

# Institutional Effectiveness Report

Program: Professional Writing, Department of English, Modern Languages, and Philosophy  
Year: 2020-2021  
Prepared by: Christine Masters, Program Coordinator and Assistant Professor of English  
Date: May 28, 2021

Following a template provided by the Francis Marion University IE committee, 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)

The PLOs align with the program mission statement by emphasizing the acquisition of communication, organizational, technological and teamwork skills that can be applied in professional settings. 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.

## Executive Summary

This report documents the Professional Writing program's assessment activities for the 2020-2021 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. This year, the benchmarks and targets for all SLOs were met. However, the baseline for SLO 4 was not met, which shows that students need to improve their abilities to select genres and delivery methods. For the coming year, action items include: 1) improve instruction in areas related to genre and delivery and 2) evaluate whether to increase measures for future benchmark and target scores.

## Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

In 2020-2021, the Professional Writing Advisory Committee adjusted the language of SLOs 4 through 7 to conform to Bloom’s Taxonomy for measurable outcomes:

As students complete the course requirements in the Professional Writing program, they should:

(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) Demonstrate an ability to select effective and appropriate genres and delivery modes (previously “Use technology strategically in writing and communication projects”), (5) Generate primary and secondary research to advance project goals (previously “Conduct primary and secondary research to advance project goals”), (6) Demonstrate an ability to collaborate on teams effectively (previously “Collaborate on teams effectively”), and (7) Demonstrate professionalism in workplace or professional contexts (previously “Enter professional career paths”). The SLOs map to the PLOs, and they are 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) Demonstrate an ability to select effective and appropriate genres and delivery modes	4	Knowledge Skills
(5) Generate primary and secondary research to advance project goals	1, 2	Knowledge Skills
(6) Demonstrate an ability to collaborate on teams effectively	1, 3	Skills Behavioral
(7) Demonstrate professionalism in workplace or professional contexts	1, 3, 5	Attitudes/values Behavioral

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

## Methods

The methods used to evaluate the Professional Writing program’s SLOs include indirect and direct evaluations.

**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 495-Professional Writing Capstone. 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 summarized or quantified, but well-written letters may help 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, N/A = does not apply or cannot be assessed from the artifacts.” From the committee responses, the program coordinator calculates an average score for each SLO. This year, 4 members of the Professional Writing Advisory Committee reviewed and rated 3 student portfolios (1 major and 2 minors). Each of these 3 students was required to create a portfolio, will graduate by December 2021, 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. This year 3 PW students (all majors) completed internships and were evaluated by 2 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, 2 majors graduated in December 2020, no majors graduated in May 2021, 2 minors graduated in May 2021, and no collaterals graduated. All 4 of these graduating seniors completed the student exit survey.

## Methods by SLO

During academic year 2020-2021, the Professional Writing Advisory Committee approved benchmark and target scores of 4.0 for all SLOs.

**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 is 4.19. It is calculated as the mean of the previous five years’ SLO 1 scores (see the 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 is 4.27. It is calculated as the mean of the previous year and the earlier four years’ combined SLO 2, 4, 5, and 6 scores due to the SLO changes explained in the 2019-2020 IE Report. 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 is 4.34. It is calculated as the mean of the previous five years' SLO 3 scores (see the 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: Demonstrate an ability to select effective and appropriate genres and delivery modes.** 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 4 is 4.46. This SLO was added last year (2019-2020), so this baseline is last year's score. 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 5: Generate 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). The baseline score for SLO 5 is 4.25. This SLO was added last year (2019-2020), so this baseline is last year's score. 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 6: Demonstrate an ability to 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). The baseline score for SLO 6 is 4.02. This SLO was added last year (2019-2020), so this baseline is last year's score. 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 7: Demonstrate professionalism in workplace or professional contexts.** 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 7 is 3.86. This SLO was added last year (2019-2020), so this baseline is last year's score. 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.

## General Education Goals

The Professional Writing programmatic SLOs map to Francis Marion's 2020-2021 General Education Goals 1 and 9 as listed below.

**Goal 1. The ability to compose effectively with rhetorical awareness, integrate relevant research when appropriate, and produce developed, insightful arguments.** This goal is addressed by SLOs 1, 2, and 5, which address writing and research skills.

**Goal 9. The ability to apply critical thinking skills to assess arguments and solve problems.** 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

The Professional Writing program collected assessment data from 5 students during the 2020-2021 academic year. This total includes 3 majors and 2 minors. Five out of the 5 students were assessed by one or more methods this year, whether by portfolio review (n=3), internship evaluation (n=3), exit survey (n=4), 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 are assessed by each method only once during their time in the program. Current results for each SLO are presented with the relationship of these results to the baseline, benchmark, and target figures. Table 2 follows with a comparative summary. Additional tables grouped by assessment method are provided in the Appendix.

**SLO 1: Apply rhetorical strategies in developing content appropriate to audiences in professional environments.** Five students were evaluated for SLO 1 by one or more methods. The combined SLO 1 average of 4.75 is higher than the baseline of 4.19, 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.** Five students were evaluated for SLO 2 by one or more methods. The combined SLO 2 average of 4.67 is higher than the baseline of 4.27, 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.** Five students were evaluated for SLO 3 by one or more methods. The combined SLO 3 average of 4.5 is higher than the baseline of 4.34, 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: Demonstrate an ability to select effective and appropriate genres and delivery modes.** Five students were evaluated for SLO 4 by one or more methods. The combined SLO 4 average of 4.42 is lower than the baseline of 4.46, 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 was not achieved, but the benchmark and target scores were achieved.

**SLO 5: Generate primary and secondary research to advance project goals.** Five students were evaluated for SLO 5 by one or more methods. The combined SLO 5 average of 4.8 is higher than the baseline of 4.25, 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 6: Demonstrate an ability to collaborate on teams effectively.** Five students were evaluated for SLO 6 by one or more methods. The combined SLO 6 average of 4.57 is higher than the baseline of 4.02, 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 7: Demonstrate professionalism in workplace or professional contexts.** Five students were evaluated for SLO 7 by one or more methods. The combined SLO 7 average of 4.64 is higher than the baseline of 3.86, 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.

Overall, the results show that SLO 4 (genre and delivery) scored the lowest (4.42). SLO 4 was greater than the benchmark and target but was less than the baseline score (see Table 2).

### Summary of SLO Scores

	<i>2020-21 Results</i>	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Benchmark</i>	<i>Target</i>
SLO 1 – Rhetorical strategies for content	4.75	4.19	4.00	4.00
SLO 2 – Writing and editing	4.67	4.27	4.00	4.00
SLO 3 – Document design	4.50	4.34	4.00	4.00
SLO 4 – Genre and delivery	4.42	4.46	4.00	4.00
SLO 5 – Research	4.80	4.25	4.00	4.00
SLO 6 – Teams	4.57	4.02	4.00	4.00
SLO 7 – Professionalization	4.64	3.86	4.00	4.00

Table 2. Current-year results for SLOs 1 to 7 compared to the baseline, benchmark, and target scores.

## Action Items

This year, action items are presented only for SLO 4. General recommendations follow after the listing of all SLOs.

**SLO 1: Apply rhetorical strategies in developing content appropriate to audiences in professional environments.** Due to current-year scores being higher than baseline, benchmark, and target scores, no action items are planned.

**SLO 2: Write and edit clear, correct, and logically organized texts.** Due to current-year scores being higher than baseline, benchmark, and target scores, no action items are planned.

**SLO 3: Design documents, both print and electronic, for usability and readability.** Due to current-year scores being higher than baseline, benchmark, and target scores, no action items are planned.

**SLO 4 Demonstrate an ability to select effective and appropriate genres and delivery modes.** To bring the score for this SLO up higher than the baseline, the following actions will be taken:

- Ask instructors of core courses to include more discussion of and reflection on genre selection and delivery modes given available technologies in writing situations.

- Ask the PW Capstone instructor to 1) include a review of the genre and delivery approaches typically practiced in specific PW career paths, 2) encourage students to include a greater range of genres and delivery methods in their portfolios, and 3) write more reflectively about their genre and delivery choices in their portfolio letters.

**SLO 5: Generate primary and secondary research to advance project goals.** Due to current-year scores being higher than baseline, benchmark, and target scores, no action items are planned.

**SLO 6: Demonstrate an ability to collaborate on teams effectively.** Due to current-year scores being higher than baseline, benchmark, and target scores, no action items are planned.

**SLO 7: Demonstrate professionalism in workplace or professional contexts.** Due to current-year scores being higher than baseline, benchmark, and target scores, no action items are planned.

**General recommendations.** Because SLO scores are improving, the Professional Writing Advisory Committee should:

- Evaluate whether to raise the benchmarks for 2021-2022 as well as the longer-term target scores for the program.

Please contact Christine Masters ([cmasters@fmarion.edu](mailto:cmasters@fmarion.edu)) with questions about this report.

Submitted to:  
Minerva Brauss, Director of Institutional Effectiveness  
Rebecca Flannagan, Department Chair

## Appendix

The Appendix contains the assessment instruments and summaries of SLO-related responses.

### I. Baseline and Current-Year Calculations

	<i>2020 Results</i>	<i>2016-2019 Averages*</i>	<i>New Baseline for 2021</i>	<i>2021 Results</i>
<b>SLO 1</b>				
Portfolio	4.36			4.25
Intern Evals	4.22			5.00
Exit Survey	4.17			5.00
All Methods	4.25	4.13	<b>4.19</b>	<b>4.75</b>
<b>SLO 2</b>				
Portfolio	4.12			4.08
Intern Evals	4.48			4.92
Exit Survey	4.33			5.00
All Methods	4.31	4.22	<b>4.27</b>	<b>4.67</b>
<b>SLO 3</b>				
Portfolio	4.28			3.75
Intern Evals	4.50			5.00
Exit Survey	4.33			4.75
All Methods	4.37	4.31	<b>4.34</b>	<b>4.50</b>
<b>SLO 4</b>				
Portfolio	4.04			4.00
Intern Evals	5.00			5.00
Exit Survey	4.33			4.25
All Methods	4.46	N/A	<b>4.46</b>	<b>4.42</b>
<b>SLO 5</b>				
Portfolio	3.92			4.40
Intern Evals	4.50			5.00
Exit Survey	4.33			5.00
All Methods	4.25	N/A	<b>4.25</b>	<b>4.80</b>
<b>SLO 6</b>				
Portfolio	3.40			3.71
Intern Evals	4.33			5.00
Exit Survey	4.33			5.00
All Methods	4.02	N/A	<b>4.02</b>	<b>4.57</b>
<b>SLO 7</b>				
Portfolio	3.92			3.92
Intern Evals	4.00			5.00
Exit Survey	3.67			5.00
All Methods	3.86	N/A	<b>3.86</b>	<b>4.64</b>

\*Only the all method averages are shown for 2016-2019; SLOs were modified and remapped in 2020--see the 2019-2020 IE report.

## II. Portfolio Rating Form

### Portfolio Rating Form

Professional Writing Program Assessment

\* Required

**Instructions for Reviewers**

Please submit a form for each student. Portfolios and transmittal letters may be accessed via the Portfolio Assessment Links document: [\[link to Google Doc\]](#)

Please respond to each SLO rating question. All comments are optional.

1. Reviewer Name \*

---

2. Student Name \*

*Mark only one oval.*

Student Name

Student Name

Student Name

Please rate your assessment of the student's demonstrated level of achievement based on the internship portfolio and reflection letter. If you are not able to assess an SLO based on these artifacts, please select "N/A" from the dropdown menu.

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

N/A

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
- N/A

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
- N/A

8. SLO3 Comments

---

---

---

---

9. SLO 4: Demonstrates an ability to select effective and appropriate genres and delivery modes. \*

*Mark only one oval.*

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

10. SLO4 Comments

---

---

---

---

---

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

*Mark only one oval.*

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

12. SLO5 Comments

---

---

---

---

---

13. SLO6: Demonstrates an ability to collaborate on teams effectively. \*

*Mark only one oval.*

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

14. SLO6 Comments

---

---

---

---

---

15. SLO7: Demonstrates professionalism in workplace and professional contexts.\*

Mark only one oval.

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

16. SLO7 Comments

---

---

---

---

---

17. Do you have any other general comments about this student's portfolio and transmittal letter?

---

---

---

---

---

**Please complete a form for each student by May 21, 2021. Thank you!**

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

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.



### III. Portfolio Ratings

Reviewer Code	Student Code	SLO1	SLO2	SLO3	SLO4	SLO5	SLO6	SLO7
R2	21-a	5	5	5	5	5	4	4
R2	21-c	5	5	4	4	5	5	5
R2	21-b	4	3	3	4	5	5	4
R3	21-a	4	5	4	4	n/a	3	4
R3	21-c	4	3	3	4	n/a	n/a	3
R3	21-b	4	4	3	3	5	n/a	4
R4	21-a	5	5	5	5	4	3	5
R4	21-c	4	4	4	4	4	n/a	4
R4	21-b	5	5	4	4	5	3	4
R8	21-a	4	3	4	4	3	3	3
R8	21-c	3	3	3	3	3	n/a	3
R8	21-b	4	4	3	4	5	n/a	4

	SLO1	SLO2	SLO3	SLO4	SLO5	SLO6	SLO7
Average	4.25	4.08	3.75	4.00	4.40	3.71	3.92
Mode	4	5	4	4	5	3	4
Median	4	4	4	4	5	3	4
Std Dev	0.622	0.900	0.754	0.603	0.843	0.951	0.669

Note: Reviewers selected "n/a" when they felt that the SLO could not be evaluated based on the artifacts presented.

## IV. Internship Sponsor Survey Form

### 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

## V. Internship Sponsor Survey Ratings

Q	Sponsor Questionnaire - Common Questions	20-c	20-d	21-a	AVG	Std Dev	Maps to
1	Increased oral and written communication skills for the workplace environment.	5	4	5	4.67	0.58	SLO 2
2	Cultivated professional habits such as taking initiative, anticipating and solving problems, and following through on communications and other activities.	5	5	5	5.00	0.00	SLO 7
3	Applied critical thinking skills to develop and implement effective communication strategies.	5	5	5	5.00	0.00	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	5.00	0.00	SLO 1,5
5	Increased organizational skills in researching, compiling data, and designing documents.	5	5	5	5.00	0.00	SLO 2,3
6	Improved abilities to develop and incorporate graphics into written documents.	n/a	n/a	5	5.00		SLO 2
7	Improved comprehension of software programs commonly used in developing print and online documents.	5	n/a	5	5.00	0.00	SLO 4
8	Improved abilities to write for an online audience.	5	5	5	5.00	0.00	SLO 1
9	Tracked work progress by clarifying tasks completed, tasks remaining, problems, and potential solutions.	5	5	5	5.00	0.00	SLO 7
10	Produced professional documents.	5	5	5	5.00	0.00	SLO 2,3
11	Followed standard business practices and functioning as a contributing member of a team.	5	5	5	5.00	0.00	SLO 6
<b>Average of Common Questions by Student</b>		5.0	4.9	5.0	4.97		
<b>Sponsor Questionnaire - Position-specific Questions</b>							
Average of scores across all position-specific work areas (questions and number of questions are different for each student).		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.00		
<b>Overall Student Rating</b>		5.0	4.9	5.0	4.98		
SLO	<b>Sponsor Ratings Mapped to SLOs</b>				<b>Avg</b>		
1	Rhetorical strategies for content (Q 3, 4, 8)				5.00		
2	Writing and editing (Q 1, 5, 6, 10)				4.92		
3	Design documents (Q 5, 10)				5.00		
4	Genre / delivery (Q 7)				5.00		
5	Research (Q 4)				5.00		
6	Teams (Q 11)				5.00		
7	Professionalization (Q 2, 9)				5.00		

## VI. Student Exit Survey Form

### 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](mailto: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"/>	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"/>	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"/>	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"/>					
Design documents, both print and electronic, for usability and readability	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Write and edit clear, correct, and logically organized texts	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Use technology strategically in writing and communication projects	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Conduct primary and secondary research to advance project goals	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Collaborate on teams effectively	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Enter professional career paths	<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"/>	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.

---

---

---

---

---

## VII. Student Exit Survey Ratings

		21-b	21-c	20-c	20-d	<b>AVG</b>	Std Dev
SLO 1	Rhetorical strategies for content	5	5	5	5	<b>5.00</b>	0.00
SLO 2	Writing and editing	5	5	5	5	<b>5.00</b>	0.00
SLO 3	Design documents	4	5	5	5	<b>4.75</b>	0.50
SLO 4	Genre / delivery	3	4	5	5	<b>4.25</b>	0.96
SLO 5	Research	5	5	5	5	<b>5.00</b>	0.00
SLO 6	Teams	5	5	5	5	<b>5.00</b>	0.00
SLO 7	Professionalization	5	5	5	5	<b>5.00</b>	0.00