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Affordable Learning Georgia Grants Collections are intended to provide faculty with the frameworks to quickly implement or revise the same materials as a Textbook Transformation Grants team, along with the aims and lessons learned from project teams during the implementation process.

Each collection contains the following materials:

- Linked Syllabus
  - The syllabus should provide the framework for both direct implementation of the grant team’s selected and created materials and the adaptation/ transformation of these materials.
- Initial Proposal
  - The initial proposal describes the grant project’s aims in detail.
- Final Report
  - The final report describes the outcomes of the project and any lessons learned.

Unless otherwise indicated, all Grants Collection materials are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
Sample English 1101 Syllabus Incorporating Successful College Composition 2016
This syllabus presents a rhetorical modes-based approach using the e-text and incorporates samples from The Polishing Cloth, an annual publication of selected essays from Perimeter College students, as well as options for reading selections available online.

Weeks 1-2: Introduction to Writing
Downloading the e-text, Navigating the e-text Using the TOC
Google Drive: Successful College Composition 2016
https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B_Py1bV5ZqgwbFQ5QUpGY1BYTVk/view?pref=2&pli=1

Ch. 1.1 and 1.2, Introduction to the course; audience, purpose, content
Ch. 2.1, Prewriting
Ch. 3.2, Description and essays, “The King’s Tomb” and Heather Rogers, "Hiding in Plain Sight"
Ch. 1.6, Paragraph Development, reflection assignment
Ch. 5.1, Fragments and Run-ons; Coordination and Subordination

Essay 1: Description

Weeks 3-4: Drafting, Impromptu Essays
Essay: Anne Lamott, "Shitty First Drafts"
Ch. 1.4 – 1.5, Thesis Statements and Methods of Organizing
Ch. 2.2, Outlining and Ch. 2.3, Drafting, pp. 54-62
Ch. 5.7, Slang and Clichés and Ch. 5.5, Punctuation: semicolons and colons

Essay 2: Impromptu (expository)

Weeks 5-7: Definition or Process
Ch. 3.5, Definition and essays, “Mass Incarceration. . .” and Judy Brady, “I Want a Wife” "I Want a Wife"
Other options: Jan Goodwin: "She Lives Off What We Throw Away" and Christine Rosen "The Myth of Multitasking"
TPC: “The Wall Between Us and Them”; reflection and/or summary paragraphs
Ch. 1.3, Using Sources
TPC essays with sources: “The True Colors of Gangs” or “The Colorful World of Cosplay”
Ch. 3.6, Process and essays, “Keep Them in Stitches” and Jessica Mitford, "Behind the Formaldehyde Curtain"
Ch. 2.4, Revising and Peer Review, pp. 72 - 76
Ch. 5.4, Pronoun Agreement, pp. 241-244

Essay 3: Definition or Process

Weeks 8-9: Comparison and Contrast, Evaluation
Ch. 3.6, Comparison and Contrast and essays, “Batman: A Hero for Any Time” and Alex Wright, "Friending, Ancient or Otherwise"
TPC examples: “Nannying vs. Lifeguarding” and “Running the Extra Mile for a Better Life”
Outlining exercises with assigned essays
Ch. 5.1, Misplaced and Dangling Modifiers, Parallelism, and Ch. 5.5, Apostrophes

**Essay 4: Comparison and Contrast**

**Weeks 9-11: Persuasion and Use of Sources**
Ch. 3.8, Persuasion and essays: Martin Luther King, Jr., *Letter from a Birmingham Jail*
Amatai Etzioni, *The Fast Food Factories* and
“Blame the Deed, Not the Breed” (*TPC*, 13th ed., in D2L)
*TPC* examples: “The Sound of Capitalism” and “Harry Reid’s Illegal Alien Student Bailout . . .”
Ch. 4.5, “Taking Notes Efficiently,” and Summarizing a Source (D2L handout)
Ch. 4.8, “Documenting Your Source Material”

**Essay 5: Responding to Sources (in class)**

**Weeks 12-15: Persuasion and Research**
Ch. 3.8, “The Value of Technical High Schools in Georgia’s Marketplace” and
“A Case for Local Agriculture in Dunwoody” (*TPC*, 19th ed., in D2L)
*TPC* examples: “The Power of Technology and Social Media” and “Are Arranged Marriages Good for Couples?”
Ch. 4.4, “Using Databases” and Ch. 4.5, “Evaluating and Processing Sources”
Ch. 4.6, “Applying Your Research”
Ch. 4.9, “Revising Your Draft,” Editing Checklists, pp. 192-193

**Essay 6: Argument with Sources**
Initial Proposal
# Affordable Learning Georgia Textbook Transformation Grants

## Round 2

**Summer 2015, Fall 2015, Spring 2016**

**Proposal Form and Narrative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name(s)</th>
<th>Georgia Perimeter College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Team Members** (Name, Title, Department, Institutions if different, and email address for each) | Kathryn Crowther, Assist. Prof., English, kathryn.crowther@gpc.edu  
Lauren Curtright, Assist. Prof., English, lauren.curtright@gpc.edu  
Nancy Gilbert, Assist. Prof., English, nancy.gilbert@gpc.edu  
Barbara Hall, Assoc. Prof., English as a Second Language (ESL) and English, barbara.hall@gpc.edu  
Tracienne Ravita, Assist. Prof., English, tracienne.ravita@gpc.edu  
Kirk Swenson, Assoc. Prof., English, kirk.swenson@gpc.edu |
| **Sponsor, Title, Department, Institution** | Pamela J. Moolenaar-Wirsiy, Executive Director, Center for Teaching and Learning, Georgia Perimeter College |
| **Course Names, Course Numbers and Semesters Offered (Summer 2015, Fall 2015, or Spring 2016)** | English 1101: English Composition I, Spring 2016  
English 1102: English Composition II, Spring 2016 |
| **Average Number of Students Per Course Section** | 24 |
| **Number of Course Sections Affected by Implementation in Academic Year 2016** | 237 |
| **Total Number of Students Affected by Implementation in Academic Year 2016** | 5688 |
| **Award Category** (pick one) | ☒ Transformations-at-Scale |
| **List the original course materials for students (including title, whether optional or required, & cost for each item)** | Steps to Writing Well with Additional Readings (required)  
Rules for Writers with Writing about Literature (required)  
| **Projected Per Student Cost** | $0.00 |
| **Projected Per Student Savings (%)** | 100% |

[Proposal No.] 1  
[Publish Date]
1. PROJECT GOALS

1. Improve accessibility and navigation of *Successful College Writing for GPC Students*. Eun-Ok Baek and James Monaghan’s 2010 study of students’ digital-textbook use shows students’ positive attitudes toward eTexts correlate with these features. Students find it easier to access an online text than a downloadable one, and those who are comfortable reading a longer text onscreen are more favorable toward eTexts than print (9-11, 21-22).

2. Consolidate chapters to eliminate redundancies and reduce printing costs. A survey conducted by the Florida Distance Learning Consortium in 2010 shows that students want a printable version of the eText, as well as the ability to self-print it (Morrison-Babb and Henderson 151). Because a self-print option is the only one available with a Creative Commons Licensed text, the eText must be concise to make printing affordable.

3. Improve chapters on research methods to make *Successful College Writing for GPC Students* viable for English 1102.

4. Develop multimedia-rich and interactive content (e.g., graphics and video) and study aids. Baek and Monaghan (21) and Morrison-Babb and Henderson (151) report that surveyed students want these tools to help them understand and retain content.

5. Embed assessment tools (e.g., learning modules and quizzes) into the content.

6. Gain adoption of the revised *Successful College Writing for GPC Students* as the standard composition and rhetoric textbooks for English 1101 and 1102 at GPC.

7. Collect and analyze instructors’ feedback on the currently used and revised versions of *Successful College Writing for GPC Students*.

8. Increase student engagement and completion of English 1101 and 1102 at GPC. Although they could not claim a direct causal relationship, in their year-long study, Andrew Feldstein et al. found a significant correlation between the use of eTexts, higher student grades, and lower rates of failure and withdrawal (7).

9. Measure student performance and retention in English 1101 and 1102 at GPC and compare these to past semesters for all data points of success and failure.

1.1 STATEMENT OF TRANSFORMATION

For the past two decades, Georgia Perimeter College (GPC) faculty and students have used *Steps to Writing Well* in English 1101 and *Rules for Writers with Writing about Literature* in English 1102. These printed textbooks have been popular because they provide: detailed writing instruction in basic areas, such as thesis statements and paragraph development; chapters on various modes of exposition and argumentation, including professional writing and student essays in each mode; a grammar handbook with exercises; and chapters on research and documentation. However, the costs of these textbooks have become prohibitive for two-year college students. Textbook searches by GPC’s English 1101/1102 curriculum committee have identified few viable alternative textbooks at affordable prices. Moreover, the eText *Successful College Writing for GPC Students*, which the team members completed in Summer 2014, requires extensive revision to help students meet the Learning Objectives of English 1101 and 1102. By increasing textbook access for over 5000 students per semester, a formidable, no-cost, electronic textbook for English 1101 and 1102 will affect many stakeholders, including GPC students, the Department of English, faculty in other departments, and the GPC administration. Its impacts will include: improving GPC students’ performances and completion rates in English courses; improving GPC students’ performances in other courses that require writing and research; increasing GPC’s rates of retention and graduation and, thereby, improving GPC’s
funding formula; contributing to the success of GPC’s Quality Enhancement Plan; and contributing to the success of Complete College Georgia.

1.2 TRANSFORMATION ACTION PLAN

Team members will track instructors’ use of the current version of *Successful College Writing for GPC Students*, and they will solicit, collect, and compile feedback and recommendations for revision from instructors and students. They will work with Tracy Adkins and William (Ken) Moss of GPC’s Office of Information Technology (OIT) and with GPC Librarian Mary Ann Cullen to develop multimedia content and assessment tools and to collect formative data. Team members will revise the eText as follows:

- **Preface and Introduction**: Kathryn Crowther, Lauren Curtright, Nancy Gilbert, Barbara Hall, Tracienne Ravita, and Kirk Swenson
- **Outlines, Paragraphs, and Thesis Statements**: Tracienne Ravita
- **Pre-Writing and Drafting**: Nancy Gilbert
- **Grammar and English as a Second Language**: Barbara Hall and Kirk Swenson
- **Rhetorical Modes with Readings and Sample Student Essays**: Kathryn Crowther
- **Research and Documentation**: Lauren Curtright

Team members will select the most easily navigable format of the eText on OpenStax. Team members will present the eText to the English 1101/1102 curriculum committee for adoption in Spring 2016 as a standard textbook for English 1101 and 1102. Finally, team members will conduct surveys and evaluate summative data on the use of the eText as a standard textbook in English 1101 and 1102.

1.3 QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE MEASURES

- Quantitative: Comparison of Drop/Fail/Withdraw (DFW) rates to measure whether the eText correlates with higher course completion rates in English 1101 and 1102.
- Quantitative: Comparison of PASS alerts and final grades to measure whether the eText correlates with improvements in Learning Objective success in English 1101 and 1102.
- Qualitative: Surveys of instructors and students on their experiences using the eText.

1.4 TIMELINE

1. **Spring of 2013**: After teaching a section of English 1101 with the textbook *Steps to Writing Well*, GPC’s Interim President Rob Watts inquired about the possibility of creating a lower-cost or no-cost textbook for the course and asked Professor Rosemary Cox to lead the project. Cox assembled a committee of faculty, librarians, OIT staff, and Learning and Tutoring Center administration to find or create an existing no-cost electronic textbook on composition and rhetoric to adopt at GPC.

2. **Fall 2013**: Committee members surveyed instructors and students to discover their textbook content and format preferences. After researching many options, the committee selected *Writing for Success*, a Creative Commons licensed textbook by The Saylor Foundation.

3. **Spring 2014**: The committee divided into groups to revise *Writing for Success*.

4. **Summer 2014**: A pilot of five sections of English 1101 was conducted using *Writing for Success*; the committee condensed and edited the 600+ page textbook for general release.

5. **Fall 2014**: With technical assistance from Tracy Adkins and William (Ken) Moss, the committee released the eText, titled *Successful College Writing for GPC Students*, which is currently used in 23 sections of English 1101 at GPC.
6. Spring 2015 and Summer 2015: Team members will track instructors’ use of the current version of *Successful College Writing for GPC Students*, and they will solicit, collect, and compile feedback and revision recommendations from instructors and students.

7. Summer 2015 and Fall 2015: Team members will revise the eText based on their research, creation and editing of content, and analysis of data; they will make the eText available on OpenStax; and they will present the eText for adoption as a standard textbook for English 1101 and 1102 in Spring 2016.

8. Spring 2016: Team members will collect and evaluate summative data on the use of the revised eText as a standard textbook in English 1101 and 1102.

1.5 BUDGET

The budget for the project, based on the Request for Proposals’ specification of $30,000, will be allocated as follows:

- About $4,867 per faculty member on the six-member team for one course release each in Fall 2015.
- $800 for travel expenses related to the project kick-off meeting.

1.6 SUSTAINABILITY PLAN

It is reasonable to expect that at least 100 sections of English 1101 and at least 100 sections of English 1102 will continue to be offered every fall and spring semester at Georgia Perimeter College in the future. Instructors may use the eText in sophomore-level literature courses and other courses with writing and text-based research, as well. At no cost, the English 1101/1102 curriculum committee—which is in charge of textbook selections for both courses—will continue to track and assess use of the eText in English 1101 and 1102. As needed, at the discretion of the curriculum committee, team members and other interested faculty will serve on a subcommittee responsible for revising the eText.

1.7 REFERENCES & ATTACHMENTS


November 24, 2014

TO: Grant Assessment Committee
    Affordable Learning Georgia

RE: Textbook Transformation Grant

Dear Committee Members,

It is with great pleasure and enthusiasm that I write this letter of support for the GPC English Division’s application for the ALG Textbook Transformation Grant.

Because I have had direct experience teaching First Year Composition classes since taking on the role of President at GPC, I have seen first-hand the need for affordable, and accessible quality texts for all students at GPC. When approached by faculty members from the English Department to develop an eTextbook for ENGL 1101 at no cost to students back in the Spring 2013 semester, I heartily supported and encouraged faculty members willing to devote their time to this project.

The eTextbook piloted in the Fall 2014 Semester, Successful College Writing for GPC Students, shows great promise. Work remains to be done, however, to improve the text’s navigation and accessibility, to add multimedia and interactive components to the text, and to expand research chapters so the text is viable for ENGL 1102 as well. Receiving ALG’s Textbook Transformation Grant would provide an invaluable aid in making the needed changes in the eTextbook possible.

Thank you for your consideration of the GPC English Division’s proposal.

Sincerely,

Robert Watts
Interim President
December 2, 2014

Affordable Learning Georgia
Grant Proposal Assessment Committee

Dear Committee Members,

I am writing this letter of recommendation to support the GPC English Division’s submission for the ALG Textbook Transformation Grant. As the Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs at Georgia Perimeter College, it is my opinion that the project’s goals to develop and add interactive course materials to the newly piloted eTextbook, Successful College Writing for GPC Students, will assist in:

- Avoiding student withdrawals from ENGL 1101 and 1102
- Increasing overall student retention and graduation
- Serving as a model for eTextbooks in disciplines outside of English

Completion of the eTextbook for English 1101 and 1102 will have a positive impact on student retention and graduation by making essential course materials available at no cost to all students. Furthermore, its impact could expand beyond English 1101 and 1102 because the eTextbook could gain use, or serve as a model for future eTextbooks, in other courses in English and related fields (such as English as a Second Language) as well as courses in other departments.

Your consideration of the enclosed grant proposal is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Philip Smith
Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs
Pamela Moolenaar-Wirsiy
Director, Center for Teaching and Learning
Georgia Perimeter College
555 North Indian Creek Drive
Clarkston, GA 30021

November 26, 2014

To: Affordable Learning Georgia
   Grant Proposal Assessment Committee

RE: ALG Textbook Transformation Grant Proposal

Dear Committee Members,

As Director for the Center of Teaching and Learning at Georgia Perimeter College, it is with pleasure that I write to express my support for the GPC English Division’s application for the ALG Textbook Transformation Grant. The proposed project to refine and develop course content for the Fall 2014 piloted version of an eTextbook will greatly benefit the CTL’s goals to improve the environment for student learning.

Simply put, having an enhanced, no cost, online eTextbook for ENGL 1101 and 1102--an essential part of the core curriculum--will directly benefit both students and the English faculty. Providing a freely available eTextbook ensures that quality learning materials are readily, and freely, available to all students. As a consequence, having a quality eTextbook available further assists faculty members in their goal to improve students’ learning experience in face-to-face classes and online.

Thank you for your consideration of the enclosed grant proposal. Rest assured that the CTL stands in support of development activities for the grantees as well as assisting them in sharing their knowledge of this project with colleagues. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Pamela Moolenaar-Wirsiy, Ph.D., M.P.A.
Director, Center for Teaching and Learning
Final Report
Affordable Learning Georgia Textbook Transformation Grants

Final Report

Date: May 20, 2016
Grant Number: 104
Institution Name(s): Georgia State University Perimeter College/Georgia Perimeter College
Project Lead:
Lauren Curtright, Assistant Professor, English, Georgia State/Perimeter College:
lcurtright@gsu.edu
Team Members:
Kathryn Crowther, Assistant Professor, English, Georgia State/Perimeter College:
kcrowther@gsu.edu
Nancy Gilbert, Assistant Professor, English, Georgia State/Perimeter College:
ngilbert@gsu.edu
Barbara Hall, Associate Professor, English, Georgia State/Perimeter College:
bhall12@gsu.edu
Tracienne Ravita, Assistant Professor, English, Georgia State/Perimeter College:
travita@gsu.edu
Kirk Swenson, Associate Professor, English, Georgia State/Perimeter College:
kswenson@gsu.edu

Course Name(s) and Course Numbers:
ENGL 1101 and ENGL 1101H; ENGL 1102 and ENGL 1102H
Semester Project Began: Spring 2015
Semester(s) of Implementation: Spring 2016
Average Number of Students Per Course Section: 24
Number of Course Sections Affected by Implementation: 13: reported in initial Spring 2016 phase
Total Number of Students Affected by Implementation: 290: 160 student responses reported in initial Spring 2016 phase

1. Narrative

Meetings: The ALG Grant Committee met a total of seven times in 2015: May 18, June 23, Aug. 3, Aug. 28, Sept. 29 (Faculty Development Day), Nov. 2, and Nov. 23. In addition, the team assigned to revise the grammar chapters (Kirk Swenson and Barbara Hall) met five times: Aug. 3, Aug. 18, Sept. 22, Oct. 6, and Oct 20. Finally, the entire committee was joined by five English faculty members for a focus group meeting on Aug. 12. This was an opportunity for all interested English faculty to discuss what they wanted in the revised text.

The priorities for revision voiced by faculty included: improve ease of navigation between sections and chapters; eliminate redundancies; include more samples of student writing; and improve accessibility to meet ADA compliancy standards. In the first meeting the committee divided the etext into five sections for purposes of revising to meet these goals. Committee members were assigned sections as follows:
• Lauren Curtright: Introduction and Research
• Kathryn Crowther: Writing Modes
Lauren Curtright – Challenges and Accomplishments:

The greatest challenge was in making the Research chapter’s guidelines for writing research papers that were both specific enough to provide meaningful guidance to students and general enough that they would apply to composition courses focused on various topics, such as social issues, or literary analysis. The greatest accomplishments were incorporating into the chapter descriptions of, and links to, up-to-date multimedia resources for helping students to conduct research using online library databases.

Kathryn Crowther – Challenges and Accomplishments:

The main challenge was to take two chapters from the original textbook (“Rhetorical Modes” and “Readings: Examples of Essays”) and condense them into one chapter. The committee decided based on instructor feedback that the textbook needed more examples of student writing and that placing sample essays in the same chapter as the information on each rhetorical mode would be more helpful to students. The new chapter contains three more sample student essays (adding “description,” “definition,” and replacing the existing “narration”) to give a total of 6 sample student essays. The sample essays come at the end of each section on the respective mode to give students a sense of the writing process from start to finish. Similarly, the online sample essays were moved from the previous stand-alone chapter to the end of each section of the new chapter and were updated to include new selections and purge non-functioning external hyperlinks.

Another goal for the chapter was to provide more links to previous content in the book to allow students to move fluidly back and forth if they need to review earlier concepts such as pre-writing and drafting (and to facilitate more flexible integration of the book into different class structures). Additionally, the existing exercises were modified and the tips were integrated into the narrative where appropriate. Finally, all of the images were given “alt-text” to enable screen-readers, and the sample essays were converted to text for the same reason.

The main accomplishments of this chapter were updated content, the addition of new student sample papers, improved navigation between this chapter and earlier sections via internal links, and the transformation of all tables and images into ADA compliant text.

Tracienne Ravita and Nancy Gilbert -- Challenges and Accomplishments:

The challenge for the Writing Process section was the same as for the text as a whole: to streamline the content by removing redundant information while retaining useful instructional materials, to improve navigation within and between sections, and to improve accessibility for those with disabilities. The 2014/2015 text presented five separate consecutive chapters on the writing process: Introduction to Writing, Prewriting Techniques, Writing Effective Paragraphs, Writing Effective Thesis Statements and Outlines, and Drafting and Revising the Essay. The 2016 version reduces the number of chapters to two: Introduction to Writing (with subchapters on audience and purpose, using sources, thesis statements, and paragraphs), and The Writing Process, (with subchapters on prewriting, outlining, drafting, and revising). Thus, the instruction is organized into the areas of foundations for essay writing, followed by the creation of an essay from the generation of ideas to the revision and formatting of a draft. Redundancies, such as the repetition of the transitions table in separate chapters, were eliminated, and hyperlinks were inserted to allow for quick migration to the appropriate materials.
Many exercises were revised, relocated, or removed, and some of the Writing at Work sections – originally highlighted in shaded boxes – were integrated into the main text or removed.

New to the 2016 version is a brief introduction to using sources in the opening chapter, links to YouTube videos on brainstorming techniques in the prewriting section, and additional examples of student paragraphs to demonstrate organization and development. Throughout these chapters, approximately thirty examples of paragraphs and outline sections from the example essay in process, as well as the sample essay and outline on aquaponics, were changed to text to allow text-to-audio programs to translate these items.

Kirk Swenson and Barbara Hall – Challenges and Accomplishments:

One major challenge in revising the grammar sections of the e-text was determining how to coordinate the standard grammar instruction with the ESL grammar instruction. In the original text, these two components were allocated to separate chapters. After consultation, Swenson and Hall decided to integrate the two. One reason for doing so was the fact that, for the students of Perimeter College, the distinction between ESL students (or English language learners) and native speakers is increasingly difficult to make. Many students function in an intermediary zone: many of their earliest years and home life have required speaking a language other than English, but their use of English also extends back into their childhood, practiced in a variety of English-speaking communities. Furthermore, many of the grammar difficulties that both native speakers and ESL students face overlap. And, since another major goal was to reduce the excessive length of the original text’s grammar instruction, Swenson and Hall were pleased that integrating these two sections eliminated redundancy and made all the grammar material more manageable and concise.

Swenson and Hall also needed to compose original material to add to the text. For example, despite its excessive length, the original text lacked a useful explanation of subordination, in particular the formation of adjective and adverb clauses, the distinction between restrictive and nonrestrictive clauses, and the function of relative pronouns. It also neglected adequate explanations of the complex and numerous verb tenses used in English, which can be especially confusing for ESL students. Swenson and Hall divided these tasks between them, with Swenson composing the former material and Hall the latter. Other sections of the grammar portions of the text were also extensively revised and expanded, for example, the section on syntax and sentence patterns.

The result of Swenson’s and Hall’s efforts is a grammar component (Chapter 5) that is better organized, clearer, more concise, and more substantive than the original. Swenson reports that the examples and explanations of sentence structure and verb forms, in particular, were helpful in class instruction during the spring 2016 semester.

2. Quotes

- Provide three quotes from students evaluating their experience with the no-cost learning materials.
  1. “I found the online textbook was very convenient and helpful. I like that I didn’t have to carry a heavy textbook and that I could fit it on my phone if I needed to. This textbook also saved me a lot of money, which is a plus.”
  2. “Successful College Composition is a good book because it explains everything very clearly and is easy to access.”
  3. “The book really helped me out this semester. Everything was simple. I learned more from that one book than I have from all my English teachers. I will definitely be using it in the future.”
4. “What I liked about the e-book was that I can access it through the iPad we received this semester; I can use it on a regular PC, and also I did not have to shell out more money for a 3rd book. It was smart to put it online. Very easy to move around in it as well.”

3. Quantitative and Qualitative Measures

3a. Overall Measurements

Qualitative

Student Opinion of Materials
Was the overall student opinion about the materials used in the course positive, neutral, or negative?
Total number of students affected in the Spring 2016 semester: 290
Total number of students surveyed: 160
- Positive: 68 % of 160 number of respondents
- Neutral: 31 % of 160 number of respondents
- Negative: 1 % of 160 number of respondents

Student Learning Outcomes and Grades
Was the overall comparative impact on student performance in terms of learning outcomes and grades in the semester(s) of implementation over previous semesters positive, neutral, or negative?

Choose One:
- ___ Positive: Higher performance outcomes measured over previous semester(s)
- X Neutral: Same performance outcomes over previous semester(s)
- ___ Negative: Lower performance outcomes over previous semester(s)

Instructors: Student Drop/Fail/Withdraw (DFW) Rates
Was the overall comparative impact on Drop/Fail/Withdraw (DFW) rates in the semester(s) of implementation over previous semesters positive, neutral, or negative?

Choose One:
- ___ Positive
- _X_ Neutral
- ____ Negative

Quantitative

Drop/Fail/Withdraw Rates
34% of students, out of a total 1610 students who registered for ENGL 1101, dropped/failed/withdrew from the course in the first semester of implementation.

[Note: These numbers do not represent reported survey results from instructors and students using SCC Spring 2016. See 3b.]

Choose One:
- ___ Positive: This is a lower percentage of students with D/F/W than previous semester(s)
- ___ Neutral: This is the same percentage of students with D/F/W than previous semester(s)
• _X_ Negative: This is a higher percentage of students with D/F/W than previous semester(s)

3b. Narrative

Summary of Supporting Data:

Instructor survey questions for Successful College Composition were introduced to the ENGL 1101/1102 Curriculum Committee on Faculty Development Day in February 2016, with the understanding that the survey would be conducted in the final weeks of the Spring Semester by all faculty members using—or not using—the revised e-text, SCC. Included in the survey were questions regarding the instructor’s evaluation of SCC’s effect on Learning Outcomes; of the changes (if any) in student DWF rates from the previous semester (Fall 2015); and of improvements in content and navigation from the original e-text. Student responses to SCC were also solicited in a separate survey at that time. Instructor and student surveys were sent out to all full and part-time faculty members in mid April 2016.

In total, 20 instructors responded to the SCC survey. Fourteen of the twenty instructors responding noted they did not use SCC. Six instructor responses, representing 13 out of the 114 sections of ENGL 1101 offered in the Spring 2016 semester (approximately 11% of ENGL 1101 sections), provided feedback on the usability of the e-text. Their collective class enrollments represent approximately 10% of students registered for ENGL 1101 in Spring 2016.

Instructors’ responses on SCC:

Instructor responses to the survey reported an overall positive experience, citing ease of use, clarity of content, and the text’s availability to students. Instructors universally reported, however, a neutral impact on the text’s effect on learning outcomes and the DWF rate from the previous semester.

Students’ responses:

Positive responses by students (approximately 67%) primarily cite the low/no cost of the text, clarity of content, and ease of access as a factor in their positive evaluations. The majority of the Neutral evaluations stem from students not using the text at all—either because the material was adequately covered in class, or because they felt confident in their understanding of the writing skills covered.

Quantitative Measures:

The raw data provided for all ENGL 1101 sections, comparing Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 results, indicates an increase in the DWF rate from 27% to 34%. However, the qualitative data gathered after the initial launch of SCC suggests otherwise. While positive, the qualitative data is still from a small sample. As a result, its impact on overall ENGL 1101 DWF rates cannot be measured with any certainty, nor can any conclusions be drawn.

Because the qualitative responses from students and instructors have been overwhelmingly positive, a longitudinal study measuring the impact of SCC on student learning outcomes and DWF rates over several semesters, not just one, would be more relevant. When instructors have time to become comfortable with using the e-text and integrating it into their course curricula, whether as a primary text or a backup resource, the DWF numbers are expected to improve.

4. Sustainability Plan
The team may expect the leadership in the Department of English at Georgia State University, Perimeter College to continue to promote the availability and use of *Successful College Composition* in English 1101 and 1102 courses on all campuses, including online. Throughout the project, the team’s department chairs consistently forwarded announcements to colleagues to give or receive information about this e-text. The faculty-led ENGL 1101/1102 Curriculum Committee at Perimeter College established a sub-committee for the electronic text, which various team members will continue to serve on or to advise. To make the e-text accessible to all faculty and students, the sub-committee will continue to work with GSU librarians to ensure that the latest version of the e-text is posted to the current online database of library research guides and/or to a future database of electronic materials produced by faculty at GSU. This sub-committee will also oversee future revisions of, and future data collections on, *Successful College Composition*. Revisions will likely require accommodating new types of assignments, as composition courses increasingly teach students communication skills in various media. The sub-committee may issue calls to faculty in order to collect, review, and add materials, including resources and examples of instructors’ assignments and students’ work, to keep the material relevant.

5. Future Plans

- This project has reinforced and broadened our understanding of the ways in which students benefit from easily accessible, up-to-date writing models and resources. It also brought to our attention the significance of visual design and navigation tools for making an e-text appealing to instructors and students alike.
- Because Perimeter College’s Center for Teaching and Learning managed and supported this project, team members expect to present on it in the future at conferences or in publications coordinated or promoted by GSU’s Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning.

6. Description of Photograph

- Team members featured in the photo are (from left to right): Lauren Curtright (Project Lead), Kirk Swenson, Kathryn Crowther, and Tracienne Ravita. Not shown: Barbara Hall and Nancy Gilbert.