1. **Assessment information collected**

Material available included final essays/projects from 400-level literature and rhetoric classes for the past two years, and final exams from the literary theory and language classes (English 310, 317, 318, 462 and 472).

The committee identified 4 students and reviewed the work of those students across three English Department upper division learning contexts, two rhetoric courses, an authors course, a genre course, and two grammar courses. Two of the three contexts are required courses for the English major because rhetoric courses are optional in the major and serve as electives. We separately reviewed the results of 310, our required course for English majors. Nine essays and 29 final exams in total were examined.

We wanted to know how our students were performing across the courses and if and to what extent they were applying their learning about language, texts, and relationships to other courses. By looking at the same students in courses with three different kinds of subject matter, we get a more direct look at how individuals deal with the different expectations involved.

2. **Conclusions drawn from the information summarized above**

- These students may or may not be representative of English majors as a whole. Of the four English language courses, only the two grammar courses were represented, which leaves out the two more socio-historically oriented courses in this group. Courses by only one instructor in each area are represented; others (especially in literature) may have different emphases, expectations, and requirements. We did not have any students in common for English as a Second Language courses or Creative Writing courses in the assessment. We did not assess any online courses.

- Our findings did not differ significantly from those in the 2013-14 assessment. Students addressed a wide variety of questions appropriate to the major's stated goals for student outcomes. The most successful were able to enter a critical and/or theoretical conversation in an independent, creative, and critical way, while the least successful struggled to relate individual instances to big ideas and to see their work as a set of choices within a larger framework.

- Critical reasoning about rhetoric was not apparent in the literature or language coursework. On bigger-picture issues such as relationships of class, race, and gender
identity to language variation, or analyzing underlying social metaphors in works of literature, it was hard to judge how much crossover there was.

* Students who struggle to identify construction problems in the grammar courses carry those struggles into their own writing in the literature courses, while those who succeed at one tend to succeed at the other.

* We noticed that only one of the papers sampled was as much as 10 pages long. This is not a problem in itself, since shorter papers are perfectly valid, but it may suggest a topic for discussion in the context of our preliminary Communications Plan.

3. Curricular changes resulting from conclusions drawn above

   A. For the department retreat in August facilitate a conversation about the role of long papers in English degree (defined as more than 10 pages). Create some shared goals for student outcomes for the English 310 course, the only required specific course in the major. (There is a choice of courses for all the other requirements of the major).

   B. Since there is no prescribed sequence of courses for English majors, we could make no assumptions about what each student brought into each course (nor can instructors make such assumptions). This lack of a predictable sequence could potentially contribute to students seeing their courses as compartmentalized rather than as parts of a larger whole.

   C. We recommend the following two changes to the assessment plan from our work:
      1) as part of the capstone portfolio, ask students to comment directly on how they see their courses relating; 2) For the next assessment cycle, look at students' records to get a clearer idea of when in their degree program they tend to take particular courses.

4. Identify the faculty members involved in reaching the conclusions drawn above and agreeing upon the curricular changes resulting

   Sarah Stanley, Eileen Harney, Burns Cooper, Duff Johnston, Christine Coffman