Part V: The Impact Report of the Quality Enhancement Plan

Introduction: Initial Goals and Intended Outcomes

McNeese State University’s Quality Enhancement Plan, *Write to Excellence*, emerged as the consensus of a faculty focus group that considered feedback from students, faculty, and community leaders as to what educational initiative would improve student learning and improve McNeese as an institution. After careful and lengthy deliberation, focus group members determined that improving student writing would produce enhanced learning outcomes for students and support the mission of the University.

The Steering Committee for the QEP put forth numerous recommendations and a plan for implementing the program with three central goals in support of one major intended outcome. There are as follows:

1. Students will improve writing skills and recognize the value of effective academic writing.
2. Students will improve their writing proficiencies as they progress through their general education courses.
3. Students will demonstrate satisfactory writing proficiencies on the mid-point assessment of academic progress.

Intended Outcome: *After completing core curriculum and course requirements, students will have the foundation to write effectively and appropriately as required by their disciplines.*

McNeese tasked three support units with primary responsibility for implementing the plan and achieving the program’s goals and vision: Freshman Foundations 101 (FFND 101); the Write to Excellence Campus Writing Center (WTEC); and the QEP Administrator who supervises Directors of FFND and WTEC and advocates for academic policies, and the course-level program and assessment plans.

First, McNeese created the Freshman Foundations and Students in Transition (FFND 101) course, a freshman experience course designed to introduce students to McNeese’s writing initiative; acclimate students to faculty expectations, program requirements, and career expectations; and, connect students to campus resources. The Director of Freshman Foundations’ role includes coordinating Colleges’ and Departments’ offerings of the 1-credit hour FFND 101 course, developing course materials and assessments, and supervising the peer-mentor program, which consists of upper-level students paired with specific sections of the FFND course.

Second, McNeese created the Write to Excellence Center, appointed a Faculty Director, and staffed the center with trained student writing tutors (upper-classmen and graduate students). The Center provides tutoring support for students in Freshman Foundations and writing-enriched courses across the curriculum, faculty development, and ongoing advocacy for the writing initiative.

Third, the QEP Administrator supervises both FFND and WTEC Directors, coordinates with faculty advisory groups, and develops and implements policies associated with the plan including curriculum requirements; faculty credit for working in the program; and, in collaboration with the Director of Institutional Effectiveness, the course-level assessment system for the program and related activities. The QEP Administrator and Director of IE work with Departments, Deans, and the University’s curriculum committees to ensure course-level and policy implementation.
Changes Made to the QEP

Generally speaking, Write to Excellence has changed from a highly structured and administered program to a decentralized systemic program that has become an integral part of the curriculum.

Freshman Foundations

Freshman Foundations (FFND 101) started as a highly structured course that was designed to introduce students to the writing initiative, teach study skills, expose students to university life and activities, and, in general, better equip them for college-level work. From its inception, the overdose of activities and expectations associated with the course had students and faculty protesting that the 1-credit hour course required too much content and too many activities. Remedies for this were thought to lie in changing the course textbook. The original text, used in the 2008 pilot, was Hamachek’s *Coping with College: A Guide to Academic Success*. This was followed the creation of an in-house text authored by our then QEP Administrator and Director of FFND. The “Portal Book,” was posted online in the course management system and tailored specifically to McNeese students and the university. By fall 2011, the current FFND Director had begun a review of the text and the focus of the course to discover that the Portal book was no more popular than the previous, but that there was general consensus about the topics that should be addressed in the course. For fall 2012, the Director selected *Power Learning and Your Life* by Robert Feldman as the common text. Subsequent study, late fall ’12 and spring ’13 revealed that by now most instructors and programs have developed their own tools and did not use the textbook to any worthwhile degree.

Throughout this period, there have been increasing fundamental questions about the nature and purpose of the course and its actual relationship to the writing initiative. The passages of the Louisiana GRAD Act in spring 2010 immediately raised the issue of retention to supreme budgetary importance with its emphasis on retention as an essential component for earning fiscal autonomy. So in fall 2010, McNeese undertook an extensive university-wide self-review to prioritize programs and services to lessen the impact of substantial reductions in state funding, and by that time the campus had reconceived of the course as increasingly tied to retention initiatives rather than supporting Write to Excellence.

Other than textbook, however, nothing changed with respect to FFND 101 until spring of 2013. Due to ongoing budget reductions and a retirement incentive plan, the FFND Director will retire at the end of 2013 and the position will not be replaced. Administration of QEP-related activities will continue under the supervision of the current QEP Administrator, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness. The IE Director, in consultation with faculty, deans, and department heads has taken the next step to make the program more responsive to ongoing, front-porch, university needs. The most significant change is the decentralization of the course from a university-wide curriculum to one that will be determined predominately by the programs teaching the course, but with a common description and revised learning outcomes to reflect that change. The following grid shows the basic changes in the course from its inception through spring 2013 and what will be different starting fall 2013:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFND 101—Spring 07 (pilot) to spring 2013</th>
<th>FFND 101 Fall 2013 onward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Description:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designed to promote success of first-year students by developing skills and encouraging attitudes needed to achieve educational and personal goals. Content includes an introduction to McNeese’s ‘Write to Excellence’ initiative and offers information about university and department resources, effective organizational and study skills, degree expectations, and career exploration. Required for all entering freshmen. (Lec 1, Lab 1, Cr 1)</td>
<td>Designed to promote success of first-year students by developing skills and encouraging attitudes needed to achieve educational and personal goals. Content includes, but is not limited to, information about university and department resources, effective organizational and study skills, degree expectations, and career exploration. Required for all entering freshmen. (Lec 1, Lab 1, Cr 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Put simply, the rationale for pushing the course out to the departments and programs is that faculty, as surveys have shown, have lost interest in the class and departments have de-prioritized it in their teaching assignments. Repeatedly, faculty have called for the latitude to get students into content earlier and teach study skills, for example, in context of the discipline(s) the students will major in. Through decentralization, the faculty who have the most direct contact with students can control the content and direction of the course, thus making attainment of objectives more likely. If faculty enthusiasm for the course increases, so too should student enthusiasm. This change also fits with the spirit of the President’s new vision of innovation for the institution by making each section a sort of laboratory for engaging students. The decentralized model also better supports variation in content and delivery to accommodate the needs of a given section in keeping with our motto: Excellence with a Personal Touch. This final revision brings both program and course goals into tighter alignment.

Write to Excellence Center
Over the past five years, there have been few changes to the WTEC. The biggest change has been the addition of an Associate Director for 2012-2013 academic year whose responsibilities include, among others, training of an increasing number of graduate-level student tutors. The Associate Director will take over as Director for the upcoming Fiscal and Academic year as the current Director will retire in May.

Policies, Curriculum, and Assessment
Broadly outlined, there have been four major groups of policy changes associated with the QEP: program-wide grading rubric; curriculum and course requirements; faculty performance credit; and, assessment management system.

Assessment Rubric
Prior to Fall 2008 implementation, QEP personnel in collaboration with faculty developed a common writing assessment rubric for all writing-enriched courses at the general education level and for most programs. The rubric includes five levels of performance on each of five descriptors: content; scope and purpose; organization; sentence structure; grammar (a shell of this rubric is presented in the Evidence section for Goal 2). Programs were encouraged to develop discipline-specific rubrics in the spirit of the “as required by the disciplines” phrase from the intent statement. A holistic version of this rubric was
used in the 2012-2013 year in composition and in assessing FFND baseline essays and will continue to be used for writing assessment at the general education level.

**Curriculum and Course Requirements**
The Academic Advisory Council (Deans’ Council) approved curriculum and course requirements for the QEP in September 2008. For the baccalaureate degree, students must take 19 hours of writing enriched coursework at the general education level and 12 hours in their major for a total of 31 credit hours. Associate degree-seeking students take 10 hours of writing enriched coursework at the general education level and six hours in the major for a total of 16 hours. The policy also specifies that for a course to carry the writing enriched (WE) designation, twenty percent of the course grade must come from written assignments.

For the 2013-2014 academic year, McNeese has adopted a new general education curriculum that changes the required hours for baccalaureate-seeking students from 19 to 12 credit hours, which is still well above the common standard for writing-across-the-curriculum programs. At the major-level, students will continue to take 12 hours of writing enriched coursework, for a total of 24 hours writing-enriched work for a baccalaureate degree.

**Faculty Performance Credit**
Approved in 2009, language was added to the faculty Annual Performance Review criteria for teaching by specifying that Quality Enhancement Plan and Freshman Foundations activities may be included in consideration for merit. Annually, at least two faculty have been awarded the Violet Howell Professorship for Write to Excellence, an award of up to $2,000.00, to support work associated with writing instruction and assessment.

**Assessment Tool and System**
Beginning with the fall 2008 cohort, students were required to purchase a subscription to LiveText Assessment Management System and submit specific writing assignments to this system in each writing enriched course. The system enabled instructors to apply the university rubric to each student’s work and would aggregate results by course, outcome, or other method. LiveText use was implemented to coincide with offerings of writing-enriched courses so that for every writing enriched course assessment would be performed. This system was used continuously through the spring 2012 semester and discontinued for the fall of 2012.

Initially, our program was intended to focus on general education for the first five-years, then upper-division writing for the next five; however, it was decided over the summer of 2008 that implementation should follow each cohort, which would also result in students gaining maximum use and possible benefit from their LiveText subscriptions. Thus, the implementation schedule was as follows:

- Fall 2008 – 100-level
- Fall 2009 – 200-level
- Fall 2010 – 300 and 400-level (program major courses)
- Fall 2011 – all remaining course necessary for students to reach the WE required curriculum had to be in place for this term.

All writing enriched courses required students to have an account and submit at least one artifact to the system. Faculty were likewise required to assess that artifact in the LiveText system, more than necessary to ascertain the impact of the program, but deemed necessary to make purchasing the system worthwhile to students. Unfortunately, the tool rapidly overtook the ability to implement actual, reliable assessment with proper faculty development and support to ensure reliable results.
For fall 2012, McNeese changed its assessment system to discontinue LiveText as a required tool for gathering evidence. This decision was based on questionable validity of data and inter-rater reliability, a 74% dissatisfaction level among faculty (as demonstrated in a fall 2011 faculty senate survey), and vocal dissatisfaction from students as recorded during several university strategic planning town hall meetings conducted by the President and his staff. Ongoing budget reductions and necessary increases in workloads and class sizes necessitated a change to the method of assessment as well. Put simply, there was too much work to be graded and assessed per faculty member to produce valid or even necessary results. Finally, from an administrative standpoint, the bulk of faculty development became taken over with training faculty and students to use LiveText; rather than working with faculty on better methods for teaching and supporting writing in their courses.

Thus, beginning with fall 2012 semester, assessment of writing at the general education level is taken from fewer points using a holistic form of the QEP rubric. Fewer courses are required to assess writing, although there has been no reduction in offerings of writing enriched courses. Academic programs assess writing as part of university-wide learning outcome 2, which deals with communication, and they use results from their writing-enriched courses to determine attainment of writing goals for the discipline. Additionally, programs may choose to use the QEP rubric or a more discipline-specific one. Achievement of writing proficiency is captured in program master plan/progress reports and reported to the Director of IE every spring for analysis and institution-wide assessment of learning outcomes (See Section 3.3.1.1 of the 5th-year Compliance Report for full detail and below for specifics).

**Impact on Learning and the Learning Environment**

Our evaluation of the impact of the QEP centers on the original goals and intended outcomes of the initiative.

**Goal 1: Students will improve writing skills and recognize the value of effective academic writing.**

Evidence for meeting goal 1 consists of direct assessments, including results on a written assessment from FFND 101, WTEC data, and, indirect assessments from surveys including National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and our own internal survey data collected each term from graduating seniors at an event called Grad Fest. The bulk of this evidence supports evaluation of the impact on student recognition of the value of effective academic writing, with some direct evidence supporting actual improved writing skills.

The Scope of the FFND 101 program and course far exceeded the focus of the QEP on writing. Significant evidence has been collected in FFND related to pass rates, impact on retention, and awareness of academic skills and dispositions necessary for college success. As the course relates to QEP goals, FFND specifically supports goal #1 that students will recognize the value of academic writing. Foundations data presented in this report are limited to that focus.

1. From Statement of Intent—common essay assigned and assessed in FFND 101 by the QEP rubric. Completed as rough and final draft. Data shows final draft scores and trendline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F08</th>
<th>S09</th>
<th>F09</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>F10</th>
<th>S11</th>
<th>F11</th>
<th>S12</th>
<th>F12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F08</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>2.93*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In every term, student performance on in-class writing assessment improved from the rough draft (formative stage) to the final draft (summative) with score nearing the “exceeds” expectations proficiency. (*The final semester report—fall 2012—reflects assessment done by a group of faculty external to the course rather than by faculty engaged in teaching the course and is formative only.)

2. FFND Pre and Post-Test Survey Results: Each term, all FFND sections administered a pre- and post-test survey to ascertain the change in knowledge and attitude toward academic proficiencies from beginning to end of term. Four sets of questions pertain specifically to the QEP and Goal #1. Answers were scored on a Likert scale (1-5) from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree.

   a. The ability to write effectively is an important skill to develop in order to succeed in my major area of study.
      i. Pre-test average from Fall ’08 to Fall 2012: 93.6% agree or strongly agree
      ii. Post-test average from Fall’08 to Fall 2012: 90.1% agree or strongly agree
   b. Self-evaluate my writing assignments before they are graded.
      i. Pre-test average from Fall ’08 to Fall 2012: 92.3% agree or strongly agree
      ii. Post-test average from Fall’08 to Fall 2012: 93.3% agree or strongly agree
   c. Understand the method in which the professor grades my writing assignments.
      i. Pre-test average from Fall ’08 to Fall 2012: 93.8% agree or strongly agree
      ii. Post-test average from Fall’08 to Fall 2012: 94.6% agree or strongly agree
   d. I expect to visit/actually visited the Writing Center ______ times this semester.
      i. Average change from Expected to Actual reported visits:
         1. 6 or more times: 25.9% to 11.9%
         2. 4-5 times: 23.6% to 8%
         3. 3-4 times: 34.9% to 19.9%
         4. 1-2 times: 7.2% to 25.4%
         5. 0 times: 8.4% to 34.8%
   e. Actual Writing to Excellence Center usage data largely corroborates these numbers. In fall 2009, 28.34% of First-time freshman attended the center; in fall 2010, 23.93%; fall 2011, 33.77%; and, in fall 2012, 33.84%. Additional usage data shows trend lines increasing for all classifications (freshman through Graduate). While freshman, by far, exceed all other classifications in writing center usage, the trending increase in upper classifications shows that students do come back to the center, even after they’ve left the freshman composition sequence. Consistently, 44% of visitors to the WTEC are repeat visitors (that is, within the term). The number of new clients peaked in fall 2010, and has dipped and risen ever since, with spring 2012 representing a low point, although spring semesters typically show lower turnout anyway. Fall 2012 figures are consistent with previous fall semester, though not as high as fall 2010.

3. National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) shows comparative data between first-year and senior-level students from ’07 to 2012 on three key questions:
   a. ...how often have you done each of the following (1=never; 4=very often)
      i. Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in:
         1. First-year five year average: 2.92 (Often)
2. Senior-year five year average: 2.66 (Sometimes–Often)
   ii. Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources:
       1. First-year five year average: 3.10 (Often)
       2. Senior-year five year average: 3.23 (Often)
   b. ...has your experience at [McNeese] contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in...
      i. Writing clearly and effectively:
         1. First-year five year average: 3.19 (Often)
         2. Senior-year five year average: 3.13 (Often)

4. GRAD-FEST (in-house) survey administered to graduating seniors includes four questions specific to QEP-writing attitudes/perceptions. Questions are scored on a Likert scale (1 – 5 from strongly disagree to strongly agree). Average scores from fall 2007 to fall 2012 are presented for each question:
   a. My coursework and experiences at MSU have improved my ability to read, write, and speak effectively: \textbf{4.35} (Agree)
   b. Have your writing skills improved since you enrolled? \textbf{4.22} (Agree)
   c. Do you think your writing skills have improved since you enrolled? \textbf{4.18} (Agree)
   d. Would you have liked to have had more writing in your courses? \textbf{3.04} (Neutral)

Notably on the Grad Fest survey, the numbers show very little change up or down over the period studied, suggesting that the QEP has made minimal impact on students' perception, although it does show that they feel McNeese has impacted their abilities to a high degree. Similarly, NSSE evidence suggests that student perceptions of writing requirements and impact has changed little from Freshman to Senior year. Freshman Foundations pre and post-test data suggests that the vast majority of students are already aware of the key priorities of not just the writing component but of a range of skills and attitudes necessary for college success. Over the period studied the difference between pre and post-test responses show, in general, at most a 5% change in perception and attitude. It is difficult to say whether this is successful. When this data is taken in combination with F, I, Ws (between 12 and 15%) we cannot be sure if the course is not simply serving those who would have otherwise done well. The retention rate of students who passed FFND averages almost 10% higher than the retention rate for the semester, and in fact our retention rate has continued to increase modestly. As for attainment of the goal, we can say that students' writing has improved (at least within the Foundations course) and that they have recognized the value of academic writing.

**Goal 2: Students will improve their writing proficiencies as they progress through their general education courses.**

The evidence presented in support of this goal begins with data from our incoming freshman class of 2008. These students wrote a diagnostic essay that was assessed to establish a baseline for the fall 08 cohort. Each subsequent fall, baseline essays are given in English composition to entering freshman, and university-wide, students in the fall 2012 semester were tasked with a writing assessment.

The data presented also shows the shell of the QEP rubric, noting the criteria and levels of expectation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Does Not Meet Expectations</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>% Not Met</th>
<th>% Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept and Support</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Structure</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2012, entering freshmen were scored on a holistic version of the QEP rubric. Thus, the mean, holistic score for the 2008 cohort, as represented in the graph above, is 2.03. The mean holistic score in 2012, as noted under evidence for Goal 1, FFND Statement of Intent, was 2.93. It is unclear why there is nearly a whole point difference in entering classes, though it may in part be due to the slightly different instruments used or the assessors themselves.

All writing enriched courses used the QEP rubric as in the above example. The benefit of this rubric is the ability to look granularly at student performance on specific criteria. From a program-assessment standpoint, however, tracking the holistic mean provides the barometer for assessing the impact of writing-enriched coursework on student performance. The following presentation of scores represents holistic scores only from writing-enriched courses beginning fall 2008 through spring 2012. Fall 2012 assessment data includes ENGL 101 and 102 only. Upper-level results will be reported in academic program master plan/progress reports due after the completion of the academic year.
Despite the reservations about using LiveText and the complications resulting from its implementation, the evidence we have shows that, where assessed, students are meeting (3) or exceeding expectations on summative, course-level assessments. In most cases, where the formative course-level score is already acceptable, the summative is still higher, showing some growth throughout the term. Still, consistently, assessments at the general education level show that we were meeting our goal that students will improve their writing in general education courses.

**Goal 3:** Students will demonstrate satisfactory writing proficiencies on the mid-point assessment of academic progress.

MAAP writing proficiency levels correspond to two of the five criteria on the QEP rubric: sentence structure and grammar and mechanics. Level 1 corresponds with the descriptors associated with “Meets Expectations” on the QEP rubric; Level 2 corresponds with “Exceeds Expectations”; and Level 3 corresponds to “Exemplary” on the QEP rubric.

**MAAP Writing Data: Percentage Labeled Proficient for Each Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>F08</th>
<th>S09</th>
<th>F09</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>F10</th>
<th>S11</th>
<th>F11</th>
<th>S12</th>
<th>F12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this data, we cannot say that we met Goal #3. Validity of this instrument, however, is highly suspect. We cannot be certain, for instance, how much exposure to writing-enriched coursework test-takers have had, or for that matter whether they’ve even completed the English composition sequence (despite advisors’ best efforts). Moreover, there is no enforcement mechanism associated with
performance on the MAAP. We have not found an appropriate incentive to ensure that students taking
the exam will take it seriously.

**Intended Outcome:** After completing core curriculum and course requirements, students will
have the foundation to write effectively and appropriately as required by their disciplines.

University-wide student learning outcome #2, which is assessed by all academic programs (graduate and
undergraduate) and reported annually on master plan/progress reports as partial fulfillment of 3.3.1.1
compliance with institutional effectiveness concerns communication. Specifically, the outcome reads
“Graduates formulate and express ideas effectively through oral, written, and/or technological
communications in academic and professional environments.” Although the scope of the outcome
appears to exceed writing-level skill specifically, the intent was that Write to Excellence would show a
demonstrable impact on achievement of this outcome since the skills associated with writing generally
would apply to all forms of communication. Program assessments for SLO2 include writing-enriched,
course-level assessments as well as a variety of other methods. The percentage in the table shows the
number of assessments where student proficiency met or exceeded expectations for the assessment.
Thus, in 2008, for 62.3% of assessments did students, as a whole, meet or exceed expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage of Assessments Where Expectations were met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the drop in 2012, graduates have shown dramatic improvement from 2008. Seniors graduating
in 2009 would have had at least some writing enriched coursework and the benefit of the writing center.
With each subsequent year, as more writing enriched coursework at the general education and program
level became offered, exposure to writing instruction and ongoing writing activity increased.

**Conclusion**

McNeese’s QEP, Write to Excellence, transformed from a highly structured, administered program to a
decentralized, systemic set of curricular requirements and learning outcomes. This is true for both FFND
and course-level writing enrichment.

With individual departments able to control the shape of their students’ FFND experience, they can
better prepare students for work in the major they have chosen (students take sections taught by
faculty from their intended program). In actuality, FFND has been pulled out of its association with Write
to Excellence to be re-tooled for its increasingly agreed upon purpose. In the upcoming semesters, the
priority with FFND will be to better track and discuss how the course can impact retention and
progression toward the degree.

While the WTEC remains largely unchanged, it has added library staff to its tutorial offerings for research
support. In the upcoming semesters, it will focus on increasing faculty development opportunities and
attracting more upper-level students as clients.

Ongoing monitoring of writing at the general education level and in the programs continues as part of
our regular fulfillment of institutional effectiveness and general education. Overall, McNeese can be said
to have met two of its three goals and, based on program-specific evidence from university-wide
communication outcomes, we have fulfilled our intended outcome.