Annual Assessment Report

Literature: English-Education/Literature
Department/School: Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages
Assessment period: 2011-2012

Assessment Plan Description:

1. **Expanded Statement of Purpose or Program Mission Statement:** *This section includes the program mission statement or expanded statement of purpose.*

Embodying the core values of a Christian liberal arts education in the Wesleyan theological tradition, and focusing on the power of language and story to shape us and our world, the LJML department and programs will provide students with knowledge, skills, and experiences to equip them to understand, interpret, analyze, evaluate, and create texts as linguistic and/or artistic expressions of diverse human experiences. We value reading, writing, researching, speaking, and discussing as profound means of participating in the redemptive work of God in all of creation.

2. **Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs):** *In this section list all the learning outcomes for the program. Keep in mind that these are the PLOs that will be submitted for catalog copy. (Where possible, show alignment to PLNU Institutional Learning Outcomes [ILOS]).*

PROGRAM: LITERATURE: Concentrations in LIT and in ENG-ED
Students who complete the program will be able to:

1. Demonstrate a continuing practice of reading that makes connections between the literature/language studied and our contemporary world. **(DLO 3, 5)**
2. Identify and articulate the relationships among literary-historical periods, dates, styles, and authors. **(DLO 1, 2)**
3. Demonstrate knowledge of major literary-theoretical perspectives and terminology. **(DLO 1, 2)**
4. Articulate the difference between a traditional linguistics and a modern linguistics notion of language. **(DLO 4)**
5. Employ strong rhetorical, literary, and analytical skills in their writing. **(DLO 1)**
6. Identify and evaluate effective use of higher and lower order thinking and writing skills. **(DLO 1, 4)**

ILO—DLO—PLO Lit Alignment of Student Learning Outcomes (Also located in the STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES portion of our Assessment Wheel.)

Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)

Learning: Informed by our faith in Christ
Members of the PLNU community will:
1a   display openness to and mastery of foundational knowledge & perspectives
1b   think critically, analytically, and creatively
1c   communicate effectively

Growing: In a Christ-Centered Faith Community
Members of the PLNU community will:
2a   demonstrate God-inspired development and understanding of self and others
2b   live gracefully within complex professional, environmental and social contexts

Serving: In a Context of Christian Faith
Members of the PLNU community will:
3a   engage in actions that reflect Christian discipleship in a context of communal service and collective responsibility
3b   serve both locally and globally in a vocational and social setting

LJML Department Learning Outcomes (DLOs)

Students coming through the Department of Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages will

1. Demonstrate the skills necessary for effective research, writing, and oral communication in various genres and media. **(ILO 1abc)**
2. Display interpretive, analytical and critical skills developed through the close study and analysis of texts. **(ILO 1abc)**
3. Demonstrate knowledge of diverse cultures and literary texts. **(ILO 1abc, ILO 2ab)**
4. Demonstrate knowledge of the nature, structure, and history of language. **(ILO 1abc, ILO 2ab)**
5. Develop redemptive social and spiritual engagement through studies of language, text, cultures, and media. **(ILO 2ab, ILO 3ab)**

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for LIT-LIT & LIT-EE

Students who, more specifically, complete the Program in Literature will be able to

1. Demonstrate a continuing practice of reading that makes connections between the literature/language studied and our contemporary world. **(DLO 3, 5)**
2. Identify and articulate the relationships among literary-historical periods, dates, styles, and authors. **(DLO 1, 2)**
3. Demonstrate knowledge of major literary-theoretical perspectives and terminology. **(DLO 1, 2)**
4. Articulate the difference between a traditional linguistics and a modern linguistics notion of language. **(DLO 4)**
5. Employ strong rhetorical, literary, and analytical skills in their writing. **(DLO 1)**
6. Identify and evaluate effective use of higher and lower order thinking and writing skills. **(DLO 1, 4)**

3. **Curriculum Map:** *This section identifies where the learning outcomes align with the curriculum (where students encounter opportunities in the curriculum to gain knowledge and skills pertinent to the designated outcomes, I= Introduce, D=Developed, M=Mastered).*

Please see the ***Differentiated Curriculum Map*** for the Literature Program in the **CURRICULUM MAPS** portion of our Assessment Wheel.

4. **Multi-Year Assessment Plan:** *This section identifies the learning outcomes and the years in which they will be assessed. Please attach appropriate documents(s). If you have not yet created this Multi-Year Assessment Plan, please let the Office of Institutional Effectiveness know – we can schedule a session for you at the beginning of the Fall, 2011 semester. This is not a long process and will be completed very quickly.*

We are in Year One of our three-year assessment cycle. During Year One we assessed **PLOs 2, 3, 5**.
   2. Identify and articulate the relationships among literary-historical periods, dates, styles, and authors.
   3. Demonstrate knowledge of major literary-theoretical perspectives and terminology.
   5. Employ strong rhetorical, literary, and analytical skills in their writing.

Please see the ***Multi-Year Assessment Plan*** for the Literature Program in the **ASSESSMENT PLAN** portion of our Assessment Wheel.

Assessment Activities: *This section will be completed annually for each PLO measured during this Academic Year (as described in your Multi-Year Assessment Plan).*

5. **Methods of Assessment and Criteria for Success:** *This section describes how student learning was assessed for each PLO during this Academic Year (AY) according to your Multi-Year Assessment Plan.*
   How do you know students are learning and to what degree you have been successful? What measures were used, direct and/or indirect? Also attach copies of any rubrics that were used.
   When was the assessment conducted and by whom?
   What were the criteria for success, the performance targets selected for each learning outcome assessed this Academic Year?

We assessed these three PLOs in two courses LIT 250: *Introduction to the Study of Literature* and LIT 495: *Literary Theory and Scholarship*. LIT 250 is the introductory course to the Literature Major in both concentrations (Literature—LIT, English Education—EE). LIT 495 is the capstone course for the Literature Major in both concentrations (Literature—LIT, English Education—EE).

LIT 250: In LIT 250 we used two means of direct assessment: analytical literary essays and the final examination. These two means of direct assessment were administered and evaluated by Dr Bettina Tate Pedersen (August-December 2011) and Dr. James Wicks (January-May 2012),

professors of LIT 250. In LIT 250 students wrote and/or presented analytical literary essays on fiction, poetry, drama, and non-fiction, and they completed a comprehensive final examination.

We evaluated the literary analyses using a rubric posted on LIVETEXT. You may see that rubric and the evaluated literary analyses on LIVETEXT for LIT 250 sec. 1 Fall 2011 and LIT 250 sec. 1 Spring 2012. A copy of that *LIT 250 Literary Analysis Rubric* is also posted in the EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING portion of our Assessment Wheel.

Our performance targets for writing literary analysis were 3% individual improvement for each student from her/his first literary analysis essay to his/her final one, and an 8% group average improvement in writing literary analysis for each class as a whole. Please see the *Grid LIT 250 Literary Analysis 2011-12 Totals* in section #6 below and also posted in the EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING portion of our Assessment Wheel.

Our goals for the final examination were for every student to score 70% or higher on the final exam. We met this goal for 25/26 students. Please see the *Grid LIT 250 Final Exam 2011-12 Totals* in section #6 below and also posted in the EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING portion of our Assessment Wheel.

LIT 495: LIT 495 was taught by Dr. Carol Blessing. Two direct and one indirect means of assessment were used to assess **PLOs 2, 3,** and **5**. The direct means of assessment were the ETS Literature Field Test given on April 23, 2012, and Senior Portfolios collected at the end of spring semester. The indirect means of assessment was a department survey sent to graduating seniors via a link to a Qualtrics Survey.*

Our target performance on the ETS Literature Field Test is to have our students scoring at least 5 points above the national average in their knowledge of literary-historical periods, dates, styles, authors, literary terms, and literary theory. Please see attached results from the *ETS Literature Field Test Results & Narrative.***

We also collected Senior Portfolios of writing from each student based on the Senior Literature Portfolio guidelines given to each LIT 495 student. As of yet we have not established a rubric for evaluating these portfolios, nor have we established performance targets for these portfolios. This will be part of our ongoing assessment work for 2012-13. Once we have established a rubric and performance targets, we will evaluate the senior portfolios for 2011-12, assess how well or poorly we met the performance targets, and add that data to this annual report.

Please see the *Literature Survey 2012 (blank)* posted in the EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING portion of our Assessment Wheel.

**The data from the *ETS Literature Field Test Results & Narrative* will not be available until Fall 2012. When we receive that data, we will update this annual report, post those results, and compile our data narrative document in the EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING portion of our Assessment Wheel.

6. **Summary of Data collected:**   *This section should discuss the results of the assessment process for the designated SLO.*
   - *What information/data was collected?*
   - *How was it data analyzed?*

LIT 250 ASSESSMENT: Each literary analysis essay in LIT 250 was graded using the rubric uploaded in LIVETEXT (Pedersen: https://c1.livetext.com/doc/7341714 and Wicks: https://c1.livetext.com/misk5/c1/course_assignments/459551/542990) and scores for those essays were determined by Dr. Pedersen and Dr. Wicks using the rubric. Pedersen and Wicks then compiled scores in *Grid LIT 250 Literary Analysis 2011-12 Totals* (Table 1 below) and *Grid LIT 250 Final Exam 2011-12 Totals* (Table 2 below). A grid formula was used to calculate the difference in performance between the first and final scores. Average improvement was determined by comparing the first and final literary analysis scores of each student. Scores recorded for those literary analyses in 2011-12 show
   - a 9.1% average group improvement in students' ability to write literary analysis. We exceeded our group improvement in writing literary analysis goal by 1.1%.
   - 22 out of 26 LIT 250 students met the individual goal of a 3% improvement in their ability to write literary analysis. Four students did not meet this goal.

TABLE 1 *Grid LIT 250 Literary Analysis 2011-12 Totals*

LIT 250: Introduction to the Study of Literature 2011-12			
Student	**First Literary Analysis**	**Final Literary Analysis**	**Difference**
1	71%	75%	4%
2	64%	90%	26%
3	64%	70%	6%
4	61%	70%	9%
5	89%	96%	7%
6	93%	96%	4%
7	79%	96%	17%
8	82%	93%	10%
9	89%	96%	7%
10	64%	79%	14%
11	64%	75%	11%
12	89%	93%	4%
13	71%	75%	4%
14	79%	93%	14%
15	68%	71%	4%
16	79%	96%	18%
17	75%	90%	15%
18	79%	96%	18%
19	96%	89%	-7%
20	75%	98%	23%
21	89%	90%	1%
22	89%	88%	-2%
23	64%	85%	21%
24	75%	89%	14%
25	89%	89%	0%
26	86%	82%	-4%
Average	**77.9%**	**87.0%**	**9.1%**

TABLE 2 *Grid LIT 250 Final Exam 2011-12 Totals*

LIT 250: Introduction to the Study of Literature Final Exam 2011-12	
Students	**Final Exam**
1	77%
2	68%
3	80%
4	72%
5	80%
6	96%
7	82%
8	84%
9	81%
10	70%
11	79%
12	88%
13	86%
14	79%
15	73%
16	95%
17	85%
18	90%
19	87%
20	98%
21	75%
22	88%
23	88%
24	87%
25	91%
26	82%
Average	**83.1%**

LIT 495 ASSESSMENT: For the LIT 495 Assessment we us three means of assessment:
  a. *ETS Literature Field Test*
  b. *Senior Portfolios*
  c. *Literature Survey*

The *ETS Literature Field Test* results will be determined and calculated within ETS and then sent to our department. Our students' exam results will be reported, evaluated, and a narrative written once we have received the results from ETS in Fall 2012. (Again please see *ETS Literature Field Test Results & Narrative* when it is posted in the EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING portion of our Assessment Wheel.)

For the *Senior Portfolios* students choose three pieces of recent, critical writing done at PLNU to submit in their portfolios. Two of the three must involve literary analysis:

  1) literary analysis (required)
  2) literary analysis (required)
  3) linguistics paper (optional) or 3rd piece of literary analysis

Portfolio selections must be

  • typed clean copies
  • free of grades and/or comments
  • identified with the student's individual ID # and not her/his name

---

GUIDELINES FOR THE PREPARATION OF A SENIOR LITERATURE PORTFOLIO

The Department of Literature, Journalism and Modern Languages at Point Loma Nazarene University currently requires majors in literature (both those concentrating in English Education [LIT-EE] and those concentrating in Literature [LIT-LIT]) to compile a portfolio of work during the spring semester of their senior year. This portfolio will not, in any way, affect the student's graduation or the student's grade in any course; instead, it is meant to help the department assess the effectiveness of its programs. Please read carefully the instructions below for creating a portfolio and submitting it to the department.

Creating Your Portfolio: The senior portfolio should include three pieces of critical writing. At least two of these pieces should involve literary analysis. The portfolio may include one linguistics paper, but this is not required. Papers should probably be fairly recent and represent work done at PLNU.
Papers should be in a typed, clean copy. You should not submit papers with grades and comments still attached from another course. All papers should be freshly typed or printed off and it is assumed that you will do a thorough job of proofing your work for grammar and spelling errors. Works submitted should **not** be signed with the individual student's name. Rather you should sign using only your ID number.

Submitting Your Portfolio: Portfolios should be handed in to your LIT 495 professor or e-mailed to Edie Chapman by (*insert date*).

We have not yet determined a rubric for assessing or set any target performance goals or criteria for those portfolios. We will most likely use the AAC&U rubrics for Written Communication and Critical Thinking. This is assessment work we will begin in Fall 2012 and conclude by December 2012.

The *Literature Survey* was sent to graduating seniors in May, so we are unable to assess data from the survey at the present time. Once the surveys are completed, we will be able to compile and analyze that data. Afterwards, the data will be added to this report.

Please see the ***AAC&U Rubrics for Written Communication and Critical Thinking*** posted in the EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING portion of our Assessment Wheel.

7. **Use of Results:** How did you use what you learned from assessment of your PLO? *If everything went as planned – have a party! If it didn't go as planned, then **Close the Loop**. This section should include the following information:*
   - *Describe any improvements your program has made in the past 12 months as a results of your assessment efforts;*
   - *Describe how the results of the assessments were disseminated and to whom*
   - *What is the program's process for reviewing the results? What is your process for discussing the implications of the results?*
   - *Based on your findings, what do you plan to do now?*
   - *If applicable – discuss program modifications, changes and timeline for implementation of changes.*
   - *Also, if applicable – discuss any budgetary implication(s) resulting from the program modifications or changes.*

This is the area of assessment in which we have the most work to do. Since this is really the first year of assessment in our Multi-Year Assessment Plan, we have not yet identified or implemented any improvements to LIT 250 or LIT 495 specifically. We do know, however, that we want to add some questions to our Literature Survey to ascertain how many of our graduates are applying and getting into graduate school programs in order to better determine and track our graduates' placement record in graduate programs. We will also want to add survey questions to determine and track our graduates' placement in middle and high school teaching positions.

We want to collect and track this data to

   a. Assess the success of our graduates in securing placement/employment;
   b. Share with prospective students and their parents; and
   c. Encourage our current students about the quality of their literature major.

The results we gathered from LIT 250 and LIT 495 were primarily gathered and compiled by Bettina Pedersen, James Wicks, Carol Blessing, and Edie Chapman and will be shared with the Literature Section faculty during our August 2012 meeting.

Our process for reviewing these results will be to meet as a Literature section and begin work on the items listed below. Since we have now gathered and will be compiling more assessment data from

LIT 250 and LIT 495; and since we are beginning Year One of our department Program Review in Fall 2012, we will be doing concentrated work in the Literature Section in the following areas:

1) Discussing (1) the means of assessment used and (2) the assessment results gathered for LIT 250 and LIT 495 to see if these results show what we wanted for our outcomes and target performance goals;
2) Determining which rubrics we will use to evaluate the Senior Portfolios and who will do that assessment, and what the schedule for completion will be;
3) Discussing the assessment of the Senior Portfolios, once we've completed it, to see what the results show in terms of our outcomes and target performance goals;
4) Determining what adjustments, if any, we may want to propose to LIT 250 and/or LIT 495 or to our means of assessing those two courses within the context of our first year self-study of Program Review
5) Determining if we need to adjust our target performance goals for LIT 250 and/or LIT 495;
6) Determining what changes we want to make in our Literature Survey;
7) Determining the way in which we want to disseminate our assessment results for and any proposed changes to LIT 250 and LIT 495 to whom outside the Literature Section.

Other Use of Results work that we completed in 2011-12 was to create an interdisciplinary Cinema Studies minor in concert with faculty from the Department of Communication and Theatre. This minor was an outgrowth, in part, of our creation of two new literature courses in 2010-11 which we created to address the lack of courses specifically designated to teach visual interpretive literacy:

1. LIT 209 *Great Works in a Literary Genre: Film* (GE) (2 units)
2. LI 371 *World Cinema* (3 units)

Related Assessment Wheel Documents & Their Locations:

1. *Differentiated Curriculum Map* (in the **CURRICULUM MAPS** portion of our Assessment Wheel)
2. *Multi-Year Assessment Plan* (in the **ASSESSMENT PLAN** portion of our Assessment Wheel)
3. *LIT 250 Literary Analysis Rubric* (in the **EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING** portion of our Assessment Wheel also found in LIVETEXT (Pedersen: https://c1.livetext.com/doc/7341714 and Wicks: https://c1.livetext.com/misk5/c1/course_assignments/459551/542990))
4. *Literature Survey 2012 (blank)* (in the **EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING** portion of our Assessment Wheel)
5. *ETS Literature Field Test Results & Narrative (forthcoming from ETS Fall 2012)*
6. *Senior Literature Portfolio Guidelines* (in the **EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING** portion of our Assessment Wheel)
7. *AAC&U Rubrics for Written Communication and Critical Thinking* (in the **EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING** portion of our Assessment Wheel)