Literature/English Education Program

Learning Outcome: PLO 1
Literature/ English Education Outcome #1: Students who complete the program will be able to integrate their literature studies with ongoing reflection and hospitable engagement with a diverse world.

Outcome Measure:
A reflective essay to be completed by graduating seniors sometime during their final year of study and submitted to Live Text in the Senior Portfolio.

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):
An average score of 87.5% on the AAC&U Integrative Learning Rubric and a score of 81.25% on the AAC&U Lifelong Learning Rubric.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS (AVERAGES OF ALL ASSESSOR SCORES)							
Key Assignment	***Local Linguistics Rubric***	***IL***	***WC***	***CT***	***OC***	***Integrative Learning (INTGL)***	***Lifelong Learning (LFL)***
Linguistics Essay	80%	--	--	--	--	--	
Major Researched Essay	--	85%	85%	85%	--	--	
Oral Presentation					80%		
Reflective Essay	--	--	--	--		87.50% (selected criteria)	81.25% (selected criteria)

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

Percentage of Class Meeting Targets for PLO #1										
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
AAC&U Integrative Learning	80%	67%	100%	100%						
AAC&U Lifelong Learning	100%	100%	100%	100%						
# of Students	5	6	6	9						

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
The small data sample of students makes drawing broad conclusions about the effectiveness of the program difficult to determine. We will need many years of data before reasonable conclusions can be drawn.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
No changes were made based on the data.

Rubric Used

- AAC&U Integrative Learning (*only Criteria #1-Connections to Experience, 2-Connections to Discipline, 3-Transfer, 5-Reflection and Self-Assessment*)
- AAC&U Foundation Skills for Lifelong Learning (*only Criteria #4-Transfer; #5-Reflection*)

Literature/English Education Program

Learning Outcome: PLO 2
Literature/English Education Program Outcome #2: Students who complete the program will be able to identify and articulate characteristics and trends of diverse literatures and historical periods: dates, styles, authors, and canon formation.

Outcome Measure:
The ETS Field Test in Literature.

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):
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 the subcategories as designated by the ETS Test:

- LIT. PRE 1900
- LIT. 1901 LATER
- LIT. ANALYSIS
- LIT. HIST/ID.

These subcategories correspond to our PLOs 2 and 3 (literary-historical periods, dates, styles, authors; major literary-theoretical perspective and terminology; and literary terms).

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

Subcategory	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	National Mean 2005-2010	Literature Program Targets
British Literature pre-1660	65.6	61	57	65	60	66	66	47	70	53	59	49	50.8	56
British Literature 1660-1900	64.6	56	56	63	60	68	52	43	56	42	49	42	46.2	51
American Literature to 1900	74.1	69	71	70	66	74	61	47	63	62	56	54	59.9	65
British and American Literature 1901-1945	65.0	63	53	64	57	66	58	52	71	60	57	58	52.1	57
Literature in English since 1945	77.8	75	74	74	62	75	75	55	70	62	66	71	61.7	67
Literary History	60.5	59	54	55	53	63	63	57	66	63	60	48	45.6	51
Identification	60.8	61	51	60	55	63	54	47	56	54	45	46	47.1	52
Literary Theory	67.9	56	61	62	64	62	58	42	64	44	49	56	48.4	53

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
The **program's target goal** is for our mean percent to be **5% above the national mean in each subcategory**. Scores not meeting our performance target are indicated in red. Over the eight-year time span since we began using the ETS Field Test in Literature, we have **met our target at a 70.83% success rate overall**.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
The sample size remains small, so no changes have been made based primarily on this data.

Rubric Used
No rubric is required.

Literature/English Education Program

Learning Outcome: PLO 3
Literature/English Education Program Outcome #3: Students who complete the program will be able to develop and support close readings of texts using literary theory and terminology.

Outcome Measure:
Senior Portfolio Major Researched Essay written in the capstone course LIT 495 Literary Theory and Scholarship.

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):
An average score as indicated in the table below on the designated AAC&U Rubrics.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS (AVERAGES OF ALL ASSESSOR SCORES)							
Key Assignment	***Local Linguistics Rubric***	***IL***	***WC***	***CT***	***OC***	***Integrative Learning (INTGL)***	***Lifelong Learning (LFL)***
Linguistics Essay	80%	--	--	--	--	--	
Major Researched Essay	--	85%	85%	85%	--	--	
Oral Presentation					80%		
Reflective Essay	--	--	--	--		87.50% (selected criteria)	81.25% (selected criteria)

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

Including Upper Division Research Paper: 2012-2016

Percentage Meeting Targets							
Key Assignment	**Upper Division Research Paper**	**Upper Division Research Paper**	**Capstone Research Paper**	**Capstone Research Paper**	**Capstone Oral Presentation**	**Capstone Reflective Essay**	**Capstone Reflective Essay**
AAC&U Rubric	**(IL)**	**(WC)**	**(WC)**	**(CT)**	**(OC)**	**(INTGL)**	**(LFL)**
TARGETS	**80.00**	**80.00**	**85.00**	**85.00**	**80.00**	**87.50**	**81.25**
2012-13	83%	100%	50%	33%	NA	NA	NA
2013-14	100%	100%	80%	100%	NA	80%	100%
2014-15	67%	67%	67%	33%	83%	67%	100%
2015-16	100%	100%	100%	100%	Not Scored	100%	100%

No Longer Including Upper Division Research Paper: 2017-

Percentage Meeting Targets							
Key Assignment	**Capstone Research Paper**	**Capstone Research Paper**	**Capstone Research Paper**	**Capstone Oral Presentation**	**Capstone Reflective Essay**	**Capstone Reflective Essay**	
AAC&U Rubric	**IL**	**WC**	**CT**	**OC**	**INTGL**	**LFL**	
TARGETS	**85.00**	**85.00**	**85.00**	**80.00**	**87.50**	**81.25**	
2016-17	78%	78%	78%	100%	100%	100%	
2017-18							
2018-19							
2019-20							
2020-21							
2021-22							

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The performance numbers are highly variable from year to year, especially because we test so few students at a time. We will need to gather many more years of longitudinal data before reasonable conclusions may be suggested.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

No changes are planned based on the data.

Rubric Used

AAC&U Rubrics: Information Literacy, Written Communication, Critical Thinking.

Literature/English Education Program

Learning Outcome: PLO 4
Literature/English Education Program Outcome #4: Students who complete the program will be able to articulate the difference between a traditional pedagogical and a modern linguistics notion of language.

Outcome Measure:
Key assignment given in LIN365.

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):
Our performance target for each student on the key assignment was a score of 80% or higher.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS (AVERAGES OF ALL ASSESSOR SCORES)							
Key Assignment	***Local Linguistics Rubric***	***IL***	***WC***	***CT***	***Integrative Learning (INTGL)***	***Lifelong Learning (LFL)***	***OC***
Linguistics Essay	80%	--	--	--	--	--	
Upper Division Paper	--	80%	80%	--	--	--	
Major Researched Essay	--	--	85%	85%	--	--	
Reflective Essay	--	--	--	--	87.50% (selected criteria)	81.25% (selected criteria)	
Oral Presentation							80%

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage at or above Benchmark			
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
LIN312	33%	67%	33%	NA
LIN365	67%	50%	70%	80%
LIN312 and LIN365 Combined	44%	57%	56%	NA

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
Given the results from students who are successfully completing the course yet failing to meet the performance target on the assignment, the target may be too high or assignment may not be the appropriate measure.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
We will examine and re-evaluate the key assignment and performance targets beginning in 2016-17.

Local Rubric Used (2013-2016)

Rubric – Signature Assignment – LINGUISTICS				
	Poor Proficiency	**Limited Proficiency**	**Proficient**	**Highly Proficient**
Purpose, Voice and Controlling Idea (20%)	Thesis includes incorrect fact or assumption (11)	Thesis purposeful but unsophisticated (14)	Thesis competent but adds no perspective (17)	Thesis highly competent and approaches concept in original way (20)
Development of Thesis (50%)	Essay reflects misunderstanding of key elements (28)	Essay includes only some key element(s) of two mindsets (35)	Essay provides sufficient support for thesis (42)	Essay include generous, enlightened support for thesis position (50)
Sentences Structured to Reveal Complex Ideas (10%)	Order of ideas sometimes illogical and/or junctures only partially bridged (4)	Ideas sometimes isolated in sentences that stand alone (6)	Ideas usually logically ordered and connected (8)	Ideas ordered and connected for fluid interpretation (10)
Appropriate Use of Linguistics Vocabulary (12%)	Either no use or misleading use of linguistic terms (3)	Key linguistic term(s) missing or misconceived (6)	Limited but accurate use of linguistic terminology (9)	Full, accurate use of linguistic vocabulary to assist with exposition (12)
Observance of Editing Conventions (8%)	Copyediting issues mislead readers and/or obscure the thrust of essay (4.5)	Copy errors sometimes require readers to re-read for meaning (5)	Copy errors are few and do not obscure meaning (6.5)	Copyediting thorough and supports the rhetorical impact of the essay; any errors are superficial (8)
Summary Comment:				**Total Points:**

Literature/English Education Program

Learning Outcome: PLO 5
Literature/English Education Program Outcome #5: Students who complete the program will be able to employ strong research, rhetorical, literary, and analytical skills in their writing.

Outcome Measure:
Senior Portfolio Major Researched Essay written in the capstone course LIT 495 Literary Theory and Scholarship.

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):
An average score as indicated in the table below on the designated AAC&U Rubrics.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS (AVERAGES OF ALL ASSESSOR SCORES)							
Key Assignment	***Local Linguistics Rubric***	***IL***	***WC***	***CT***	***Integrative Learning (INTGL)***	***Lifelong Learning (LFL)***	***OC***
Linguistics Essay	80%	--	--	--	--	--	
Major Researched Essay	--	85%	85%	85%	--	--	
Reflective Essay	--	--	--	--	87.50% (selected criteria)	81.25% (selected criteria)	
Oral Presentation							80%

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

From the Upper Division Research Paper: 2012-16

Percentage Meeting Targets							
Key Assignment	**Upper Division Research Paper**	**Upper Division Research Paper**	**Capstone Research Paper**	**Capstone Research Paper**	**Capstone Oral Presentation**	**Capstone Reflective Essay**	**Capstone Reflective Essay**
AAC&U Rubric	**(IL)**	**(WC)**	**(WC)**	**(CT)**	**(OC)**	**(INTL)**	**(LL)**
TARGETS	**80.00**	**80.00**	**85.00**	**85.00**	**80.00**	**87.50**	**81.25**
2012-13	83%	100%	50%	33%	NA	NA	NA
2013-14	100%	100%	80%	100%	NA	80%	100%
2014-15	67%	67%	67%	33%	83%	67%	100%
2015-16	100%	100%	100%	100%	Not Scored	100%	100%

From the Capstone Research Paper: 2017-

Percentage Meeting Targets							
Key Assignment	**Capstone Research Paper**	**Capstone Research Paper**	**Capstone Research Paper**	**Capstone Oral Presentation**	**Capstone Reflective Essay**	**Capstone Reflective Essay**	
AAC&U Rubric	**IL**	**WC**	**CT**	**OC**	**INTGL**	**LFL**	
TARGETS	**85.00**	**85.00**	**85.00**	**80.00**	**87.50**	**81.25**	
2016-17	78%	78%	78%	100%	100%	100%	
2017-18							
2018-19							
2019-20							
2020-21							
2021-22							

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Information Literacy (IL) may be adequately assessed in the capstone research essay rather than in an upper division paper, so we made this change beginning in 2016-17. Written Communication assessment was already included in capstone research essay assessment. The performance numbers are highly variable from year to year, especially because we test so few students at a time.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

No changes are planned based on the data.

Rubric Used

AAC&U Rubrics: Information Literacy, Written Communication, Critical Thinking.

Literature/English Education Program

Learning Outcome: PLO 6
Literature/English Education Program Outcome #6: Students who complete the program will be able to present literary analysis to formal audiences, demonstrating strategies for audience engagement and oral communication of written work.

Outcome Measure:
A formal oral presentation of literary scholarship completed as part of the Senior Portfolio.

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):
An average score as indicated in the table below on the designated AAC&U Rubrics.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS (AVERAGES OF ALL ASSESSOR SCORES)							
Key Assignment	***Local Linguistics Rubric***	***IL***	***WC***	***CT***	***Integrative Learning (INTL)***	***Lifelong Learning (LL)***	***OC***
Linguistics Essay	80%	--	--	--	--	--	
Upper Division Paper	--	80%	80%	--	--	--	
Major Researched Essay	--	--	85%	85%	--	--	
Reflective Essay	--	--	--	--	87.50% (selected criteria)	81.25% (selected criteria)	
Oral Presentation							80%

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

From the Upper Division Research Paper: 2012-16

Percentage Meeting Targets							
Key Assignment	**Upper Division Research Paper**	**Upper Division Research Paper**	**Capstone Research Paper**	**Capstone Research Paper**	**Capstone Oral Presentation**	**Capstone Reflective Essay**	**Capstone Reflective Essay**
AAC&U Rubric	**(IL)**	**(WC)**	**(WC)**	**(CT)**	**(OC)**	**(INTL)**	**(LL)**
TARGETS	**80.00**	**80.00**	**85.00**	**85.00**	**80.00**	**87.50**	**81.25**
2012-13	83%	100%	50%	33%	NA	NA	NA
2013-14	100%	100%	80%	100%	NA	80%	100%
2014-15	67%	67%	67%	33%	83%	67%	100%
2015-16	100%	100%	100%	100%	Not Scored	100%	100%

From the Capstone Research Paper: 2017-

Percentage Meeting Targets						
Key Assignment	**Capstone Research Paper**	**Capstone Research Paper**	**Capstone Research Paper**	**Capstone Oral Presentation**	**Capstone Reflective Essay**	**Capstone Reflective Essay**
AAC&U Rubric	**IL**	**WC**	**CT**	**OC**	**INTGL**	**LFL**
TARGETS	**85.00**	**85.00**	**85.00**	**80.00**	**87.50**	**81.25**
2016-17	78%	78%	78%	100%	100%	100%
2017-18						
2018-19						
2019-20						
2020-21						
2021-22						

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

No conclusions can be drawn at this time.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

The oral presentation assignment for the LIT495 Major Researched Paper was formalized as an annual mini-conference: Literary Scholarship on Point. No further changes will be made at this time.

Rubric Used

AAC&U Rubric: Oral Communication rubric.