	5	5	4
R5	19-d	3	3	4	3	3	3
R5	18-b	5	5	4	4	4	4
R5	19-c	4	5	4	3	4	3
R5	19-b	5	5	4	4	4	3
R6	19-b	5	5	5	5	5	4
R6	19-c	5	5	4	4	4	3
R6	18-b	5	5	5	5	5	4
R6	19-d	4	3	3	3	2	2
		4.3	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.1
Count	5s	12	11	6	8	5	1
	4s	8	6	12	9	9	8
	3s	3	5	5	7	7	8
	2s	1	2	1	0	3	6
	1s	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Total	24	24	24	24	24	24
Count as %	5s	50%	46%	25%	33%	21%	4%
	4s	33%	25%	50%	38%	38%	33%
	3s	13%	21%	21%	29%	29%	33%
	2s	4%	8%	4%	0%	13%	25%
	1s	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%
Count as %	5s and 4	83%	71%	75%	71%	58%	38%
	3s	15%	20%	20%	30%	35%	35%
	2s	5%	10%	5%	0%	10%	25%
	1s	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%

Internship Sponsor Survey

Sponsor's Evaluation of the Internship

Student: _____

Sponsor: _____

Semester: _____

Using a scale of 1 – 5, with 5 representing the highest score, please rate the student intern's progress in meeting internship objectives. If an item is not applicable, please write N/A.

Your Rating (1 – 5)	Please rate the student's success level in achieving the objectives described in the internship agreement:
	[Different for each internship]

Your Rating (1 – 5)	Please rate the student's success level in achieving these general learning objectives:
	Increased oral and written communication skills for the workplace environment.
	Cultivated professional habits such as taking initiative, anticipating and solving problems, and following through on communications and other activities.
	Applied critical thinking skills to develop and implement effective communication strategies.
	Increased research skills through multiple channels, including traditional library sources, electronic sources (including the web), phone contacts, and personal contacts.
	Increased organizational skills in researching, compiling data, and designing documents.
	Improved abilities to develop and incorporate graphics into written documents.
	Improved comprehension of software programs commonly used in developing print and online documents.
	Improved abilities to write for an online audience
	Tracked work progress by clarifying tasks completed, tasks remaining, problems, and potential solutions.
	Produced professional documents.
	Followed standard business practices and functioning as a contributing member of a team.

Please write your comments here:

_____   _____

[Sponsor name]   Date

Internship Sponsor Survey Data

		Students						
Q	Sponsor Questionnaire - Common Questions*	18-d	19-a	19-b	19-c	19-d	AVG	SLO Map
1	Increased oral and written communication skills for the workplace environment.	5	5	5	5	4	4.800	SLO 5, SLO 6
2	Cultivated professional habits such as taking initiative, anticipating and solving problems, and following through on communications and other activities.	5	3	5	5	4	4.400	
3	Applyied critical thinking skills to develop and implement effective communication strategies.	5	4	5	4	4	4.400	SLO 1
4	Increased research skills through multiple channels, including traditional library sources, electronic sources (including the web), phone contacts, and personal contacts.	5		5	5	4	4.750	SLO 1
5	Increased organizational skills in researching, compiling data, and designing documents.	5	4	5	5	4	4.600	SLO 2, SLO 3
6	Improved abilities to develop and incorporate graphics into written documents.			5	5	4	4.667	SLO 4
7	Improved comprehension of software programs commonly used in developing print and online documents.	5	5	5	5	4	4.800	
8	Improved abilities to write for an online audience.	5	5	5	5	4	4.800	SLO 1
9	Tracked work progress by clarifying tasks completed, tasks remaining, problems, and potential solutions.	5	3	5	5	4	4.400	
10	Produced professional documents.	5	5	5	5	3	4.600	SLO 3, SLO 6
11	Followed standard business practices and functioning as a contributing member of a team.	5	4	5	5	4	4.600	
	Average of Common Questions by Student	5.0	4.2	5.0	4.9	3.9	4.620	

*Note: To calculate accurate averages, student rating inputs are left blank when the sponsor indicated "N/A" on the for

	Sponsor Questionnaire - Position-specific Questions							
	Average of scores across all position-specific work areas (differen	4.8	4.6	5.0	4.9	4.3	4.648	
	Overall Student Ratings	4.9	4.4	5.0	4.9	4.1	4.634	

	Map of Sponsor Ratings to SLOs	Average Rating
1	Develop content appropriate to audiences in professional environments = Q 3, 4, 8	4.65
2	Organize information logically and strategically = Q 5	4.60
3	Design documents, both print and electronic, for usability and readability = Q 5, 10	4.60
4	Integrate visuals with text cohesively = Q 6	4.67
5	Use clear language accurately and effectively = Q 1	4.80
6	Edit texts for correctness, consistency, and readability. = Q 1, 10	4.70

English 305: Business Writing Pre- and Post-Test Questions

1. Which statement best describes the purpose of an executive summary?

2. Which of the following abbreviations is commonly found at the bottom of a transmittal letter?

3. Which salutation should you use when writing a business letter to Constance Smith if you don't know her marital status?

4. To which audience would it be most appropriate to send a memo instead of a letter?

5. Which of the following is a good rule to observe when creating presentations?

6. Which statement is true about style sheets?

7. Which of the following is true about email?

8. Which of the following is NOT one of the guidelines for achieving "you attitude" in business writing?

9. Which of the following is the best advice for writing "bad news" messages?

10. What is the best way to start your first paragraph in a job application (cover) letter?

11. Which of the following is a key question to ask yourself as you revise a document?

12. Which sentence is NOT an example of parallel structure?

13. Which of the following sentences has an active verb?

14. Which kind of graphic works best for showing a trend over time?

15. How should you discuss a chart in the body a report?

16. What are the three main organizational elements in the message section of a memo?

17. The basic elements of effective document design are...

18. Which of the following is NOT a characteristic of a well-designed document?

19. Which of the following is an example of INCORRECT punctuation?

20. Which of the following DOES NOT help to make your document more readable?

Student Exit Survey Questions

1. I decided to major in English during this period: [choice of grade level]

2. I majored in English for the following reasons: [free response]

3. I am glad that I majored in English [Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Agree / Strongly Agree]

4. I would like to see these changes in English department programs: [free response]

5. I have had the following problems with the operations of the English department: [Scheduling / Course Content / None / Other (specify)] [free response]

6. The problems were or are being handled effectively by the department [Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Agree / Strongly Agree]

7. I have been effectively advised by the English faculty [Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Agree / Strongly Agree] [free response]

8. I find the English department's extra-curricular activities (Sigma Tau Delta, *Snow Island Review*, Hunter Series readings, visiting writers, etc.) to be valuable. [Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Agree / Strongly Agree]

9. I find these extra-curricular activities to be especially valuable: [free response]

10. Did you work for the department? If so, how valuable and rewarding was the experience? [free response]

11. The skills I am learning as an English major should help in my career. [Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Agree / Strongly Agree]

12. After graduation, I plan to go [free response]

13. I anticipate using the following skills learned in English courses: [free response]

14. Overall, my English courses have been enjoyable and/or profitable. [Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Agree / Strongly Agree]

15. I have found these courses to be the most enjoyable and/or profitable: [free response]

16. I have found these courses to be the least enjoyable and/or profitable: [free response]

17. My English courses have helped me learn how to read literary tests more closely and critically. [Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Agree / Strongly Agree]

18. My English courses have helped me learn how to find and evaluate sources to support my arguments about literary texts. [Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Agree / Strongly Agree]

19. My English courses have helped me learn how to understand a text in its historical and cultural context. [Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Agree / Strongly Agree]

20. My English courses have helped me to see how literature serves a purpose beyond the purely aesthetic and helps define cultural and personal identities. [Strongly Disagree / Disagree / Agree / Strongly Agree]

21. I am an (circle one) [choice of Liberal Arts, Teacher Licensure, or Professional Writing majors]