Model Course/Program Outcomes Guide
January 2015

Course/Program Title: ENG 102 Composition and Literature

Course/Program Team: Joan Johnson, Melinda May, Kathryn Benchoff, Alicia Drumgoole, Mike Harsh, Amanda Miller

English 102, Composition and Literature, refines the writing process through the reading and interpretation of literature. Students learn manuscript presentation, inquiry, and research skills by writing a clearly documented research paper. The prerequisite for this class is English 101.

Expected Learning Outcomes: The expected learning outcomes for this course were revised and implemented in FA13 after faculty decided that clearer, more consistent analysis of student work was necessary.

The Outcomes for ENG 102 were revised as follows:

Students will be able to demonstrate the following skills:

Processes
- Employ prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing to contribute to the clear communication of ideas, taking into consideration the feedback of instructors and peers.

Conventions
- Formulate and support a focused thesis statement on a literary topic with adequate evidence while adhering to the conventions of standard written English in a well-structured essay.

Rhetorical Knowledge
- Demonstrate critical thinking and an understanding of literary analysis and terminology in order to employ collegiate voice, tone, level of formality, and support for claims.

Research
- Engage in inquiry-driven research, properly attributing and citing the language and ideas of others to avoid plagiarism in a well-reasoned essay.

Assessment:

Instructors use a common rubric to grade essays and the final research paper (see below). Instructors all assign a research paper based on literature as the culminating course project. All instructors use a common textbook that has been chosen based on the learning outcomes.

Additionally, all 102 instructors are required to use and employ common Course Content Objective to ensure that the rigor of the 102 course is consistent throughout the department.

Faculty and Adjuncts are evaluated by peers and supervisors on a regular basis to ensure that all required course content objectives are being met.

See also the Course Content Objectives and General Education Outcomes listed below:

COURSE CONTENT OBJECTIVES:

- Write and revise a minimum of two (2) to three (3) unified, well-developed essays, effectively using literary analysis and primary and/or secondary source material. These essays are in addition to the research paper.
- Formulate a literary thesis, conduct scholarly research, cite textual evidence using parenthetical documentation, and produce a final research paper of at least 4-6 pages with Works Cited page using MLA format. APA format may be used in some instances.
- Discuss, critique, and analyze different literary genres from various cultures and time periods and discern their historical, social, ethnic, and cultural diversity.
- Become familiar with various authors, the time period in which they wrote, and their importance and relevance in today's world.
- Use appropriate literary terminology and cite specific examples of those terms in literary works.
- Apply the conventions of academic writing including appropriate use of source material, textual evidence, documentation, and highly developed composition skills.

General Education Outcomes: This course fulfills an English General Education requirement. These are the outcomes for that requirement:

Outcome 1: Write or deliver an organized, coherent, fully developed essay or speech that uses standard English and cites outside sources appropriately.

Outcome 2: Evaluate a piece of writing from either literature, current events, non-fiction essays, or a college textbook for logical flaws, rhetorical purpose, organization, and evidence for claims.

All Research Papers are assessed using the rubric below to collect and measure via the rubric. Additionally, samples of the research papers are collected on a regular basis for review and discussion during annual department meetings with full time and adjunct faculty members.

While it is required that all faculty assign documented research papers in ENG 102, we are meeting in SP 15 semester to design and revise guidelines for the research essay assignment. This will help to ensure that essay requirements for all 102 students meet or exceed minimum standards for the assignment as shown in the rubric.

English 102 -- Student Outcomes Assessment

Student: _____   **Grade:** _____

A = Excellent)   **B = Very Good**   **C = Good**   **D = Fair**   **F = Poor**

Processes	Points Possible = 10	Points Earned =
• Uses prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing to contribute to the clear communication of ideas • Demonstrates consideration of feedback from instructor or peers	Out of 10 A (9) B (8) C (7) D (6) F (___)	

Conventions	Points Possible = 70	Total Points Earned =
Overall Organization and Coherence (5) • Displays effective organization and clear transitions within and between paragraphs	Out of 5 A (5) B (4) C (3) D (2) F (___)	Points Earned =
Essay Structure and Development (35) *Introduction* • Engages the reader with an inviting attention statement • Provides background information that orients reader and transitions to the thesis • Ends with an insightful, focused, one-sentence thesis on a literary topic that states the central assertion of the essay *Body Paragraphs* • Contain a topic sentence that directly supports thesis and states central idea of paragraph • Provide concrete details and textual evidence, where appropriate, to explain, expand, and support the topic • Are well-organized, fully developed, and on topic • Provide satisfying closure for each paragraph *Conclusion* • Provides closure for entire analysis • Is well-developed, transitioned, and satisfying • Does not introduce new information	Out of 35 A (33) B (30) C (26) D (23) F (___)	Points Earned =
Grammar and Style / Use of Standard English (30) • Uses a variety of sophisticated (but clear and concise) sentence structures • Uses historical present tense • Exhibits specific, advanced vocabulary and diction • Avoids fluff, wordiness, and vague, generic phrases • Contains few errors in grammar, punctuation, and usage • Avoids fragments, comma splices, and run-on sentences	Out of 30 A (28) B (25) C (22) D (20) F (___)	Points Earned =

Rhetorical Knowledge	Points Possible = 20	Points Earned =

• Demonstrates well-informed critical thinking and sound literary analysis • Analyzes rather than summarizes ideas • Uses literary terminology effectively • Addresses the proper audience • Displays a consistent and appropriate point of view • Adopts college-level voice and tone	Out of 20 A (19) B (17) C (15) D (13) F (____)	
Research Points Possible = 50		**Points Earned =**
• Uses appropriate MLA format • Utilizes various sources and the student's ideas to present a cogent argument • Uses timely, academic, and reliable sources • Uses summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation to avoid plagiarism • Integrates short, appropriate, focused quotations into paragraphs driven by student-authored text • Uses parenthetical citations properly • Provides an accurate, properly formatted Works Cited page	Out of 50 A (46) B (40) C (36) D (30) F (____)	
Note: For the research essay, instructors must weight this section at 50 points. For earlier essays involving a research component, points may be awarded at the discretion of the instructor.		
Deductions		
Total		

Point scale for the research paper assignment:
Out of 150 points: A = 135-150   B = 120-134   C = 105-119   D = 90-104   F = 89 and below

Point scale for an assignment not involving any research:
Out of 100 points: A = 90-99   B = 80-89   C = 70-79   D = 60-69   F = 59 and below

Validation:

ENG 102 Course Outcome Revision Rationale: As a department, we agreed that continuity between courses was paramount, and saw the opportunity to revise higher level English course rubrics to reflect the fundamentals learned in ENG 101. We considered the common student complaint that students weren't learning in ENG 101 what they needed to be successful in ENG 102 (Composition and Literature). In order to reinforce the skills taught in ENG 101, we restructured both the course outcomes and the rubric to align directly and comprehensively with ENG 101. We divided the course outcomes into the same categories – rhetorical knowledge, processes, conventions, and research – and looked carefully at the components of each, discussing the adaptations that could be made to incorporate literary analysis.

We decided that under the category "conventions" we could simply add "on a literary topic" to reinforce that while the topic of the writing would be shifting to literature, the expectations for the structure and organization would be similar to those in ENG 101. Under "rhetorical knowledge," we added that students should demonstrate an understanding of literary analysis and terminology, emphasizing the new skills and ideas that would be learned in 102 while still maintaining college-level voice, tone, formality, and support.

Once we had adjusted the course outcomes, we used the new ENG 101 rubric draft as a basis for the 102 rubric. Again, we added into "conventions" that thesis statements should be on a literary topic, and replaced "essay" with "analysis" in order to reflect the shift to literary analysis. Under "rhetorical knowledge," we added "analyzes rather than summarizes ideas," and "uses literary terminology effectively" to align the measurable skills with the course outcomes.

Results:

Although data and statistical goals are certainly important in assessing an English class, we must also ensure that the transformation of subjective data (evaluation of essays) into statistical data (number of students satisfying a certain outcome) is standardized.

While we might say we expect 80% of our students to achieve 70% competency levels in all outcomes, these numbers are arbitrary until we are able to standardize the way we collect qualitative data and transform it into statistical data.

The data collected in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 reflect information about the previous rubric.

The research paper fulfills both the requirements for General Education Outcome 1 and the course outcomes.

We began data collection Spring 2012, so our first semester was a pilot of an entirely new database and new general education outcomes.

In the ENG 102 classes for the SP12 Semester, we found that the department averages indicated that of the 222 students who turned in a Research Paper, upwards of 78% passed all categories of the rubric.

Course Totals for General Education Outcome 1: SP12 (Pilot) ENG 102 Research Papers

	Organization		Coherence		Development		Standard English Skills		Source Citation	
Course	% Pass	%Fail	% Pass	% Fail	%Pass	% Fail	% Pass	% Fail	% Pass	% Fail
ENG 102	90	10	88	12	80	20	89	21	78	22

In Fall 2012, of the 170 students who turned in a Research Paper, upwards of 92% of students passed all categories of the rubric.

Course Totals for General Education Outcome 1: FA12 ENG 102 Research Papers

FA 12	Organization		Coherence		Development		Standard English Skills		Source Citation	
Course	% Pass	%Fail	% Pass	% Fail	%Pass	% Fail	% Pass	% Fail	% Pass	% Fail
ENG 102	96	4	93	7	94	6	96	4	92	8

This data presented a problem because the staff agreed that "passing" (above 60%) did not reflect an adequate measure of student success. We agreed that success should be defined as the achievement of the minimum grade of C (70%).

Therefore, we decided to break out the success measures into grade-specific categories so that we can see the students who are genuinely successful. Otherwise, A students are combined with D students, the latter of which we should not determine as successful per our outcomes.

As a result, we changed the databases to reflect letter grades rather than pass/fail. We also changed the rubric (see "validation" above) and have planned norming sessions to ensure the viability of the new rubric.

This data reflects the bell curve we would expect to see in a 102 class. We will continue to norm to make sure we are grading essays in a similar way, but the data, as seen here, presents no grade inflation issues. Our data for the 2013-2014 academic year should be more valuable, since our outcomes and rubrics are now aligned and the outcomes information can be pulled directly from the rubric.

Course Totals for General Education Outcome 1: SP13 and Su 13 (Non-Pilot)
ENG 102 Research Papers

Semester	Total Students	Organization			Coherence			Development			Standard English Skills			Source Citation		
		A	B-C	D-F	A	B-C	D-F	A	B-C	D-F	A	B-C	D-F	A	B-C	D-F
SP13	254	101	130	23	98	128	28	89	125	39	88	140	26	78	144	31
SU13 (Non-Pilot)	50	17	33	0	18	31	1	17	31	2	12	36	2	12	34	4
Total	304	118	163	23	116	159	29	106	156	41	100	176	28	90	178	35
% out of students		39%	54%	8%	38%	52%	10%	35%	51%	13%	33%	58%	9%	30%	59%	12%

In SP13, a committee comprised of full-time faculty members met to revise Course Outcomes across the English Department to establish a more sophisticated and usable tool to gather course data. At that time, we used the rubric to collect and measure both Course Outcomes and General Education Outcomes. Under the new rubric, Course Outcomes were revised to align directly to a rewritten rubric designed to capture data fulfilling the requirements for both the Course data and the General Education data. The tool for measurement is the Research Paper, and assignment that is required of all English 102 courses.

We designed the revised rubric to directly correlate with our Course Outcomes: Processes, Conventions, Rhetorical Knowledge, and Research.

Course Outcomes Data: FA13-SP14 Semester and Su 13 (Pilot)

Semester	Total	Processes					Conventions					Rhetorical Knowledge					Research				
		A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F
SU13	93	48	17	11	2	3	32	19	16	1	3	43	29	15	3	3	40	36	11	3	5
FA13	141	74	26	25	7	9	23	58	33	17	10	42	44	33	12	10	35	47	30	12	15
SP 14	215	81	70	47	10	7	66	76	47	20	6	68	77	48	16	7	73	66	41	21	14
Total	449	203	113	83	19	19	121	153	96	38	19	153	150	96	31	20	148	149	82	36	34
Percentage		45	25	18	4	4	27	34	21	8	4	34	33	21	7	4	33	33	18	8	8

The data produced for the SU13-SP14 academic year indicates that upwards of 80% of students are meeting requirements in all categories by scoring a C or above:

Processes: 88% of students scored a grade of C or higher on this section.
Conventions: 82% of students scored a grade of C or higher on this section.
Rhetorical Knowledge: 88% of students scored a C or higher on this section.
Research: 84% of students scored a grade of C or higher on this section.

Although students seem to be meeting or exceeding expectations in these categories, students seem to lag somewhat in the areas of Conventions and Research. This could be because the faculty tends to grade these sections more rigorously than the other two. To help determine this, the Department plans on collecting a sample of research papers from all classes in FA15 to look for trends within the rubric, and then meet and discuss results.

Additionally, the Processes section of the Rubric leans toward A grades. We met with all faculty and discussed this trend in FA14, and the consensus was that students who submitted a Research Essay were performing well in terms of turning in drafts and attempting to understand feedback, and this earned them high marks in the category.

The scores in general from students submitting Research Papers are high in the 102 classes, with grades in all categories leaning towards A's and B's. One explanation for this situation is that students work on this project for several weeks, often receiving feedback from both peers and faculty on the progress of their papers. This would be a common outcome for students who are this invested in a project of this kind. Also, we have eliminated from this tally students who do not submit papers, thus skewing failing grades in this category. It may be necessary in future data collection to have faculty indicate the number of submissions versus the total number of students taking the class.

Additionally, we looked at the difference between web and lecture based classes, and our data indicates that grading is consistent, if not more rigorous for online study. We will continue to monitor these trends.

General Education Outcome 2

For General Education Outcome 2, we require students to "evaluate a piece of writing from either literature, current events, non-fiction essays, or a college textbook for logical flaws, rhetorical purpose, organization, and evidence for claims."

We selected a piece called "The Case for Torture" (see below) and asked students to read this text and answer four accompanying questions about that text. The questions ask students to evaluate rhetorical purpose, organization, evidence, and logical flaws using a multiple choice format.

OUTCOME 2
Evaluate a piece of writing from either literature, current events, non-fiction essays, or a college textbook for logical flaws, rhetorical purpose, organization, and evidence for claims.

ASSESSMENT FOR OUTCOME 2

Students were given an article given to them by the English Department and then given a brief quiz with questions related to logical flaws, rhetorical purpose, organization, and evidence for claims.

In SP12, the data indicated that of the 240 English 102 students who completed the exercise, 74% passed the test. However, we did notice that only 63% of the students successfully answered Question 4. We noted this and then collected more data on the same reading for the FA12 data.

Course Total for General Education Outcome 2 – SP 12 Critical Reading Sample

SP 12 ENG 102 Outcomes for Gen Ed. 2		
	%Pass	%Fail
Question 1:	72	28
Question 2:	68	32
Question 3:	93	7
Question 4:	63	37
Total (out of 240 students)	**74**	**26**

In Fall 2012, we kept the same reading passage and questions, aware of the fact that Question 4 was proving difficult for the students. We found, similarly, that of the 170 students who completed General Education Outcome 2, 72% passed the quiz, but only 55% answered Question 4 correctly. We discussed this question in our English Department meeting and decided to revise the question so that it still dealt with logical fallacies, but asked about logical fallacies in a different way.

Course Total for General Education Outcome 2 – FA 12 Critical Reading Sample

FA 12 ENG 102 Outcomes for Gen Ed. 2		
	%Pass	%Fail
Question 1:	77	23
Question 2:	61	39
Question 3:	94	6
Question 4:	55	45
Total (170 students)	**72%**	**28%**

For the SP 13 semester, the Department decided to alter the wording of question 4 because we felt it was more important that we assess the student's understanding of logical fallacies rather than the student's memorization of specific logical fallacy names. The first 3 questions remained relatively the same, but now question 4 gave students even more difficulty, lowering the pass rate for question 4 to 35% and the pass rate for the overall test to 69%. Faculty will look at question 4 again to determine whether the question is flawed or whether students are not achieving an important General Education outcome.

Course Total for General Education Outcome 2 – SP 13 Critical Reading Sample

SP 13 ENG 102 Outcomes for Gen Ed. 2		
	%Pass	%Fail
Question1:	80	20
Question 2:	70	30
Question 3:	91	9
Question 4:	35	65
Total (188 students)	**69%**	**31%**

Outcomes again remained static between SU13-SP 14. The Department decided in the Summer of 2014 to implement a more rigorous academic tool to measure General Education Outcome 2 more effectively and to assess student learning upon entering and exiting the class, as it seems that scores are not impacted across courses or with cumulative education.

The faculty has met several times to Discuss General Education Outcome 2, and most agree that students can effectively complete the requirements of the Outcome within the class, but tend not to do well when it comes to evaluating the article.

Because of this, the Department would like to implement a more relevant and rigorous tool to collect and assess students' reading and comprehension in the General Education Classes.

Course Total for General Education Outcome 2 in ENG 102 classes: SU13-SP 14

Semester	Total	Question 1		Question 2		Question 3		Question 4	
--	--	Pass	Fail	Pass	Fail	Pass	Fail	Pass	Fail
SU13	44	34	10	35	9	41	3	22	22
FA 13	321	236	84	201	120	288	32	131	190
SP 14	188	128	60	112	69	170	18	67	121
Total	553	398	154	348	198	499	53	220	333
Percentage		72	28	63	36	90	10	40	60

Follow-up:

In Fall 2013, faculty collected an A, B, C, D, and F paper, as determined by our use of the rubric. We compared the way we use the new rubric, the resulting grades, and the feedback provided on student papers. The statewide "C" standards will be used as a benchmarking tool and were used to develop the research paper rubric.

We also encouraged adjunct feedback about the new outcomes and rubric. Several professors piloted the rubric in the summer courses as a preliminary measure of data, and the Department piloted the new rubric in FA14.

The Department held meetings in FA13 and in FA 14 to discuss student learning outcomes and academic rigor within the English Department. During these meetings, all full time and adjunct faculty met to discuss trends in SLOA data and to norm and discuss academic rigor and grading techniques. There was widespread agreement on conditions that merited an A,B,C, D, and F grade among all faculty members. To ensure that everyone is working to continue our standards of academic rigor and faculty training, the Department plans to meet each Fall to evaluate learning outcomes and to continue the progress that we have made in the past few years as the data continues to evolve. Additionally, a sample of research papers should be measured against the students' final grade for the course to help determine the efficacy of the tool.

New assessments will likewise be designed within the next year (FA 14-FA15) to determine student knowledge with respect to grammar, literary analysis, and source documentation for General Education Outcome 2. It appears that the tool used for General Education Outcome 2 is static between courses and semesters, so faculty will work to develop an entirely new assessment rather than trying to work with the former tool.

Additionally, faculty will develop and implement specific guidelines for the 102 Research paper and make sure that those guidelines are communicated to all full-time and adjunct faculty.

Budget Justification:

Professional development funds for full time faculty and stipends for adjunct faculty will be needed. These will go toward conferences, webinars, and training/norming sessions for full time and adjunct faculty.

Files referenced and attached:

- 102 Rubric
- English Course Outcomes and General Education Databases
- General Education Outcomes Data Collection Tools
- Reading for General Education Outcome 2: *The Case for Torture* and accompanying questions