

Colonnade FOUNDATIONS Assessment 2023-2024	
Potter College of Arts and Letters	English
Literary Studies	
David LeNoir	

Please select the option(s) that best describe all sections of this course (you may select more than one):

- ☐ Taught 100% face to face
- ☐ Taught 100% online
- ☒ Mix of online and face to face
- ☐ Includes dual credit

Student Learning Outcome 1			
<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	Command of Literary Elements: Capstone mastery (score of 4) “Student demonstrates accurate, clear, and precise comprehension of literary concepts, elements, devices, etc.”		
<b>Measurement Instrument 1</b>	Student formal papers—literary analyses—which have been developed over time with opportunity for in-process revision.		
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	The rubric is designed to consider the full range of literary studies, so mastery as indicated by the highest scores is not an expectation for an introductory-level course. Consistent ratings of 4—true mastery—would be anticipated only among advanced students, such as senior English majors. In an introductory-level course, student ratings are expected to be clustered in the lower portion of the rubric scale—but not the bottom.		
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	80% of ENG 200 essays will score 1.5 or higher.  (A supplementary measure is for 30% to score 2.5 or higher.)	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	85% of the essays scored 1.5 or higher.  (In the supplementary measure, 37% scored 2.5 or higher.)

<b>Methods</b>	A list of randomly-selected ENG 200 students was obtained from IR. Copies of student papers were submitted by faculty. Each paper was read and rated by two faculty members. If the initial ratings were identical or adjacent for an outcome, the mean scores were recorded. If the two initial ratings were disparate (i.e., differed by more than 1 point), a third faculty reader rated the paper and the mean of the three scores was recorded. N=54.		
<b>Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.</b>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Met</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Not Met</b>
<b>Follow-Up</b> Academic year 2024-25			
Previous success on this measure had suggested we might move on to another outcome in place of this one, but last year's results (61%) suggested we should retain it through at least one more cycle. The strong success this year puts us back on track to consider moving to a new measure after at least one more successful year. No specific changes are anticipated in our sampling or methodology, though we may want to consider adjustments due to the earlier deadline for reports.			

Student Learning Outcome 2				
<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	Evidence to Support Analytical Argument: Capstone mastery (score of 4) "Information is taken from primary and/or secondary source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive literary analysis."			
<b>Measurement Instrument 1</b>	Student formal papers—literary analyses—which have been developed over time with opportunity for in-process revision.			
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	The rubric is designed to consider the full range of literary studies, so mastery as indicated by the highest scores is not an expectation for an introductory-level course. Consistent ratings of 4—true mastery—would be anticipated only among advanced students, such as senior English majors. In an introductory-level course, student ratings are expected to be clustered in the lower portion of the rubric scale—but not the bottom.			
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>		80% of ENG 200 essays will score 1.5 or higher.  (A supplementary measure is for 30% to score 2.5 or higher.)	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	98% of the essays scored 1.5 or higher.  (In the supplementary measure, 50% scored 2.5 or higher.)
<b>Methods</b>	A list of randomly-selected ENG 300 students was obtained from IR. Copies of student papers were submitted by faculty. Each paper was read and rated by two faculty members. If the initial ratings were identical or adjacent for an outcome, the mean scores were recorded. If the two initial ratings were disparate (i.e., differed by more than 1 point), a third faculty reader rated the paper and the mean of the three scores was recorded. N=54			
<b>Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.</b>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Met</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Not Met</b>
<b>Follow-Up</b> Academic year 2024-25				
This outcome has been met consistently over the last few cycles. As we move into a new academic year, the department will consider whether to continue with this outcome to affirm continuing success or to shift our next assessment to a different outcome. No changes are anticipated in our sampling or methodology.				

### Student Learning Outcome 3

<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	Human Expression Shapes Context: Capstone mastery (score of 4) “Student accurately and precisely locates particular literary works in relation to multiple relevant contexts.”		
<b>Measurement Instrument 1</b>	Student formal papers—literary analyses—which have been developed over time with opportunity for in-process revision.		
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	The rubric is designed to consider the full range of literary studies, so mastery as indicated by the highest scores is not an expectation for an introductory-level course. Consistent ratings of 4—true mastery—would be anticipated only among advanced students, such as senior English majors. In an introductory-level course, student ratings are expected to be clustered in the lower portion of the rubric scale—but not the bottom.		
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	80% of ENG 200 essays will score 1.5 or higher.  (A supplementary measure is for 30% to score 2.5 or higher.)	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	92% of the essays scored 1.5 or higher.  (In the supplementary measure, 50% scored 2.5 or higher.)
<b>Methods</b>	A list of randomly-selected ENG 200 students was obtained from IR. Copies of student papers were submitted by faculty. Each paper was read and rated by two faculty members. If the initial ratings were identical or adjacent for an outcome, the mean scores were recorded. If the two initial ratings were disparate (i.e., differed by more than 1 point), a third faculty reader rated the paper and the mean of the three scores was recorded. N=54		
<b>Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.</b>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Met</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Not Met</b>
<b>Follow-Up</b> Academic year 2024-25			
This marks the second year of improvement on this measure. Last year’s result (78%) fell just short of the goal but was an improvement over the previous cycle’s results, and this year’s success clearly indicates progress. This outcome will be revisited for at least one more assessment cycle. No specific changes are anticipated in our sampling or methodology, though we may want to consider adjustments due to the earlier deadline for reports.			