

Institutional Effectiveness Report

Program: Professional Writing, Department of English, Modern Languages, and Philosophy
Year: 2019-2020
Prepared by: Christine Masters, Program Coordinator and Assistant Professor of English
Date: May 29, 2020

Following a template provided by the Francis Marion University IE office, this report first provides a summary of the Professional Writing program's mission, program learning outcomes, and student learning outcomes. Next, after presenting an executive summary, the report includes sections on assessment methods, assessment results, and action items. Finally, an appendix provides the assessment instruments and rating summaries.

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) Apply rhetorical strategies in developing content appropriate to audiences in professional environments, (2) Write and edit clear, correct, and logically organized texts, (3) Design documents, both print and electronic, for usability and readability, (4) Use technology strategically in writing and communication projects, (5) Conduct primary and secondary research to advance project goals, (6) Collaborate on teams effectively, and (7) Enter professional career paths. The SLOs map to the PLOs and may be categorized into outcome types as indicated in Table 1.

SLOs and Corresponding PLOs with Outcome Types

SLO Description	PLOs	Outcome Types
(1) Apply rhetorical strategies in developing content appropriate to audiences in professional environments	1	Knowledge Skills
(2) Write and edit clear, correct, and logically organized texts	1, 2	Knowledge Skills
(3) Design documents, both print and electronic, for usability and readability	1, 2, 4	Knowledge Skills
(4) Use technology strategically in writing and communication projects	4	Knowledge Skills
(5) Conduct primary and secondary research to advance project goals	1, 2	Knowledge Skills
(6) Collaborate on teams effectively	1, 3	Skills Behavioral
(7) Enter professional career paths	1, 3, 5	Attitudes/values Behavioral

Table 1. An explanation of how the SLOs relate to the PLOs and the learning outcome types.

The SLOs listed above are a new this year and were created to address a PW 2018-2019 IE Report action item. The new SLOS were approved unanimously by the EMP department’s Professional Writing Advisory Committee (PWAC), which, in 2019-2020, has been comprised of the program coordinator and six faculty members who currently teach Professional Writing courses or who often have taught them in the past. After the committee’s approval, the SLOs were proposed to all of the department faculty members via email. A majority vote of the faculty was received via email during Spring semester. A total of 24 out of 36 faculty members voted in favor of the changes, and 12 faculty members did not vote.

The new SLOs map more closely to the PLOs and also address programmatic SLO categories that are typical in professional and technical writing programs across the United States. In previous years, our program SLOs had been:

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 new SLOs expand on and enhance these previous years’ SLOs. In particular, the role of rhetoric is explicitly mentioned in SLO1, and the new SLO2 combines the previous SLOs 2, 4, 5, and 6 (those that have to do with writing and editing texts and relating texts to visuals) into one learning outcome item. The new SLOs also include three entirely new SLOs that address the technology, teamwork, and professionalization aspects of the PLOs. Another new SLO specifically addresses the research skills that are implied in and essential for meeting PLOs 1 and 2. In addition, the new SLOs 6 and 7 incorporate the “attitudes and values” and “behavioral” types of learning outcomes that had been lacking in the previous set of SLOs.

Executive Summary

This report documents the Professional Writing program’s assessment activities for the 2019-2020 academic year. The Professional Writing program directly assesses its Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) by evaluating student portfolios and analyzing sponsor feedback on internship sponsor surveys. The program indirectly assesses SLOs by analyzing student feedback on portfolio reflection letters and senior exit surveys.

The program revised the SLOs in response to an action item on last year’s IE Report. The new SLOs map more closely to the PLOs and also address programmatic SLO categories that are typical in professional and technical writing programs across the United States. The SLOs numbered 4 through 7 (representing technology, research, collaboration, and career-readiness) were added this year.

This year, the benchmarks for SLOs 1 through 6 were met. However, the benchmark for SLO 7 was not met, which shows that students need to improve their readiness to enter career paths. For the coming year, action items include developing more opportunities for students to achieve career-readiness. These could be in-class activities, such as working on more client-based projects, as well as extracurricular activities. The Professional Writing Advisory Committee (PWAC) will also determine whether portfolios are a reliable assessment method for the new SLOs, especially SLO 6 (teamwork and collaboration), and discuss whether additional methods are needed to better assess the new SLOs.

Methods

The methods used to evaluate the Professional Writing program SLOs include indirect and direct evaluations by students, faculty members, and the working professionals who supervise our interns.

Portfolio Review (indirect and direct). 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 create these portfolios during English 405. At this time, students also are asked to write accompanying reflection letters with self-evaluations of they perceived themselves to have met the SLOs through the examples in their portfolios. This indirect assessment is not quantified, but it helps to inform committee members’ direct assessment of the portfolios. At the end of the academic year, the program coordinator distributes an evaluation survey (see the 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. The program coordinator also interprets key insights from student reflection letters to document indirect assessment results for this method. Five members of the Professional Writing Advisory Committee reviewed and rated 5 student portfolios (4 majors and 1 minor). Each of these 5 students were required to create portfolios, will graduate by December 2020, and did not have their portfolio rated in a previous year.

Internship Sponsor Surveys (direct). 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 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. Six PW students (4 majors and 2 minors) completed internships this year and were evaluated by 5 different workplace sponsors.

Student Exit Surveys (indirect). The Professional Writing program administers an exit survey to all graduating seniors. Besides soliciting opinions on the program, the exit survey asks students to evaluate how well they perceive themselves as having met each of the seven SLOs. The program coordinator summarizes the responses in the IE report. This year’s exit survey included the new SLOs. During the 2019-2020 academic year, 2 majors graduated in December, 2 majors graduated in May, 1 minor graduated in May, and 1 collateral graduated in May. All 6 of these graduating seniors completed a new version of the student exit survey that aligns with the new set of SLOs. This survey has been specifically tailored to the Professional Writing program, whereas the previous exit survey had been written with specific questions for English Liberal Arts majors that did not apply to our PW majors.

Note: The program no longer collects English 305 (Business Writing) pre- and post-test data for program assessment purposes. An action item proposed in the 2018-2019 IE Report provides the rationale for discontinuing this assessment method. During a meeting in Fall 2019, faculty members on the Professional Writing Advisory Committee voted in favor of the action item and the practice was discontinued this year.

Methods by SLO

For each SLO, summaries are provided below to show the assessment methods used as well as the baseline, benchmark, and target figures.

SLO 1: Apply rhetorical strategies in developing content appropriate to audiences in professional environments. The methods used to measure this SLO include (1) evaluating student portfolios (direct and indirect), (2) collecting internship sponsor surveys (direct), and (3) collecting graduating seniors’ exit surveys (indirect). The baseline score for SLO 1 of 4.13 is calculated as the mean of the previous four years’ SLO 1 scores (see Appendix). The benchmark score that the program wanted to achieve this year for this SLO was 4.0 and the longer-range target was also 4.0.

SLO 2: Write and edit clear, correct, and logically organized texts. The methods used to measure this SLO include (1) evaluating student portfolios (direct and indirect), (2) collecting internship sponsor surveys (direct), and (3) collecting graduating seniors’ exit surveys (indirect). The baseline score for SLO 2 of 4.22 is calculated as the mean of the previous four years’

combined SLO 2, 4, 5, and 6 scores due to the SLO changes explained above (see Appendix for details). The benchmark score that the program wanted to achieve this year for this SLO was 4.0 and the longer-range target was also 4.0.

SLO 3: Design documents, both print and electronic, for usability and readability. The methods used to measure this SLO include (1) evaluating student portfolios (direct and indirect), (2) collecting internship sponsor surveys (direct), and (3) collecting graduating seniors' exit surveys (indirect). The baseline score for SLO 3 of 4.31 is calculated as the mean of the previous four years' SLO 3 scores (see Appendix). The benchmark score that the program wanted to achieve this year for this SLO was 4.0 and the longer-range target was also 4.0.

SLO 4: Use technology strategically in writing and communication projects. The methods used to measure this SLO include (1) evaluating student portfolios (direct and indirect), (2) collecting internship sponsor surveys (direct), and (3) collecting graduating seniors' exit surveys (indirect). Because it is new this year, there are no baseline data, benchmark goals or target plans for this SLO. This year's data will be used for to create a baseline and goals for future years.

SLO 5: Conduct primary and secondary research to advance project goals. The methods used to measure this SLO include (1) evaluating student portfolios (direct and indirect), (2) collecting internship sponsor surveys (direct), and (3) collecting graduating seniors' exit surveys (indirect). Because it is new this year, there are no baseline data, benchmark goals or target plans for this SLO. This year's data will be used for to create a baseline and goals for future years.

SLO 6: Collaborate on teams effectively. The methods used to measure this SLO include (1) evaluating student portfolios (direct and indirect), (2) collecting internship sponsor surveys (direct), and (3) collecting graduating seniors' exit surveys (indirect). Because it is new this year, there are no baseline data, benchmark goals or target plans for this SLO. This year's data will be used for to create a baseline and goals for future years.

SLO 7: Enter professional career paths. The methods used to measure this SLO include (1) evaluating student portfolios (direct and indirect), (2) collecting internship sponsor surveys (direct), and (3) collecting graduating seniors' exit surveys (indirect). Because it is new this year, there are no baseline data, benchmark goals or target plans for this SLO. This year's data will be used for to create a baseline and goals for future years.

General Education Goals

The Professional Writing programmatic SLOs map to 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 SLO2, which addresses writing 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 SLOs 3 and 4, which assess technology skills and document design skills. This goal also is implied in all of the other SLOs

because they can involve the use of technology, although 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 SLOs 1 through 5, and this ability may also be implied in SLOs 6 and 7.

Results

A total of 11 students identified as Professional Writing students during the 2019-2020 academic year. This total includes 8 majors, 2 minors, and 1 collateral. Ten out of the 11 students were assessed by one or more methods this year, whether by portfolio review, internship evaluation, exit survey, or through a combination of these methods. Not all students submit portfolios for review, complete their internships, and/or graduate during the same academic year. However, all students will be assessed by each method only once during their time in the program.

Below are the results for each SLO presented by assessment type and averaged by each SLO with the relationship of these results to the baseline, benchmark, and target figures. See the Appendix for summary charts grouped by assessment method.

SLO 1: Apply rhetorical strategies in developing content appropriate to audiences in professional environments. Eleven students were in the program this year and 10 were evaluated for SLO 1 by one or more methods.

Method	n	Average Rating
Portfolios	5	4.36
Internships	6	4.22
Exit surveys	6	4.17
<hr/>		
SLO 1 average		4.25

The combined SLO 1 average of 4.25 is higher than the baseline of 4.13, higher than the benchmark score that was desired for this year of 4.0, and also higher than the target that was set at 4.0. The baseline, benchmark, and target scores were achieved.

SLO 2: Write and edit clear, correct, and logically organized texts. Eleven students were in the program this year and 10 were evaluated for SLO 2 by one or more methods.

Method	n	Average Rating
Portfolios	5	4.12
Internships	6	4.48
Exit surveys	6	4.33
<hr/>		
SLO 2 average		4.31

The combined SLO 2 average of 4.31 is higher than the baseline of 4.22, higher than the benchmark score that was desired for this year of 4.0, and also higher than the target that was set at 4.0. The baseline, benchmark, and target scores were achieved.

SLO 3: Design documents, both print and electronic, for usability and readability. Eleven students were in the program this year and 10 were evaluated for SLO 3 by one or more methods.

Method	n	Average Rating
Portfolios	5	4.28
Internships	6	4.50
Exit surveys	6	4.33
<hr/>		
SLO 3 average		4.37

The combined SLO 3 average of 4.37 is higher than the baseline of 4.31, higher than the benchmark score that was desired for this year of 4.0, and also higher than the target that was set at 4.0. The baseline, benchmark, and target scores were achieved.

SLO 4: Use technology strategically in writing and communication projects. Eleven students were in the program this year and 10 were evaluated for SLO 4 by one or more methods.

Method	n	Average Rating
Portfolios	5	4.04
Internships	6	5.00
Exit surveys	6	4.33
<hr/>		
SLO 4 average		4.46

The combined SLO 4 average of 4.46 is higher than the benchmark score that was desired for this year of 4.0, and also higher than the target that was set at 4.0. There was no baseline for this new SLO. The benchmark and target scores were achieved.

SLO 5: Conduct primary and secondary research to advance project goals. Eleven students were in the program this year and 10 were evaluated for SLO 5 by one or more methods.

Method	n	Average Rating
Portfolios	5	3.92
Internships	6	4.50
Exit surveys	6	4.33
<hr/>		
SLO 5 average		4.25

The combined SLO 5 average of 4.25 is higher than the benchmark score that was desired for this year of 4.0, and also higher than the target that was set at 4.0. There was no baseline for this new SLO. The benchmark and target scores were achieved.

SLO 6: Collaborate on teams effectively. Eleven students were in the program this year and 10 were evaluated for SLO 6 by one or more methods.

Method	n	Average Rating
Portfolios	5	3.40
Internships	6	4.33
Exit surveys	6	4.33
<hr/>		
SLO 6 average		4.02

The combined SLO 6 average of 4.02 is higher than the benchmark score that was desired for this year of 4.0, and also higher than the target that was set at 4.0. There was no baseline for this new SLO. The benchmark and target scores were achieved.

SLO 7: Enter professional career paths. Eleven students were in the program this year and 10 were evaluated for SLO 7 by one or more methods.

Method	n	Average Rating
Portfolios	5	3.92
Internships	6	4.00
Exit surveys	6	3.67
<hr/>		
SLO 7 average		3.86

The combined SLO 7 average of 3.86 is lower than the benchmark score that was desired for this year of 4.0, and also lower than the target that was set at 4.0. There was no baseline for this new SLO. The benchmark and target scores were not achieved.

Overall, the results show that SLO 4 (technology) scored the highest (4.46) and SLO 7 (career-readiness) scored the lowest (3.86).

Student Comments

Key insights from student reflection letters and text responses on the exit survey follow.

Portfolio Reflections

“I think that the greatest benefit of being in this program is doing projects that have actual value to them. Every single project I have completed has increased my knowledge of some aspect of writing, it isn’t just reading a textbook and taking a test to see if you understood what you read. It is applying what you read in the textbook to a project or assignment. It has been especially beneficial to me because that is how I learn best, by doing things hands on.”

“[prior to PW classes] ...I had only ever used Microsoft Word to create documents, so having to use more than one program made me realize that there isn’t a program that can do everything. Instead of stubbornly sticking with the same program, I need to learn to adjust according to my needs.”

“Having to learn all these new programs that I had never used before made me realize that I could do that with other programs. I know that if there comes a time in my career where I am

presented with a new program, I won't be worried because I'll know that I can learn how to use a new program.”

“I've gained a lot of confidence during my time at Francis Marion, especially in my professional writing skills.”

“Throughout the entire Professional Writing program, I have learned to be precise with grammar, sentence structure, and editing.”

Program Changes Suggested on the Exit Survey

- “More opportunities to take on real projects (like Farm to School)”
- “Another Business Writing Course”
- “I think the Professional Writing program would benefit from making the Non-Profit class a requirement.
- “I also think a collaboration with Computer Science majors or Marketing majors might also benefit Professional Writing students.”
- “I would like to see more of a variety of writing courses because there are so many professional writing careers. Also, the New Media course should be longer in order to cover everything needed and not feel rushed.”

Additional Comments from the Exit Survey

- “Happy I picked this major”
- “Making Professional Writing my collateral was one of the best decisions I have made at FMU. This program has made me more confident in my writing abilities. I also feel more comfortable taking on various writing projects. I am very grateful for my experience in the program.”

On the exit survey, all students responded with “5” (strongly agree) when asked if they were glad that they chose to study PW, if their PW courses had been enjoyable and rewarding, and if they had been effectively advised by PW faculty.

Faculty Comments on the Portfolio Review Process

Several of the reviewers commented that it was difficult to assess SLOs 5, 6, and 7 through portfolio artifacts. Sometimes the student reflection letters were helpful in determining ratings for these SLO categories. As they evaluated portfolios, faculty members often found themselves thinking about their classroom observations of students' behavior and work and acknowledged that their ratings could be influenced by these experiences.

Action Items

This section provides further reflection on the results and presents suggestions for the program.

Of all the assessment methods, the portfolio reviews performed by professors returned the lowest averages across all of the SLOs except for SLO 1 (rhetoric and content creation). Since faculty members are expert evaluators of student work, the portfolio scores are likely the most accurate measures of student skills and knowledge. However, faculty members acknowledged that portfolio reviews may be inadequate for assessing some of the new SLOs that are related to attitudes and behaviors. It is logical that the lowest SLO portfolio ratings were for SLOs 5, 6, and 7 because these concern processes more than products.

All of the benchmarks were met this year except for SLO 7, which assesses students' readiness to enter career paths. The Professional Writing program will address the SLO that did not meet the benchmark this year (SLO 7) through the following action item:

1. Program faculty members will develop more opportunities for students to achieve career-readiness. These could be in-class activities, such as working on more client-based projects, as well as extracurricular activities.

In addition, the Professional Writing Advisory Committee will:

2. Determine whether portfolios are a reliable assessment method for all of the new SLOs, especially SLO 6 (teamwork and collaboration), and/or if additional methods are needed to better assess individual SLOs.
3. Decide on appropriate benchmarks that will be desirable to achieve next year and also set assessment targets for 3-5 years in the future.

These action items will result in improvements to the Professional Writing program and will also streamline the program's assessment practices.

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

Submitted on May 29, 2020, to:
Rebecca Flannagan, Department Chair
Minerva Brauss, Director of Institutional Effectiveness

Appendix

This appendix contains the baseline calculations, the data collection instruments, and response summaries by assessment method.

Baseline Calculations

Average SLO Ratings by Method and Year (Pre-2020 SLOs)

	2019	2018	2017	2016	Average of 2016 to 2019
SLO 1					
Portfolio	4.30	N/A	4.20	4.60	
Intern Evals	4.65	4.25	N/A	N/A	
Engl 305 Test*	87%	68%	76%	78%	
converted to 5-point	4.4	3.4	3.8	3.9	
All Methods	4.43	3.83	4.00	4.25	4.13
SLO 2					
Portfolio	4.10	N/A	4.30	4.60	
Intern Evals	4.60	4.75	N/A	N/A	
All Methods	4.35	4.75	4.30	4.60	4.50
SLO 3					
Portfolio	4.00	N/A	3.90	4.30	
Intern Evals	4.60	4.75	N/A	N/A	
All Methods	4.30	4.75	3.90	4.30	4.31
SLO 4					
Portfolio	4.00	N/A	4.20	4.30	
Intern Evals	4.67	4.33	N/A	N/A	
All Methods	4.34	4.33	4.20	4.30	4.29
SLO 5					
Portfolio	3.70	N/A	3.60	4.10	
Intern Evals	4.80	4.25	N/A	N/A	
All Methods	4.25	4.25	3.60	4.10	4.05
SLO 6					
Portfolio	3.10	N/A	3.40	4.30	
Intern Evals	4.70	4.50	N/A	N/A	
All Methods	3.90	4.50	3.40	4.30	4.03

*Percentages are converted to a 5-point scale to calculate the baseline figures.

Baseline Conversion for New SLOs - Combining Averages

Old SLOs	New	Baseline for 2020
1	1	4.13
2, 4, 5, 6	2	4.22
3	3	4.31
N/A	4	N/A
N/A	5	N/A
N/A	6	N/A
N/A	7	N/A

Portfolio Review Survey

Portfolio Rating Form

Professional Writing Program Assessment

* Required

Instructions for Reviewers

Please submit a form for each student. Note that students with electronic portfolios also have written transmittal letters. Links to all portfolios, letters, and the e-portfolio assignment are on this Google Doc: [\[link\]](#)

Each SLO rating question requires a response. All comments are optional.

1. Reviewer Name *

2. Student Name *

Mark only one oval.

[Student Name]

[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 (and reflection letter, if applicable) that she prepared.

3. SLO1: Applies rhetorical strategies in developing content appropriate to audiences in professional environments. *

Mark only one oval.

- 5 - Outstanding
- 4 - Above average
- 3 - Average
- 2 - Below average
- 1 - Poor

4. SLO1 Comments

5. SLO 2: Writes and edits clear, correct, and logically organized texts. *

Mark only one oval.

- 5 - Outstanding
- 4 - Above average
- 3 - Average
- 2 - Below average
- 1 - Poor

6. SLO2 Comments

7. SLO3: Designs documents, both print and electronic, for usability and readability. *

Mark only one oval.

- 5 - Outstanding
- 4 - Above average
- 3 - Average
- 2 - Below average
- 1 - Poor

8. SLO3 Comments

9. SLO 4: Uses technology strategically in writing and communication projects. *

Mark only one oval.

- 5 - Outstanding
- 4 - Above average
- 3 - Average
- 2 - Below average
- 1 - Poor

10. SLO4 Comments

11. SLO5: Conducts primary and secondary research to advance project goals. *

Mark only one oval.

- 5 - Outstanding
- 4 - Above average
- 3 - Average
- 2 - Below average
- 1 - Poor

12. SLO5 Comments

13. SLO6: Collaborates on teams effectively. *

Mark only one oval.

- 5 - Outstanding
- 4 - Above average
- 3 - Average
- 2 - Below average
- 1 - Poor

14. SLO6 Comments

15. SLO7: Demonstrates readiness to enter career paths. *

Mark only one oval.

- 5 - Outstanding
- 4 - Above average
- 3 - Average
- 2 - Below average
- 1 - Poor

16. SLO7 Comments

17. General Comments

Please complete a form for each student by May 22, 2020.

You will have the option to complete additional forms after you click the Submit button.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.



Portfolio Review Survey Ratings

Reviewer	Student Code	SLO1	SLO2	SLO3	SLO4	SLO5	SLO6	SLO7
R4	20-b	4	4	5	4	3	2	3
R4	20-a	5	5	5	5	5	3	5
R4	20-e	5	4	4	5	4	1	4
R4	20-d	4	4	4	5	3	3	4
R4	20-c	5	5	5	5	5	4	5
R5	20-b	5	4	5	3	4	4	3
R5	20-a	5	5	5	4	4	4	4
R5	20-e	4	5	5	5	5	3	5
R5	20-d	3	4	4	4	4	3	3
R5	20-c	5	5	5	4	5	3	3
R3	20-b	4	4	4	4	5	4	4
R3	20-a	5	4	4	5	4	4	5
R3	20-e	4	3	3	3	3	4	3
R8	20-b	4	3	3	3	3	3	3
R8	20-a	4	4	4	3	3	3	4
R8	20-e	4	3	3	3	4	3	4
R8	20-d	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
R8	20-c	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
R7	20-b	4	4	4	3	3	4	3
R7	20-a	5	4	5	5	4	4	5
R7	20-e	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
R7	20-d	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
R7	20-c	5	5	5	5	5	4	5
R3	20-d	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
R3	20-c	5	4	5	5	4	4	5
		SLO1	SLO2	SLO3	SLO4	SLO5	SLO6	SLO7
	Average	4.36	4.12	4.28	4.04	3.92	3.40	3.92
	Mode	4	4	4	5	4	4	3
	Median	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Std Dev	0.569	0.600	0.678	0.841	0.759	0.764	0.812
	% of 4 or 5 ratings	96%	88%	88%	68%	68%	52%	64%

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 Ratings

Q	Sponsor Questionnaire - Common Questions*	Student Codes						AVG	Maps to
		19-e	20-a	20-f	21-b	20-e	20-b		
1	Increased oral and written communication skills for the workplace environment.	4	3	5	5	5	4	4.33	SLO 2
2	Cultivated professional habits such as taking initiative, anticipating and solving problems, and following through on communications and other activities.	3	3	5	5	5	5	4.33	SLO 7
3	Applied critical thinking skills to develop and implement effective communication strategies.	3	4	5	5	5	4	4.33	SLO 1
4	Increased research skills through multiple channels, including traditional library sources, electronic sources (including the web), phone contacts, and personal contacts.	4	5	5	4	5	4	4.50	SLO 1, SLO 5
5	Increased organizational skills in researching, compiling data, and designing documents.	4	4	5	5	5	5	4.67	SLO 2, SLO 3
6	Improved abilities to develop and incorporate graphics into written documents.	5	3	5	5	5	N/A	4.60	SLO 2
7	Improved comprehension of software programs commonly used in developing print and online documents.	5	5	5	5	5	N/A	5.00	SLO 4
8	Improved abilities to write for an online audience.	4	1	5	4	5	4	3.83	SLO 1
9	Tracked work progress by clarifying tasks completed, tasks remaining, problems, and potential solutions.	2	2	5	5	5	3	3.67	SLO 7
10	Produced professional documents.	4	3	5	5	5	4	4.33	SLO 2, SLO 3
11	Followed standard business practices and functioning as a contributing member of a team.	3	3	5	5	5	5	4.33	SLO 6
	Average of Common Questions by Student	3.7	3.3	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.2	4.36	
	Sponsor Questionnaire - Position-specific Questions								
	Average of scores across all position-specific work areas (questions and number of questions are different for each student).	3.3	3.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.4	4.366	
	Overall Student Rating	3.5	3.1	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.3	4.362	
SLO	Sponsor Ratings to SLOs							Average Rating	
1	Apply rhetorical strategies in developing content appropriate to audiences in professional environments (Q 3, 4, 8)							4.22	
2	Write and edit clear, correct, and logically organized texts (Q 1, 5, 6, 10)							4.48	
3	Design documents, both print and electronic, for usability and readability (Q 5, 10)							4.50	
4	Use technology strategically in writing and communication projects (Q 7)							5.00	
5	Conduct primary and secondary research to advance project goals (Q 4)							4.50	
6	Collaborate on teams effectively (Q 11)							4.33	
7	Enter professional career paths (Q 2, 9)							4.00	

Student Exit Survey

Professional Writing Program Exit Survey

Francis Marion University, Department of English

* Required

Major / Minor / Collateral Information

Participation in this exit survey is voluntary and you may choose to end your participation at any time. The information that you provide on this survey will be used for institutional effectiveness reporting. Your name and any other identifying information that you share will be removed from the report. If you have questions, please contact Christine Masters (cmasters@fmarion.edu).

1. Your name

2. Please provide a non-FMU email address where we can reach you in the future.

3. I am a Professional Writing... *

Mark only one oval.

- major
 minor
 collateral
 N/A

4. If you are a PW MAJOR, what is your minor (or what are your collaterals)?

5. If you are a PW MINOR, what is your major?

6. If you are a PW COLLATERAL, what is your major? What is your other collateral?

Reasons for studying Professional Writing

7. I am glad that I chose to study Professional Writing.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
strongly disagree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	strongly agree

8. I chose to study Professional Writing for the following reasons:

Courses

9. Overall, my courses at FRANCIS MARION UNIVERSITY have been enjoyable and/or rewarding.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
strongly disagree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	strongly agree

10. Overall, my PROFESSIONAL WRITING courses have been enjoyable and/or rewarding.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
strongly disagree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	strongly agree

11. I have found these Professional Writing courses to be the MOST enjoyable and/or rewarding:

12. I have found these Professional Writing courses to be the LEAST enjoyable and/or LEAST rewarding:

13. My Professional Writing courses have helped me to: *

Check all that apply.

	N/A	strongly disagree	somewhat disagree	neutral	somewhat agree	strongly agree
Apply rhetorical strategies in developing content appropriate to audiences in professional environments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Design documents, both print and electronic, for usability and readability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Write and edit clear, correct, and logically organized texts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use technology strategically in writing and communication projects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conduct primary and secondary research to advance project goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Collaborate on teams effectively	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enter professional career paths	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Future Plans

14. After graduation, I plan to:

15. In my future career, I anticipate that I will most use the following Professional Writing-related skills and knowledge:

Program Feedback

16. I have been effectively advised by Professional Writing Faculty members. (Please skip this question if you were not advised by PW faculty.)

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
strongly disagree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	strongly agree

17. I would like to see these changes in the Professional Writing program:

18. Please write additional comments and feedback in the space below.

Student Exit Survey Ratings

SLO QUESTIONS		<i>Student Responses</i>								
	<i>My Professional Writing courses have helped me to:</i>	A	B	C	D	E	F*	AVG	Std Dev	
SLO 1	[Apply rhetorical strategies in developing content appropriate to audiences in professional environments]	4	5	5	5	5	1	4.17	1.60	
SLO 2	[Write and edit clear, correct, and logically organized texts]	5	5	5	5	5	1	4.33	1.63	
SLO 3	[Design documents, both print and electronic, for usability and readability]	5	5	5	5	5	1	4.33	1.63	
SLO 4	[Use technology strategically in writing and communication projects]	5	5	5	5	5	1	4.33	1.63	
SLO 5	[Conduct primary and secondary research to advance project goals]	5	5	5	5	5	1	4.33	1.63	
SLO 6	[Collaborate on teams effectively]	5	5	5	5	5	1	4.33	1.63	
SLO 7	[Enter professional career paths]	3	5	3	5	5	1	3.67	1.63	
F* - Possible error in understanding the form. The student's other answers were all 5s and their comments were all positive.										
ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS		A	B	C	D	E	F*	AVG	Std Dev	
	I am glad that I chose to study Professional Writing.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.00	0.00	
	Overall, my courses at FRANCIS MARION UNIVERSITY have been enjoyable and/or rewarding.	5	5	4	5	4	5	4.67	0.52	
	Overall, my PROFESSIONAL WRITING courses have been enjoyable and/or rewarding.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.00	0.00	
	I have been effectively advised by Professional Writing Faculty members. (Please skip this question if you were not advised by PW faculty.)	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.00	0.00	