



The assessment work was successful albeit not straightforward. The faculty raised concerns during the norming session about outcome E2.4: Compare & Contrast Literary Theories (Compare and contrast literary theories as they complement, overlap with, or conflict with each other and with the perspectives of other disciplines). They felt that the all-encompassing nature of E2.4 made it difficult to capture in a single assignment. The faculty felt that such an assignment, if it is to be created, will limit the quality of instruction and make for a mechanical construct that is not conducive to the study of literature. After an extensive discussion that was echoed in the March 30 meeting, the faculty agreed that discussion and/or application of more than one theoretical approach in different assignments is sufficient to satisfy said outcome. Furthermore, the faculty decided that there is value in a more holistic understanding of what constitutes a theoretical perspective, which is relevant to outcomes E2.2 and E2.4. The functional implementation of these new understandings will be communicated by the Chair of The Department of English to the rest of the faculty (regular and adjunct) using clarifying language along with exemplar assignments and other best practices. As for the collection of artifacts, all classes used a portfolio model that collected multiple assignments. Artifacts were easily accessible and presented in a manner conducive to assessment, with the exception of one course that included a large number of files, handwritten assignments, and video links that did not direct to the target student assignment. The evaluators found it difficult to assess the artifacts from that course and for that reason assigned NA rankings across the five learning outcomes. In the future, it is recommended that instructors submit sequenced component assignments, e.g. a series of discussions and other best