

Academic Program Assessment and Planning Workspace

English Composition

Created on: 07/10/2019 04:22:00 PM EDT
Last Modified: 10/05/2019 03:21:55 PM EDT

Table of Contents

General Information	1
Standing Requirements	2
Mission Statement	2
Outcomes	2
Curriculum Map	2
2018-2019 Assessment Cycle	3
Assessment Plan	3
Assessment Findings	5
Action Plan	11
Status Report	14
2019-2020 Assessment Cycle	18
Assessment Plan	18
Assessment Findings	18
Action Plan	18
Status Report	18
Appendix	19

General Information (Academic Program Assessment and Planning Workspace)

Standing Requirements

MISSION STATEMENT

The Composition Program's aim is to prepare students for the rhetorical, ethical, and genre-related demands of college writing. As our collective outcomes for ENG 101, 101P, 201, and 201H state, students will learn how to critically read and respond to various texts; draft and revise; develop rhetorical knowledge; understand the important of information literacy; and craft prose using the appropriate conventions for an academic audience.

OUTCOMES

English Composition Outcome Set

Outcome 1: Rhetorical Knowledge

Students will demonstrate rhetorical knowledge across contexts and audiences.

Mapping

No Mapping

Outcome 2: Revision Practices

Students will develop writing projects through multiple drafts.

Mapping

No Mapping

Outcome 3: Information Literacy

Students will apply knowledge of information literacy and ethical citation practices.

Mapping

No Mapping

Outcome 4: Mechanics and Usage

Students will apply knowledge of sentence-level mechanics and usage.

Mapping

No Mapping

CURRICULUM MAP

There are no curriculum maps

2018-2019 Assessment Cycle

ASSESSMENT PLAN

Mission Statement

The Composition Program's aim is to prepare students for the rhetorical, ethical, and genre-related demands of college writing. As our collective outcomes for ENG 101, 101P, 201, and 201H state, students will learn how to critically read and respond to various texts; draft and revise; develop rhetorical knowledge; understand the important of information literacy; and craft prose using the appropriate conventions for an academic audience.

Measures

English Composition Outcome Set

Outcome

Outcome: Outcome 1: Rhetorical Knowledge

Students will demonstrate rhetorical knowledge across contexts and audiences.

Measure: ENG 201: Culminating Artifact

Program level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Benchmark (Minimum Only Assessment Point: Introductory Level

Expected Level of

Performance): At least 80% of the artifacts should score at or above this level.

Implementation Plan

(timeline):

Key/Responsible

Personnel:

Supporting Attachments:

 ENG 201 Rubric for Outcome 1, 2018-19 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

Outcome: Outcome 2: Revision Practices

Students will develop writing projects through multiple drafts.

Measure: ENG 201: Culminating Artifact

Program level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:


Benchmark (Minimum Only Assessment Point: Introductory Level

Expected Level of

Performance): At least 80% of the artifacts should score at or above this level.

**Implementation Plan
(timeline):**
**Key/Responsible
Personnel:**

Supporting Attachments:

 Rubric for ENG 201 Outcome 2, 2018-19 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

Outcome: Outcome 3: Information Literacy

Students will apply knowledge of information literacy and ethical citation practices.

Measure: ENG 201: Culminating Artifact
Program level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Benchmark (Minimum Only Assessment Point: Introductory Level

Expected Level of

Performance): At least 80% of the artifacts should score at or above this level.

**Implementation Plan
(timeline):**
**Key/Responsible
Personnel:**

Supporting Attachments:

 Rubric for ENG 201 Outcome 3, 2018-19 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

Outcome: Outcome 4: Mechanics and Usage

Students will apply knowledge of sentence-level mechanics and usage.

Measure: ENG 201: Culminating Artifact
Program level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Benchmark (Minimum Only Assessment Point: Introductory Level

Expected Level of

Performance): At least 80% of the artifacts should score at or above this level.

**Implementation Plan
(timeline):**
**Key/Responsible
Personnel:**

Supporting Attachments:

④ Rubric for ENG 201 Outcome 4, 2018-19 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

Finding per Measure

English Composition Outcome Set

Outcome

Outcome: Outcome 1: Rhetorical Knowledge

Students will demonstrate rhetorical knowledge across contexts and audiences.

Measure: ENG 201: Culminating Artifact

Program level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

**Benchmark (Minimum
Expected Level of
Performance):**

Only Assessment Point: Introductory Level

At least 80% of the artifacts should score at or above this level.

**Implementation Plan
(timeline):**

**Key/Responsible
Personnel:**

Supporting Attachments:

④ ENG 201 Rubric for Outcome 1, 2018-19 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

Findings for ENG 201: Culminating Artifact

Summary of Findings:

- % Did not meet expectations: 23
- % Met expectations: 68
- % Exceeded expectations: 10

As the numbers indicate, 78% of students met or exceeded expectations for rhetorical knowledge, just 2% shy of our 80% benchmark. This is a 6% increase from last year's findings, an indicator that instructors are being more transparent and specific with rhetorical expectations in their instruction and assignments. As a program, we have emphasized to instructors the need to outline specific audience, genre, and style constraints for each assignment rather than to assume a general academic audience across writing expectations. Further, we have discussed in teacher training workshops the need to help students craft and connect to a specific readership for their work rather than to write solely for

their teachers and peers. Research in composition clearly concludes that students write more effectively when they have a specific audience in mind, and those expectations need to be made transparent in writing instruction.

Results :

Benchmark (Expected Level of Performance) Achievement: Not Met

Recommendations:

We will continue to offer opportunities for instructors to share and get feedback on assignments, which are key in helping students craft better reader-based prose. We will also continue to provide sample assignments and to press for a standard assignment design throughout the program.

Reflections/Notes:

Substantiating Evidence:

ENG 201 Results for Outcome 1, 2018-19 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Improve Rhetorical Knowledge
(Action Plan; 2018-2019 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome: Outcome 2: Revision Practices

Students will develop writing projects through multiple drafts.

Measure: ENG 201: Culminating Artifact

Program level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Benchmark (Minimum Only Assessment Point: Introductory Level

Expected Level of Performance): At least 80% of the artifacts should score at or above this level.

Implementation Plan

(timeline):

Key/Responsible

Personnel:

Supporting Attachments:

Rubric for ENG 201 Outcome 2, 2018-19 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

Findings for ENG 201: Culminating Artifact

Summary of Findings:

Trait 1: Preliminary work included
% did not meet expectations: 38

% met expectations: 61
% exceeded expectations: 0

Trait 2: Revision

% did not meet expectations: 43
% met expectations: 54
% exceeded expectations: 4

Trait 1 involves students submitting early drafts of their revised artifact so they can more effectively reflect on and develop awareness of their writing process and revision plans. As indicated, only 61% of students submitted preliminary work, and while we were still able to assess their culminating artifact, the absence of preliminary work makes revision less visible and de-emphasizes writing as a process.

Due to Trait 1's low numbers, Trait 2 is also naturally low as well (58%). Without a preliminary draft, it is difficult for assessors to discern how much revision was done from first to final draft. In general, students have a difficult time understanding the process of revision as well as being able to articulate their own choices when revising. Our inclusion of this outcome is an attempt to emphasize the importance of revision and to develop self-awareness in student writers.

Results :

Benchmark (Expected Level of Performance) Achievement: Not Met

Recommendations:

We will continue to work with instructors and students about saving preliminary drafts of their work and to view revision as an important aspect of the writing process. We realize students simply work electronically in one draft, so they may not save a preliminary draft, but continuing to work within one draft may prevent them from doing deep revision. We hope to encourage teachers to require and respond to early drafts so that students are given adequate feedback and guidance as they revise. We also want students to distinguish the difference between revision and editing, and we believe this may be more effective if students create some space, cognitively and literally, between the preliminary draft of a work and the final polished piece they select as their culminating artifact.

Regarding Trait 2, we will continue to encourage instructors to build drafting, feedback, and revising cycles into their pedagogy. We will also continue to emphasize the need for students to reflect on their revision processes so they become more effective at articulating and executing their revision choices. When students have a clearer sense of why they're revising, they are able to make weigh various options and to make informed choices about their writing craft.

Reflections/Notes:

Substantiating Evidence:

ENG 201 Results for Outcome 2, 2018-19 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Improve Evidence and Awareness of Revision
(Action Plan; 2018-2019 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome: Outcome 3: Information Literacy

Students will apply knowledge of information literacy and ethical citation practices.

Measure: ENG 201: Culminating Artifact

Program level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Benchmark (Minimum Only Assessment Point: Introductory Level

Expected Level of Performance): At least 80% of the artifacts should score at or above this level.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Supporting Attachments:

 Rubric for ENG 201 Outcome 3, 2018-19 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

Findings for ENG 201: Culminating Artifact

Summary of Findings: Trait 1: Sources
% did not meet expectations: 37
% met expectations: 55
% exceeded expectations: 9

Trait 2: Citation Practices
% did not meet expectations: 38
% met expectations: 56
% exceeded expectations: 6

The traits of this outcome involve understanding how to effectively use sources from a rhetorical and contextual standpoint (Trait 1) as well as how to accurately and correctly cite a source (Trait 2). We are below our 80% benchmark for both traits, 64% and 62% respectively. This outcome is particularly important because ENG 201, the course from which artifacts are culled, is research-based composition, and students should have a solid sense of source usage by the time they complete the course.

Some of the reasons these numbers might be low include the generic nature of ENG 201 citation, since the writing done in that class is not tied to a particular discipline with a specific citation conventions. Students are not yet immersed in their majors and the corresponding disciplinary knowledge, which is the basis for all citation conventions. It is difficult to teach citation conventions divorced from a specific discipline, but we have tried to move in that direction with the thematic approach in ENG 201.

Results : Benchmark (Expected Level of Performance) Achievement: Not Met

Recommendations: Our instructors need more collaborative relationships with faculty in other disciplines as well as more training in citation methods across the disciplines. While it impossible to master citation methods in all disciplines, instructors' rhetorical training should allow them to develop a basic understanding of common citation practices outside of those used in English.

We will provide workshops and teaching materials that help teachers build their pedagogical knowledge of citation practices.

Reflections/Notes:

Substantiating Evidence:

[ENG 201 Results for Outcome 3, 2018-19 \(Adobe Acrobat Document\) \(See appendix\)](#)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Improve Information Literacy
(Action Plan; 2018-2019 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome: Outcome 4: Mechanics and Usage

Students will apply knowledge of sentence-level mechanics and usage.

Measure: ENG 201: Culminating Artifact

Program level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Benchmark (Minimum Only Assessment Point: Introductory Level

Expected Level of Performance): At least 80% of the artifacts should score at or above this level.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Supporting Attachments:

🔗 Rubric for ENG 201 Outcome 4, 2018-19 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

Findings for ENG 201: Culminating Artifact

Summary of Findings: % did not meet expectations: 17
% met expectations: 71
% exceeded expectations: 12

Student artifacts exceeded expectations in the area of sentence-level expectations with a total of 83%. In particular, that outcome states that in order to meet expectations, a student's "communication has only a few errors in style, mechanics, or other issues that might distract from the message," and to exceed expectations, a student's "communication is virtually free of mechanical, stylistic or other issues that might distract from the message."

We were pleased with the result of this outcome, which seems to indicate that instructors are effective at teaching sentence-level clarity and correctness. This is an especially satisfactory result given that we have eliminated remedial writing classes, and all students coming into Marshall either take ENG 101P or ENG 101, but by the time they complete ENG 201, they are largely writing at the level expected of them.

Results : Benchmark (Expected Level of Performance) Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations: We will continue to talk about error in our program and the types of error we see most commonly. One benefit I hope we continue to have is small class sizes, which allow us to work individually with student writers. There are certainly errors that seem more prevalent across all student writers, but individual writers have a better chance of improving when they are taught grammar within the context of their own writing.

Reflections/Notes:

Substantiating Evidence:

🔗 ENG 201 Results for Outcome 4, 2018-19 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Maintain and Improve Sentence-Level Mechanics and Usage
(Action Plan; 2018-2019 Assessment Cycle)

Overall Recommendations

No text specified

Overall Reflection

No text specified

ACTION PLAN

Mission Statement

The Composition Program's aim is to prepare students for the rhetorical, ethical, and genre-related demands of college writing. As our collective outcomes for ENG 101, 101P, 201, and 201H state, students will learn how to critically read and respond to various texts; draft and revise; develop rhetorical knowledge; understand the important of information literacy; and craft prose using the appropriate conventions for an academic audience.

Actions

English Composition Outcome Set

Outcome

Outcome: Outcome 1: Rhetorical Knowledge

Students will demonstrate rhetorical knowledge across contexts and audiences.

Action: Improve Rhetorical Knowledge

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for ENG 201: Culminating Artifact
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2018-2019 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings:

% Did not meet expectations: 23 % Met expectations: 68 % Exceeded expectations: 10 As the numbers indicate, 78% of students met or exceeded expectations for rhetorical knowledge, just 2% shy of our 80% benchmark. This is a 6% increase from last year's findings, an indicator that instructors are being more transparent and specific with rhetorical expectations in their instruction and assignments. As a program, we have emphasized to instructors the need to outline specific audience, genre, and style constraints for each assignment rather than to assume a general academic audience across writing expectations. Further, we have discussed in teacher training workshops the need to help students craft and connect to a specific readership for their work rather than to write solely for their teachers and peers. Research in composition clearly concludes that students write more effectively when they have a specific audience in mind, and those expectations need to be made transparent in writing instruction.

Action Plan details:

Our action plan for improving rhetorical knowledge in student writing includes helping instructors develop a vocabulary for talking about rhetorical constraints and designing assignments that are audience-specific rather than designed for generic academic audiences. We will do this through pre-semester teaching workshops and information sharing throughout the semester.

The program may also consider implementing a common assignment or assignment goals for the ENG 201 artifact.

Implementation Plan (timeline):	Our goal is to reach an 80-85% "meets expectations" rating by 2021's assessment.
Key/Responsible Personnel:	Key personnel include the Coordinator of Composition, the Composition Committee, and composition faculty.
Measures:	We will use our current assessment instrument for the foreseeable future.
Priority:	Medium

Outcome: Outcome 2: Revision Practices

Students will develop writing projects through multiple drafts.

Action: Improve Evidence and Awareness of Revision

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for ENG 201: Culminating Artifact
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2018-2019 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings:

Trait 1: Preliminary work included % did not meet expectations: 38 % met expectations: 61 % exceeded expectations: 0 Trait 2: Revision % did not meet expectations: 43 % met expectations: 54 % exceeded expectations: 4 Trait 1 involves students submitting early drafts of their revised artifact so they can more effectively reflect on and develop awareness of their writing process and revision plans. As indicated, only 61% of students submitted preliminary work, and while we were still able to assess their culminating artifact, the absence of preliminary work makes revision less visible and de-emphasizes writing as a process. Due to Trait 1's low numbers, Trait 2 is also naturally low as well (58%). Without a preliminary draft, it is difficult for assessors to discern how much revision was done from first to final draft. In general, students have a difficult time understanding the process of revision as well as being able to articulate their own choices when revising. Our inclusion of this outcome is an attempt to emphasize the importance of revision and to develop self-awareness in student writers.

Action Plan details:	We will make assignment scaffolding suggestions that outline plans for preliminary work and feedback. We will also make more direct announcements and information documents about the need to include preliminary work in artifacts.
Implementation Plan (timeline):	Our goal is to reach 80-85% "meets expectations" ratings for this outcome by our 2021 assessment.
Key/Responsible Personnel:	Key personnel include the Coordinator of Composition. the Composition Committee, and composition faculty.
Measures:	We will use our current assessment instrument for the foreseeable future.
Priority:	Medium

Outcome: Outcome 3: Information Literacy

Students will apply knowledge of information literacy and ethical citation practices.

Action: Improve Information Literacy

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for ENG 201: Culminating Artifact
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2018-2019 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings:

Trait 1: Sources % did not meet expectations: 37 % met expectations: 55 % exceeded expectations: 9 Trait 2: Citation Practices % did not meet expectations: 38 % met expectations: 56 % exceeded expectations: 6 The traits of this outcome involve understanding how to effectively use sources from a rhetorical and contextual standpoint (Trait 1) as well as how to accurately and correctly cite a source (Trait 2). We are below our 80% benchmark for both traits, 64% and 62% respectively. This outcome is particularly important because ENG 201, the course from which artifacts are culled, is research-based composition, and students should have a solid sense of source usage by the time they complete the course. Some of the reasons these numbers might be low include the generic nature of ENG 201 citation, since the writing done in that class is not tied to a particular discipline with a specific citation conventions. Students are not yet immersed in their majors and the corresponding disciplinary knowledge, which is the basis for all citation conventions. It is difficult to teach citation conventions divorced from a specific discipline, but we have tried to move in that direction with the thematic approach in ENG 201.

Action Plan details:

Through pre-semester workshops and information sharing during the semester, we will provide more instructor support for teaching source usage. This might entail developing a common assignment with common rhetorical demands and citation expectations so that culminating artifacts are more uniform. Given the thematic nature of ENG 201, it is not unusual for culminating artifacts to be diverse, which is perhaps why citation practices vary across student writing.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Our goal is to reach 80-85% "meets expectations" ratings for this outcome by our 2021 assessment.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Key personnel include the Coordinator of Composition, the Composition Committee, and composition faculty.

Measures:

We will continue to use our current assessment instrument for the foreseeable future.

Priority:

High

Outcome: Outcome 4: Mechanics and Usage

Students will apply knowledge of sentence-level mechanics and usage.

Action: Maintain and Improve Sentence-Level Mechanics and Usage

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for ENG 201: Culminating Artifact
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2018-2019 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings:

% did not meet expectations: 17 % met expectations: 71 % exceeded expectations: 12 Student artifacts exceeded

expectations in the area of sentence-level expectations with a total of 83%. In particular, that outcome states that in order to meet expectations, a student's "communication has only a few errors in style, mechanics, or other issues that might distract from the message," and to exceed expectations, a student's "communication is virtually free of mechanical, stylistic or other issues that might distract from the message." We were pleased with the result of this outcome, which seems to indicate that instructors are effective at teaching sentence-level clarity and correctness. This is an especially satisfactory result given that we have eliminated remedial writing classes, and all students coming into Marshall either take ENG 101P or ENG 101, but by the time they complete ENG 201, they are largely writing at the level expected of them.

Action Plan details:	Through pre-semester workshops and information sharing during the semester, we will promote the good work we are doing in this area and share pedagogical techniques for working with student writers on sentence-level conventions. As previously stated, we will continue to demand small class sizes so we can work with writers as individuals. This will allow us to isolate writing weakness within individual student writers so that they are focused on improving their specific writing practices.
Implementation Plan (timeline):	Our goal is to reach an 85-88% "meets expectations" rating by our 2021 assessment.
Key/Responsible Personnel:	Key personnel include the Coordinator of Composition, the Composition Committee, and composition faculty.
Measures:	We will continue to use our current assessment instrument for the foreseeable future.
Priority:	Low

STATUS REPORT

Action Statuses

English Composition Outcome Set

Outcome

Outcome: Outcome 1: Rhetorical Knowledge

Students will demonstrate rhetorical knowledge across contexts and audiences.

Action: Improve Rhetorical Knowledge

Action Plan details: Our action plan for improving rhetorical knowledge in student writing includes helping instructors develop a vocabulary for talking about rhetorical constraints and designing assignments that are audience-specific rather than designed for generic academic audiences. We will do this through pre-semester teaching workshops and information sharing throughout the semester.

The program may also consider implementing a common assignment or assignment goals for the ENG 201 artifact.

Implementation Plan Our goal is to reach an 80-85% "meets expectations" rating by 2021's assessment.

(timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:	Key personnel include the Coordinator of Composition, the Composition Committee, and composition faculty.
Measures:	We will use our current assessment instrument for the foreseeable future.
Priority:	Medium

Status for Improve Rhetorical Knowledge

No Status Added

Outcome: Outcome 2: Revision Practices

Students will develop writing projects through multiple drafts.

Action: Improve Evidence and Awareness of Revision

Action Plan details:	We will make assignment scaffolding suggestions that outline plans for preliminary work and feedback. We will also make more direct announcements and information documents about the need to include preliminary work in artifacts.
Implementation Plan (timeline):	Our goal is to reach 80-85% "meets expectations" ratings for this outcome by our 2021 assessment.
Key/Responsible Personnel:	Key personnel include the Coordinator of Composition. the Composition Committee, and composition faculty.
Measures:	We will use our current assessment instrument for the foreseeable future.
Priority:	Medium

Status for Improve Evidence and Awareness of Revision

No Status Added

Outcome: Outcome 3: Information Literacy

Students will apply knowledge of information literacy and ethical citation practices.

Action: Improve Information Literacy

Action Plan details:	Through pre-semester workshops and information sharing during the semester, we will provide more instructor support for teaching source usage. This might entail developing a common assignment with common rhetorical demands and citation expectations so that culminating artifacts are more uniform. Given the thematic nature of ENG 201, it is not unusual for culminating artifacts to be diverse, which is perhaps why citation practices vary across student writing.
Implementation Plan	Our goal is to reach 80-85% "meets expectations" ratings for this outcome by our

(timeline):	2021 assessment.
Key/Responsible Personnel:	Key personnel include the Coordinator of Composition, the Composition Committee, and composition faculty.
Measures:	We will continue to use our current assessment instrument for the foreseeable future.
Priority:	High

Status for Improve Information Literacy

No Status Added

Outcome: Outcome 4: Mechanics and Usage

Students will apply knowledge of sentence-level mechanics and usage.

Action: Maintain and Improve Sentence-Level Mechanics and Usage

Action Plan details:	Through pre-semester workshops and information sharing during the semester, we will promote the good work we are doing in this area and share pedagogical techniques for working with student writers on sentence-level conventions. As previously stated, we will continue to demand small class sizes so we can work with writers as individuals. This will allow us to isolate writing weakness within individual student writers so that they are focused on improving their specific writing practices.
Implementation Plan (timeline):	Our goal is to reach an 85-88% "meets expectations" rating by our 2021 assessment.
Key/Responsible Personnel:	Key personnel include the Coordinator of Composition, the Composition Committee, and composition faculty.
Measures:	We will continue to use our current assessment instrument for the foreseeable future.
Priority:	Low

Status for Maintain and Improve Sentence-Level Mechanics and Usage

No Status Added

Status Summary

No text specified

Summary of Next Steps

No text specified

2019-2020 Assessment Cycle

ASSESSMENT PLAN

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

ACTION PLAN

STATUS REPORT

Appendix

-
- A. **ENG 201 Rubric for Outcome 1, 2018-19** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
 - B. **Rubric for ENG 201 Outcome 2, 2018-19** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
 - C. **Rubric for ENG 201 Outcome 3, 2018-19** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
 - D. **Rubric for ENG 201 Outcome 4, 2018-19** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
 - E. **ENG 201 Results for Outcome 1, 2018-19** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
 - F. **ENG 201 Results for Outcome 2, 2018-19** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
 - G. **ENG 201 Results for Outcome 3, 2018-19** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
 - H. **ENG 201 Results for Outcome 4, 2018-19** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
-