



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
PULASKI TECH

Assessment Report:
2019-2020
ENGL 1311: Composition I



Course-Level Learning Outcomes

1. What are the Course-Level Outcomes (CLOs)?

ACTS #ENGL 1013

The student will:

1. Respond appropriately to various rhetorical situations, purposes, and audiences
2. Use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating
3. Integrate original ideas with those of others
4. Develop flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proofreading
5. Use collaborative writing processes
6. Demonstrate knowledge of structure, paragraphing, tone, mechanics, syntax, grammar, and documentation

2. Which CLOs were addressed for this academic year? (2019-2020)

All of the CLOs were addressed and assessed using direct and indirect methods. All were reported:

Rhetorical Knowledge: Students will respond appropriately to various rhetorical situations, purposes, and audiences. (CLO 1)

Critical Thinking: Students will use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating. (CLO 2)

Academic Integrity: Students will integrate original ideas with those of others. (CLO 3)

Use of Invention Techniques: Students will develop flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proofreading. (CLO 4)

Collaborative Writing Processes: Students will use collaborative writing processes. (CLO 5)

Knowledge of Conventions: Students will demonstrate knowledge of structure, paragraphing, tone, mechanics, syntax, grammar, and documentation. (CLO 6)

3. Which CLOs are being addressed in your assessment plan next academic year? (2020-2021)

In the next academic year, all of them will be addressed, assessed, and recorded.

4. Explain the assessment cycle.

In 2018, a new method for assessment was established for first-year Composition courses, and it was piloted during AY 2018-2019. Along with the method, a new standardized rubric was created. Each instructor uses the rubric to assess their students' assignment, then generate a report. During this cycle, the method (direct, portfolio) will be identical each year and all CLOs will be assessed, until further notice. AY 2019-2020 represents the first year of a three-year cycle.

5. What are the assessment methods? Are they direct or indirect?

Composition I focuses on communicating ideas clearly. Students practice methods of drafting, including how to create a thesis and how to support and develop that thesis in a focused, thorough, and stylistically appropriate essay that demonstrates awareness of audience and the conventions of medium and genre. The class will focus on writing strategies such as invention, arrangement, drafting, and revision, including teamwork with the instructor and/or classmates in the writing process, fluency issues such as the use of transitions, and the correction of major usage errors. The class requires students to read texts critically and to practice good scholarship through the conventions of style and documentation. Students practice integrating summary, paraphrase, and quotation into their own original compositions. Students write a minimum of fifteen pages of formal writing to be divided among at least three major compositions that address at least three of the following six genres: argument, narrative, analysis, report, review, and proposal. One must be a research paper that incorporates material from quality sources. Students will also submit a final portfolio for the course that includes evidence of course outcomes through paper assignments, invention techniques, and rough drafts as well as a final reflection that discusses development of skills learned in the course.

For this assessment, students' portfolios include evidence of writing diverse genres to diverse audiences, integration of sources, the use of invention techniques that illustrate multiple stages of the writing process, and the use of collaborative writing processes. The portfolios' artifacts include invention strategies, preliminary drafts, revisions and polished projects. Students' portfolios also show evidence of metacognition of the development of skills through a final reflection.

For each assessment period, a standard rubric is used to evaluate the students' essays and each student's essay is scored on each CLO in one of the following proficiencies: Mastered, Developing, Emerging, and Not Present. This represents a change from skills-based language to a focus on student proficiency. Although the scoring is standardized, instructors do not necessarily associate the scores with grading of the portfolio. Each of the course learning outcomes are designated in the rubric.

Though we had planned to use a criteria threshold of 70%, we modified the threshold to 75%; we wish to see 75% of students illustrating "developing" or "mastered" levels.

All instructors assess their sections' essays and generate a rubric evaluation report, then send the report to the departmental assessment head.

6. What are the assessment goal(s)?

The goals for assessment in Composition I are as follows:

- Establish a baseline. We want 75% of students to have developed or mastered each of the CLOs.
- Use the data to adjust instruction. Instructors can improve student learning by defining assignment expectations and increasing the breadth and/or depth of their instruction.
- Use the data to determine areas of weakness or strength. As a discipline, we can identify areas of weakness or strength and identify action that should be taken.

7. What were the findings for this academic year? (2019-2020)

Table 1: Fall 2019 Portfolio. Yellow cells indicate performance below 75% threshold.

2019 Fall Portfolio	Total Evaluations	Rhetorical Knowledge	Critical Thinking	Academic Integrity	Use of Invention Techniques	Collaborative Writing Processes	Knowledge of Conventions	Self-Reflection
Traditional corequisite	312	282	246	248	277	264	260	243
Traditional non-corequisite	237	203	200	194	211	193	199	188
Traditional (corequisite and non-corequisite)	549	485	446	442	488	457	459	431
Online	87	75	67	63	76	72	70	77
All Concurrent	104	91	88	84	94	87	92	84
Total all students Fall 2019	740	651	601	589	658	616	621	592

Table 2 Spring 2020 Portfolio. Yellow cells indicate performance below 75% threshold.

Spring 2020 Portfolio	Total Evaluations	Rhetorical Knowledge	Critical Thinking	Academic Integrity	Use of Invention Techniques	Collaborative Writing Processes	Knowledge of Conventions	Self-Reflection
Total Traditional/Corequisite	103	87	86	78	87	81	87	81
Total Traditional/Non-Corequisite	71	66	65	63	50	50	64	49
Total Traditional students	174	153	151	141	137	131	151	130
Total Online	66	47	50	47	51	50	56	46
All Students	240	200	201	188	188	181	207	176

Table 3. Academic Year 2019-2020 Course Learning Outcomes by Course Types. Yellow cell indicates performance below 75% threshold.

AY 2019-2020	Total Evaluations	Rhetorical Knowledge	Critical Thinking	Academic Integrity	Use of Invention Techniques	Collaborative Writing Processes	Knowledge of Conventions	Self-Reflection
Total Traditional/Corequisite	415	369	332	326	364	345	347	324
Total Traditional/Non-Corequisite	308	269	265	257	261	243	263	237
Total Traditional (corequisite and non-corequisite)	723	638	597	583	625	588	610	561
Total Online	153	122	117	110	127	122	126	123
Total Concurrent	104	91	88	84	94	87	92	84
Total all students	980	851	802	777	846	797	828	768

CLO 1: Rhetorical Situations (Rhetorical Knowledge)

Fall 2019

Out of 740 total students assessed for Rhetorical Situations (Rhetorical Knowledge), 651 (88%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 549 traditional students, 485 (88%) scored Mastering or Developing; of those, 312 students were in traditional corequisite courses and 282 (90%) scored Mastering or Developing; of those 237 students were in traditional, non-corequisite courses and 203 (85.7%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 87 online students, 75 (86%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 104 concurrent credit students, 91 (87.5%) scored Mastering or Developing.

Spring 2020

Out of 240 total students assessed for Rhetorical Situations (Rhetorical Knowledge), 200 (83.3%) scored Mastering or Developing. Of those, 103 students were in traditional corequisite courses and 87 (84.4%) scored Mastering or Developing, and 71 students were in traditional, non-corequisite courses and 66 (92.9%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 66 online students, 47 (71.2%) scored Mastering or Developing.

CLO 2: Writing and Reading (Critical Thinking)

Fall 2019

Out of 740 total students assessed for Writing and Reading (Critical Thinking), 601 (81.2%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 549 traditional students, 446 (81.2%) scored Mastering or Developing; of those, 312 students were in traditional corequisite courses and 246 (78.8%) scored Mastering or Developing; of those 237 students were in traditional, non-corequisite courses and 200 (84.4%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 87 online students, 67 (77%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 104 concurrent credit students, 88 (84.6%) scored Mastering or Developing.

Spring 2020

Out of 240 total students assessed for Writing and Reading (Critical Thinking), 201 (83.8%) scored Mastering or Developing. Of those, 103 students were in traditional corequisite courses and 86 (83.5%) scored Mastering or Developing; of those 71 students were in traditional, non-corequisite courses, and 65 (91.5%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 66 online students, 50 (75.8%) scored Mastering or Developing.

CLO 3: Academic Integrity

Fall 2019

Out of 740 total students assessed for Academic Integrity, 589 (79.6%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 549 traditional students, 442 (80.5%) scored Mastering or Developing; of those, 312 students were in traditional corequisite courses and 248 (79.5%) scored Mastering or Developing; of those 237 students were in traditional, non-corequisite courses and 194 (81.9%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 87 online students, 63 (72.4%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 104 concurrent credit students, 84 (80.7%) scored Mastering or Developing.

Spring 2020

Out of 240 total students assessed for Academic Integrity, 188 (78.3%) scored Mastering or Developing. Of those, 103 students were in traditional corequisite courses and 78 (75.7%) scored Mastering or Developing, and 71 students were in traditional, non-corequisite courses and 63 (88.7%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 66 online students, 47 (71.2%) scored Mastering or Developing.

Academic Year 2019-2020

Out of 980 total students assessed for Academic Integrity, 777 (79.2%) scored Mastering or Developing. Of those, 415 students were in traditional corequisite courses and 326 (78.6%) scored Mastering or Developing, and 308 students were in traditional, non-corequisite courses and 257 (78.8%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 104 concurrent credit students, 84 (80.7%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 153 online students, 110 (71.9%) scored Mastering or Developing.

CLO 4: Flexible Strategies (Use of Invention Techniques)

Fall 2019

Out of 740 total students assessed for Use of Invention Techniques, 658 (88.9%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 549 traditional students, 488 (88.9%) scored Mastering or Developing; of those, 312 students were in traditional corequisite courses and 277 (88.8%) scored Mastering or Developing; of those 237 students were in traditional, non-corequisite courses and 211 (89%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 87 online students, 76 (87.4%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 104 concurrent credit students, 94 (90.4%) scored Mastering or Developing.

Spring 2020

Out of 240 total students assessed for Use of Invention Techniques, 188 (78.3%) scored Mastering or Developing. Of those, 103 students were in traditional corequisite courses and 87 (84.4%) scored Mastering or Developing. Of the 71 students in traditional, non-corequisite courses, 50 (70.4%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 66 online students, 51 (77.3%) scored Mastering or Developing.

CLO 5: Collaborative Writing Processes

Fall 2019

Out of 740 total students assessed for Collaborative Writing Processes, 616 (83.2%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 549 traditional students, 457 (83.2%) scored Mastering or Developing; of those, 312 students were in traditional corequisite courses and 264 (84.6%) scored Mastering or Developing; of those 237 students were in traditional, non-corequisite courses and 193 (81.4%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 87 online students, 72 (82.8%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 104 concurrent credit students, 87 (83.6%) scored Mastering or Developing.

Spring 2020

Out of 240 total students assessed for Collaborative Writing Processes, 181 (75.4%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of the 103 students who were in traditional corequisite courses, 81 (78.6%) scored Mastering or Developing; of those 71 students in traditional, non-corequisite courses, 50 (70.4%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 66 online students, 50 (75.8%) scored Mastering or Developing.

CLO 6: Knowledge of Conventions

Fall 2019

Out of 740 total students assessed for Knowledge of Conventions, 621 (83.9%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 549 traditional students, 459 (83.6%) scored Mastering or Developing; of those, 312 students were in traditional corequisite courses and 260 (83.3%) scored Mastering or Developing; of those 237 students were in traditional, non-corequisite courses and 199 (84%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 87 online students, 70 (80.5%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 104 concurrent credit students, 92 (88.5%) scored Mastering or Developing.

Spring 2020

Out of 240 total students assessed for Knowledge of Conventions, 207 (86.3%) scored Mastering or Developing. Of those, 103 students were in traditional corequisite courses and 87 (84.4%) scored Mastering or Developing; 71 students were in traditional, non-corequisite courses and 64 (90.1%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 66 online students, 56 (84.8%) scored Mastering or Developing.

Final Reflection (Self-Reflection)

Fall 2019

Out of 740 total students assessed for Self-Reflection, 592 (80%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 549 traditional students, 431 (78.5%) scored Mastering or Developing; of those, 312 students were in traditional corequisite courses and 243 (77.9%) scored Mastering or

Developing; of those 237 students were in traditional, non-corequisite courses and 188 (79.3%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 87 online students, 77 (88.5%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 104 concurrent credit students, 84 (80.8%) scored Mastering or Developing.

Spring 2020

Out of 240 total students assessed for Self-Reflection, 176 (73.3%) scored Mastering or Developing. Of those, 103 students were in traditional corequisite courses and 81 (78.6%) scored Mastering or Developing; 71 students were in traditional, non-corequisite courses and 49 (69%) scored Mastering or Developing. Out of 66 online students, 46 (69.7%) scored Mastering or Developing.

8. What is your analysis of the findings?

CLO 1: Rhetorical Situations (Rhetorical Knowledge)

Fall 2019

The results show that 88% of students meet the threshold. All classifications and sub-classifications of students meet the successful threshold. The highest rate of success (90%) is found among the traditional students who are enrolled in corequisite courses. The lowest rate of success (85.7%) is found among the traditional students who are enrolled in non-corequisite courses. Online students performed less well (86%) than students in traditional courses (88.3%).

Spring 2020

The results show that 83.3% of students meet the threshold, which was a decrease from 88% in the Spring 2019. The online group did not meet the threshold; its rate of success was 71.2%. Even though this group did not experience a change in format, this decrease may reflect the other challenges faced by students during the pandemic. Many students mentioned illness, changes in work schedules, and the closing of K-12 schools as obstacles during this semester. In addition, it is likely that less content was produced overall. The highest rate of success (92.9%) is found among the traditional students who are enrolled in non-corequisite courses. The success rate for traditional students who are enrolled in corequisite courses is lower (84.4%).

CLO 2: Writing and Reading (Critical Thinking)

Fall 2019

The results show that 81.2% of students meet the threshold. All classifications and sub-classifications of students meet the successful threshold. The highest rate of success (84.6%) is found among the concurrent students; this is similar to the traditional students who are enrolled in non-corequisite courses (84.4%). The lowest rate of success (77%) is found among students who are enrolled in online courses. Online students performed less well (77%) than students in traditional courses (81.2%) or concurrent courses (84.6%).

Spring 2020

The results show that 83.8% of students meet the threshold. All classifications and sub-classifications of students meet the successful threshold. The highest rate of success (91.5%) is found among the traditional, non-corequisite students. The lowest rate of success (75.8%) is found among students who are enrolled in online courses. Online students also performed less well than students in traditional corequisite courses (83.5%).

CLO 3: Academic Integrity

Fall 2019

The results show that 79.6% of the students assessed meet the threshold; however, one subpopulation, online students, did not meet the threshold with only 72.4% meeting the threshold. The highest rate of success (81.9%) is found among traditional students in non-corequisite courses. The lowest rate of success (72.4%) is found among online students. Concurrent students (80.7%) performed marginally better than traditional students overall (80.5%), though lower than subpopulation of traditional students in non-corequisite courses (81.9%). Though the numbers are only slightly below the threshold, this decrease in online students' performance is concerning because in a previous semester, online students (78% in Fall 2018) performed relatively higher than traditional students (70% in Fall 2018) in "Citation and Documentation."

Spring 2020

The results show that 78.3% of the students assessed meet the threshold; however, one subpopulation, online students, did not meet the threshold with only 71.2% meeting the threshold. The highest rate of success (88.7%) is found among traditional students in non-corequisite courses. The lowest rate of success (71.2%) is found among online students. The rate of success for traditional students in non-corequisite courses is 75.7%, slightly above the threshold.

In AY 2019-2020, we continued to collect data through our former assessment tool, the final paper, using a common rubric. This assessment is not our primary tool, but it is a second way to measure at least one of the Course Learning Outcomes. The 2019-2020 CLO for "Academic Integrity" in the portfolio is somewhat equivalent to the "Citation and Documentation" measurement in the final paper. For this measurement, 387 students were assessed in Fall 2019 and 146 students were assessed in Spring 2020. Of these, 73.1% (Fall 2019) and 74% (Spring 2020) of all students assessed met or exceeded expectations. For both terms, student performance is assessed is below the threshold on this single measure. When we break down the numbers further, we see that the assessed students who were enrolled in traditional corequisite courses consistently scored below the threshold. In Fall 2019, only 67.1% (n= 104/155) of students in traditional corequisite courses met expectations. In Spring 2020, only 69.8% (n= 44/63) of students in traditional corequisite courses met expectations. When paired

with the results from the portfolio assessment, we can see that this population needs additional support; therefore, action is needed.

CLO 4: Flexible Strategies (Use of Invention Techniques)

Fall 2019

The results show that 88.9% of students meet the threshold. All classifications and sub-classifications of students meet the successful threshold. The highest rate of success (90.4%) was found among concurrent credit students, though it was only slightly higher than all other subpopulations. The lowest rate of success (87.4%) is found among online students. In this area, traditional students were the least variable among corequisite students (88.8%) and non-corequisite students (89%). The across the board similarity in numbers may indicate a problem with the assessment tool, the scoring rubric.

Spring 2020

The results show that 78.3% of students meet the threshold. The subpopulation of traditional, non-corequisite students did not meet the threshold (70.4%). The highest rate of success (84.4%) was found among traditional, corequisite students, followed by online students (77.3%). The lowest rate of success (70.4%) is found among traditional, non-corequisite students. The results for this characteristic showed more differentiation than those of the previous semester.

Though students have mostly met the threshold for flexible strategies, it is possible that the lower numbers for flexible strategies may be part of the portfolio-building during the pandemic semester. Students may have spent less time developing the invention techniques and may have focused on the final drafts of compositions. Since students overall met the threshold, though minimally, no action is required at this time. The standardized assignment may make it easier for corequisite students to meet the threshold than for non-corequisite students.

CLO 5: Collaborative Writing Processes

Fall 2019

The results show that 83.2% of students meet the threshold. All classifications and sub-classifications of students meet the successful threshold. The highest rate of success (84.6%) was found among traditional students taking corequisite courses, though it was only slightly higher than all other subpopulations. The lowest rate of success (81.4%) is found among traditional students taking non-corequisite courses. The across the board narrow range (similarity) in numbers may indicate a problem with the assessment tool, the scoring rubric.

Spring 2020

The results show that 75.4% of students meet the threshold. The sub-classification of students in traditional, non-corequisite courses did not meet the successful threshold with a success rate of 70.4%. The highest rate of success (78.6%) was found among traditional students taking

corequisite courses, followed by the success rate for online students (75.8%). The lowest rate of success (70.4%) is found among traditional students taking non-corequisite courses.

Though students have mostly met the threshold, it is possible that the lower numbers for collaborative writing processes may be part of the challenges of offering feedback and representing them while portfolio-building during the pandemic semester. Students may have spent less time receiving feedback and may have focused on the final drafts of compositions. Since students overall met the threshold, though minimally, no action is required at this time. In addition, the standardized assignment may make it easier for corequisite students to meet the threshold than for non-corequisite students.

CLO 6: Knowledge of Conventions

Fall 2019

The results show that 83.9% of students meet the threshold. All classifications and sub-classifications of students meet the successful threshold. The highest rate of success (88.5%) was found among concurrent credit students. The lowest rate of success (80.5%) is found among students in online courses. The relative success of online students is a little surprising. This is the first year to assess “Knowledge of Conventions” using this rubric, and though it compares to the previous assessment method’s “Grammar and Mechanics” outcome, the results do not correlate. In Fall 2018 and Spring 2019, online students scored the highest among student populations with 99% and 96% success, respectively, using the final paper as the assessment measurement tool. In Fall 2019 and Spring 2020, online students scored 100% and 95%, respectively, using the final paper as the assessment measure tool.

Spring 2020

The results show that 86.3% of students meet the threshold, which is the highest success rate for any category. All classifications and sub-classifications of students meet the successful threshold. The highest rate of success (90.1%) was found among students in traditional, non-corequisite courses. The lowest rate of success (84.4%) is found among students in traditional, corequisite courses. The relative success of online students is a little surprising.

Final Reflection (Self-Reflection)

Fall 2019

The results show that all students met the threshold for this.

Spring 2020

The results show that only 73.3% of students meet this threshold, which is the lowest success rate for any learning outcome. Only the students in traditional, corequisite courses met the threshold with a success rate of 78.6%. Students in traditional, non-corequisite courses had the

lowest success rate (69%). Online students had a marginally higher success rate of 69.7%. This may be an anomaly but it is likely the result of the pandemic-disrupted semester.

9. What is the action plan for the next academic year? (2020-2021) Explain.

Actions

We recommend the following actions based on the results from 2019-2020 assessment. Each action is explained. The explanation can be found by using the correlating parenthetical references:

- Prepare to connect with the General Education Learning Outcomes assessment. (1.1)
- Consider revising the portfolio rubric to more precisely measure outcomes for Flexible Strategies and Collaborative Learning Processes. (2.3 and 2.4)
- Consider changing the standardized portfolio assignment in the following ways:
 - Encourage students to include introductions to artifacts in their portfolios. (2.1, 2.6)
 - Require students to illustrate an independent invention technique that is not a worksheet or similar heuristic, then include it in their portfolios. (2.3)
 - Encourage students to offer evidence they have used the feedback in their writing. (2.4)
 - Encourage students to offer evidence they have offered usable feedback to other peers. (2.4)
 - Require students to curate a third artifact showing an invention technique and/or use of collaboration. (2.3, 2.4)
 - Encourage students to work on their portfolios other than the ends of the semesters. (2.6)
- Review how online students scored and build supports in online courses and in the anticipated hybrid-flex environment of Fall 2020. Though we usually do not extrapolate areas of improvement for online students to traditional and concurrent sections, this semester will feature more online content in all the sections. Areas in which online students did well (2.4) might offer insight that could benefit all students. Likewise, areas that need improvement for online students should be considered areas that need improvement for all students. (2.1, 2.2, 2.6) Following the review, we recommend that faculty:
 - Develop additional in-class practices with recognizing and integrating sources and have supports for sharing them in an online space. Continued work with remote teaching modes should include more practices, particularly since we see that online students have challenges with this area. (2.2)

- Digitally share ways in which in-class exercises support student learning with assessing and integrating sources. These exercises should be formative, not just summative, should represent lower-stakes assignments, and represent a range of complexity. (2.2)
- Introduce the concept of self-reflection earlier in the semester and provide clearer guidance on this part of the portfolio. (2.6)

Explanation

1.1 Assessment Alignment

We need to align our CLO assessment with the new General Education Learning Outcomes. This course is one of the courses students use to develop Communication (GELO 1). For that, students must “create an oral presentation or written work that is informative, well-reasoned, organized, researched, and demonstrates knowledge of convention.” We must either be ready to submit a portfolio to illustrate “Critical Thinking” and “Knowledge of Convention” or we must submit a single piece from the portfolio with its associated assessment.

2.1 Rhetorical Knowledge

Because online students did not meet the threshold in Spring 2020, and because they were also the lowest scoring population in Fall 2019, online students need additional supports to meet this learning outcome (Rhetorical Knowledge). Since the measurement tool requires students to produce distinct compositions from diverse genres, purposes, and audiences, online students may need low stakes assignments to help them consider rhetorical contexts. One example of this: a student might be told to identify the intended audience, genre, or purpose for an assignment and they might need to include that brief description (or analysis) in an artifact’s introduction. Further instruction on the portfolio itself, particularly the introductions, may provide clarity on how to better identify genre, purpose, and audience within their writing. This will serve the purpose of reinforcing Rhetorical Knowledge CLO and increasing transference of skills through using the Final Portfolio.

2.2 Academic Integrity

Although students overall meet the threshold in Fall 2019, online students must have additional supports with academic integrity. Since online students and concurrent credit students scored less high than traditional students in non-corequisite courses, we should see if there are additional in-class practices with academic integrity skills that can be added to online instruction.

Multiple measures in Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 indicate that academic integrity continues to be an area for improvement, particularly for online students. Instructors should provide more direction and support in this area. This is a consistent trend for online students. Faculty should develop additional in-class practices with recognizing and integrating sources and have supports for sharing them in an online space. Continued work with remote teaching modes

should include more practices, particularly since we see that online students have challenges with this area.

2.3 Flexible Strategies (Use of Invention Techniques)

The results for this CLO are statistically similar across the board and may indicate a need to revise the rubric. Spring norming portfolio workshops indicate that the current rubric may permit some generosity in assessing invention techniques. The rubric currently allows for quantifying use of invention techniques. It is possible we may need to change to evaluate the invention techniques qualitatively. We may, for instance, require that students illustrate an independent invention technique that is not a worksheet or similar heuristic in which the student has filled in items. An example of an independently produced invention technique might indicate the student can independently and flexibly develop strategies for invention of work.

The results for this CLO may also indicate a need to revise the standard assignment. Currently, corequisite students are compelled by an additional requirement of the Comp Review portfolio assignment. The Comp Review portfolio assignment requires a third artifact of an invention technique. Since corequisite students must produce a third artifact, their portfolios more closely meet the requirements of the rubric. Perhaps all Comp I sections could have a requirement of a third or the assignment could make the changes described in the above paragraph.

2.4 Collaborative Writing Processes

Spring 2019 norming workshops indicated that instructors will assume that changes are made even if the students themselves have not clearly indicated use in the portfolio. We understand that we are generously interpreting content and we are seeing that students show evidence that they have received feedback from others, but we have not required evidence that they then use the feedback; therefore, it is possible that we may need to change the rubric or standardized assignment to encourage students to offer evidence they have used the feedback in their writing.

We may *also* need to allow students to show evidence that they have given feedback to peers, particularly feedback that is not based upon sentence level errors (Knowledge of Conventions). It is presumed that the ability to give qualitative feedback of (content and rhetorical knowledge) might indicate that the student can independently include collaboration as part of writing processes outside of composition classes. One example of showing evidence of giving feedback can include screenshot or photo of feedback a student offered their peers along with an explanation of context.

For both receiving and offering feedback, it is easier for students to curate evidence when they are using online collaborative techniques, such as online peer review or online instructor feedback.

Like the CLO “Flexible Techniques,” the results for this CLO may also indicate a need to revise the standard assignment. Currently, corequisite students are compelled by an additional requirement of the Comp Review portfolio assignment. The Comp Review portfolio assignment requires a third artifact of written collaboration. Since corequisite students must produce a third artifact, their portfolios more closely meet the requirements of the rubric. Perhaps faculty could require all Comp I students to offer a third artifact that shows use of feedback.

2.5 Knowledge of Conventions

Although all populations successfully met this learning outcome, attention should be paid to providing online students with support in developing knowledge of conventions outside of grammar and mechanics. This support may include increased peer and instructor feedback for organization, structure, etc.

2.6 Final Reflection (Self-Reflection)

All populations successfully met this outcome in Fall 2019 and students overall did not meet the threshold in Spring 2020, a semester disrupted by SARS-CoV-2. This category addresses a skill that has not been assessed in the past. Spring 2020 results indicate a low number of self-reflections in multiple class types. The lack of self-reflection may be partially explained as an item that students couldn’t or didn’t wish to create for their portfolios. While this can be explained in part by sudden shifts due to the SARS-CoV-2, continued online and anticipated hybrid flex instruction may need to intentionally encourage self-reflection or the writing of reflection(s) during the 2020-2021 academic year. Instructors may need to introduce the concept of self-reflection earlier in the semester and provide clearer guidance on this part of the portfolio. Related to this, instructors may also need to scaffold introductions to artifacts in their portfolios.