

## Annual Assessment Report

### Literature: English-Education/Literature

Department/School: Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages

Assessment period: 2012-2013

#### Assessment Plan Description:

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

#### No changes made to Mission Statement in 2012-13.

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.

Appendix 1: LJML Mission Statement ([LJML Mission 2012-2013 Mission Statement LJML.pdf](#))  
(Located in the **MISSION STATEMENT** portion of our Assessment Wheel.)

2. **Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs):** *This section lists 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]).*

**We made revisions to two of our PLOs. Those revised PLOs are highlighted in yellow below.** We made these revisions to bring the PLOs into closer alignment with what we are actually doing in our current instruction. We also believe these revisions make our PLOs more measurable.

Alignment of our Program Learning Outcomes to Department and Institutional Learning Outcomes are indicated in the documents loaded on our Assessment Wheel and noted as appendices below.

#### **PROGRAM: LITERATURE: Concentrations in LIT and in ENG-ED**

Students who complete the program will be able to:

1. Demonstrate reading practices that make connections between the literature studied and our contemporary world. **(DLO 3, 5)**
2. Identify and articulate characteristics of 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 pedagogical and a modern linguistics notion of language. **(DLO 4)**
5. Employ strong rhetorical, literary, and analytical skills in their writing. **(DLO 1, 2)**
6. Identify and evaluate effective use of higher and lower order thinking and writing skills. **(DLO 1, 4)**

With Bloom's Taxonomy included:

1. Demonstrate (Application) reading practices that make connections between the literature studied and our contemporary world. (DLO 3, 5)
2. Identify and articulate (Comprehension & Synthesis) characteristics of literary-historical periods: dates, styles, and authors. (DLO 1, 2)
3. Demonstrate (Application) knowledge of major literary-theoretical perspectives and terminology. (DLO 1, 2)
4. Articulate (Comprehension) the difference between a traditional pedagogical and a modern linguistics notion of language. (DLO 4)
5. Employ (Application) strong rhetorical, literary, and analytical skills in their writing. (DLO 1, 2)
6. Identify (Knowledge) and evaluate (Comprehension & Evaluation) effective use of higher and lower order thinking and writing skills. (DLO 1, 4)

Appendix 2: PLO—DLO—ILO LIT & LIT-EE Alignment ([04. LJML Outcomes 2012-2013 Literature \(LIT, EE\).pdf](#))  
May see also Appendix 3: Course Learning Outcomes ([06. LJML Outcomes 2012-2013 Course Learning Outcomes.pdf](#))  
(Located in the **STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES** portion of our Assessment Wheel.)

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).*

**We made no changes to our Differentiated Curriculum Maps for the Literature Program in 2012-13, except for the two revisions to the PLOs.**

Appendix 4: Differentiated Curriculum Map LJML LIT-LIT ([03. LJML Map 2011-2012 Curriculum Map Literature.pdf](#))  
Appendix 5: Differentiated Curriculum Map LJML LIT-EE ([04. LJML Map 2011-2012 Curriculum Map LIT-English Education.pdf](#))  
(Located 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 abandoned a multi-year approach to our Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) in Literature (LIT-LIT, LIT-EE). We did this because we actually assess all our PLOs 1-6 each year by the work required of students in completing their Senior Literature Portfolios. Thus, we decided it was in effective to break this assessment into a multiple-year cycle.

We also expanded our design for the Senior Literature Portfolio to included two new assignments which will directly assess PLOs 1 and 4. With this addition all PLOs will be directly assessed in the Senior Literature Portfolios from 2013-14 forward.

The components of the Senior Literature Portfolios include each of the following:  
**NEW**

- For PLO 1: We are designing a reflective essay to be completed by graduating seniors in their final year of study and to be included in Senior Literature Portfolios from 2013-14 forward. The reflective essays will be assessed using the AAC&U Reading rubric.
- For PLO 4: We also established a standard key assignment for our upper division linguistics courses so that students would complete the same key assignment regardless of which linguistic course they took. The rubric we chose for this assignment was a local rubric we designed to suit both the program learning outcomes and the course learning outcomes for our linguistics courses. This assignment was not included in the 2012-13 Senior Portfolios but will be required and included in Senior Literature Portfolios from 2013-14 forward.

#### REVISED

- For PLOs 5 & 6: We established a standard key assignment for our upper division literature courses so that students would complete their final papers in those classes based on a consistent and uniform assignment and rubric for assessment. Thus, any major paper written for any upper division literature class could be submitted as part of the Senior Literature Portfolio. This key assignment is included in the portfolio and is assessed annually. The rubrics we are using for this assignment (regardless of which upper division literature course the students took) are the AAC&U Information Literacy, and the AAC&U Written Communication rubrics. We also revised the key assignment for LIT 495—the major literary research and analysis paper—for clarity in the specific components we wanted to see in this major paper. This key assignment continues to be required in the Senior Literature Portfolio.

#### CONTINUING

- For PLOs 2 & 3: We are continuing to give the ETS Literature Field Test.

We made no changes to the key assignments for LIT 250 Introduction to the Study of Literature, nor their assessment. These are included in the Senior Literature Portfolio only as an introductory bench mark to show the development of each student's work from the beginning to the conclusion of their course of studies in the Literature Program.

Appendix 6: Assessment Plan Literature 3YR Cycle 2012-13 ([05. LJML Plan 2012-2013 3YR Cycle Literature \(LIT, EE\).pdf](#))

Appendix 7: Assessment Plan Literature 2012-13 ([06. LJML Plan 2012-2013 Assessment Plan Literature \(LIT, EE\).pdf](#))

(Located 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 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 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?*

### **LIT 250: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF LITERATURE**

We assessed these PLOs 2, 3, 5, 6 in two sections of LIT 250: *Introduction to the Study of Literature* LIT 250 is the introductory course to 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. James Wicks, professor of LIT 250: Fall section (August-December 2012), Spring section (January-May 2013). 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 testing their knowledge of literary-theoretical perspectives and terminology, and literary-historical periods: dates, styles, and authors.

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 2012 and LIT 250 sec. 1 Spring 2013. 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. For results please see the **Results Grid LIT 250 Literary Analysis 2012-13 Totals** in section #6 below and also posted in the **EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING** portion of our Assessment Wheel for student results.

Our performance target for each student on the final examination was a score of 70% or higher. For results please see the **Results Grid LIT 250 Final Exam 2012-13 Totals** in section #6 below and also posted in the **EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING** portion of our Assessment Wheel.

<p>Appendix 8: 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT (<a href="#">07. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT.pdf</a>) Appendix 9: 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT 250 Rubric (<a href="#">08. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT 250 Rubric for Lit. Analysis.pdf</a>) (Located in the <b>EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING</b> portion of our Assessment Wheel.)</p>
--

**LIT 495: LITERARY THEORY AND SCHOLARSHIP**

We assessed PLOs 2, 3, 5, and 6 in LIT 495: *Literary Theory and Scholarship*. LIT 495 is the capstone course for the Literature Major in both concentrations (Literature—LIT, English Education—EE).

**LIT 495:** LIT 495 (Literary Theory and Scholarship) was taught by Dr. Carol Blessing. This course is our capstone course for the Literature major. Two direct means of assessment were used to assess PLOs 2, 3, 5, and 6.

**DIRECT MEANS OF ASSESSMENT:** The direct means of assessment were the ETS Literature Field Test given on April 26, 2013. Senior Literature Portfolios submitted and assessed at the end of spring semester 2013.

**ETS Field Test:** 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).

**Senior Literature Portfolio:** All of our graduating literature majors submitted a Senior Literature Portfolio adhering to the Senior Literature Portfolio guidelines. The guidelines were distributed in LIT 495, our capstone course for the Literature major. As outlined in our Assessment Plan, we established uniform key assignments and rubrics for evaluating all of the components of the Senior Literature Portfolios. We also established the performance targets listed in the table below:

<b>Key Assignment</b>	<b><i>Information Literacy Rubric</i></b> <b>PERFORMANCE TARGET</b>	<b><i>Written Communication Rubric</i></b> <b>PERFORMANCE TARGET</b>	<b><i>Critical Thinking Rubric</i></b> <b>PERFORMANCE TARGET</b>
Upper Division Paper	80% (average)	80% (average)	N/A
LIT 495 Major Paper	N/A	85% (average)	85% (average)

Appendix 10: Senior Literature Portfolio Guidelines & Assignments ([09. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT Senior Portfolio.pdf](#)).

(Located in the **EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING** portion of our Assessment Wheel.)

**INDIRECT MEANS OF ASSESSMENT:** The indirect means of assessment was our Graduating Senior/Alumni Survey. We revised our indirect means of assessment which is a department survey sent to graduating seniors and alumni via a link to a Qualtrics Survey during the summer. The revisions brought our survey into greater alignment with our Program Learning Outcomes. The survey addresses these areas: Profile Information, Department Learning Outcomes, Program Learning Outcomes, Employability and Career, Lasting Life Impacts, and Overall Experience of the Literature major.

Appendix 11: Literature Survey 2012-13 (Blank) ([10. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT Exit Survey June 14.pdf](#))

(Located 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 the data analyzed?*

In all of our data we are working with a statistically small sample on a yearly basis. Once we have several years of data compiled and thus a larger data sample, we will be able to draw more statistically sound conclusions from our data. Because of the small sample, our results are easily skewed because of anomalous high or low scores as will be evident when looking at the one very low score in this year's data (See especially results for student #23 in the Literary Analysis grid below). Further, the data in this annual report includes all students taking LIT 250. Thus, both Literature and Writing majors are included in the results since we chose not to disaggregate our literature and writing students' results.

#### **LIT 250 ASSESSMENT RESULTS:**

**LITERARY ANALYSIS ALL SCORES:** Each literary analysis in LIT 250 was graded using the rubric loaded in LIVETEXT (Wicks: [https://c1.livertext.com/misk5/c1/course\\_assignments/459551/542990](https://c1.livertext.com/misk5/c1/course_assignments/459551/542990)) and scores for those essays were determined by Dr. Wicks using the rubric. Dr. Wicks then compiled scores in **Results Grid LIT 250 Literary Analysis 2012-13 Totals** (Tables 1 & 3 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 2012-13 show

- a **5.0%** average group improvement in students' ability to write literary analysis. **We fell short of our group improvement in writing literary analysis target by 3.0%.**
- 18 out of 24 LIT 250 students met the individual goal of a 3% improvement in their ability to write literary analysis. **Six students did not meet this goal.**
- 10 out of 24 LIT 250 students were Literature majors or minors. Of these ten, seven students met the individual goal of a 3% improvement in their ability to write literary analysis. **Three students did not meet this goal.**

**FINAL EXAM ALL SCORES:** Each student in LIT 250 completed a comprehensive final exam at the end of the semester (Fall 2012, Spring 2013). Dr. Wicks also administered the LIT 250 Final Exam in each semester. These scores are recorded in the **Results Grid LIT 250 Final Exam 2012-13 Totals** (Tables 2 & 3 below). We met our performance target of 70% or higher on the Final Exam for 21/24 students. **Three students did not meet this performance target.**

Appendix 12: Results Grid LIT 250 Literary Analysis Totals ([11. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT 250 Lit AnalysisTotal.pdf](#))

Appendix 13: Results Grid LIT 250 Final Exam Totals ([12. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT 250 Final Exam Total.pdf](#))

Appendix 14: Multi-year Results Grid LIT 250 Literary Analysis and Final Exam Averages ([13. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT 250 Analysis-Final Exam.pdf](#))

(Located in the **EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING** portion of our Assessment Wheel.)

**TABLE 1 Results Grid LIT 250 Literary Analysis 2012-13 Totals (Appendix 12)** (Also posted in the EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING portion of our Assessment Wheel)

<b>LIT 250: Literary Analysis 2012-13 Totals</b>					
<b>Student</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Major</b>	<b>First Literary Analysis</b>	<b>Final Literary Analysis</b>	<b>Difference</b>
1	F	WRI	85%	99%	14%
2	F	WRI	92%	96%	4%
3	M	LIT-EE	92%	96%	4%
4	F	LIB ST	82%	96%	14%
5	F	TCHR ED	92%	99%	7%
6	F	WRI	93%	92%	-1%
7	F	FRE	78%	92%	14%
8	M	PSY	93%	97%	4%
9	M	LIT-EE	82%	90%	8%
10	M	LIT	79%	91%	12%
11	F	SPA	82%	84%	2%
12	F	LIT	92%	96%	4%
13	F	SPA	89%	92%	3%
14	F	LIT	89%	89%	0%
15	F	SPA	93%	95%	2%
16	F	LIT	85%	84%	-1%
17	F	SPA	67%	70%	3%
18	F	LIT-EE	78%	90%	12%
19	F	LIT	90%	96%	6%
20	M	WRI	68%	88%	20%
21	F	WRI	68%	88%	20%
22	F	BUS ADM (Am Lit Minor)	85%	88%	3%
23	F	LIT-EE	89%	55%	-34%
24	F	LIB ST	90%	96%	6%
			84.0%	89.0%	5.0%

**TABLE 2 Results Grid LIT 250 Final Exam 2012-13 Totals (Appendix 13)** (Also posted in the EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING portion of our Assessment Wheel)

<b>LIT 250 Final Exam 2012-13 Totals</b>			
<b>Student</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Major</b>	<b>Final Exam</b>
1	F	WRI	85%
2	F	WRI	96%
3	M	LIT-EE	87%
4	F	LIB ST	94%
5	F	TCHR ED	89%
6	F	WRI	73%
7	F	FRE	65%
8	M	PSY	85%
9	M	LIT-EE	68%
10	M	LIT	83%
11	F	SPA	85%
12	F	LIT	96%
13	F	SPA	90%
14	F	LIT	75%
15	F	SPA	98%
16	F	LIT	82%
17	F	SPA	74%
18	F	LIT-EE	91%
19	F	LIT	96%
20	M	WRI	84%
21	F	WRI	87%
22	F	BUS ADM (Am Lit Minor)	71%
23	F	LIT-EE	67%
24	F	LIB ST	90%
			83.0%



**TABLE 3 Multi-year Results Grid LIT 250 Literary Analysis and Final Exam Averages (Appendix 14)** (Also posted in the **EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING** portion of our Assessment Wheel)

<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>First Literary Analysis</b>	<b>Final Literary Analysis</b>	<b>Difference between First &amp; Final Literary Analysis</b>	<b>Final Exam</b>
<b>2011-12</b>	<b>77.9%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>9.1%</b>	<b>83.1%</b>
<b>2012-13</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>83.0%</b>
<b>2013-14</b>				
<b>2014-15</b>				
<b>2015-16</b>				
<b>2016-17</b>				
<b>2017-18</b>				
<b>2018-19</b>				
<b>2019-20</b>				

**LIT 495 CAPSTONE ASSESSMENT RESULTS:** For the LIT 495 Capstone Assessment we used three means of assessment:

- A. *ETS Literature Field Test* (direct)
- B. *Senior Portfolios* (direct)
- C. *Literature Survey* (indirect)

**A. ETS LITERATURE FIELD TEST RESULTS:** Each student in LIT 495 completed the ETS Literature Field Test. Dr. Blessing proctored the test in April 2013. The *ETS Literature Field Test* results are determined and calculated within ETS and then sent to our department. Our students' exam results will be reported, evaluated, and included in our *ETS Literature Field Test Results & Narrative* once we have received the results from ETS in June 2013.

Appendix 15: ETS Literature Field Test Results & Narrative 2012-13 ([14. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT ETS Field Test Results.pdf](#))

Appendix 16: 2006-2013 ETS Comparative Report ([15. LJML Evidence 2006-2011 Assessment Report LIT ETS Comparative Results.pdf](#))

(Located in the **EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING** portion of our Assessment Wheel.)

**B. SENIOR PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENTS RESULTS:** For the *Senior Portfolios* students were given the *Senior Literature Portfolio Guidelines & Assignments* (Appendix 10) posted on LIVE TEXT to guide their compilation of their Senior Literature Portfolio. Portfolios were then assessed using the **AAC&U Rubrics for Information Literacy, Written Communication, and Critical Thinking**. Students results and targets are indicated in Tables 4 and 5 below (Appendix 17 & 18). See also the report for Literature in the [Degree Qualifications Profile](#).

**TABLE 4 Senior Literature Portfolio Results Grid 2012-13 Totals (Appendix 17)** (Also posted in the EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING portion of our Assessment Wheel)

UPPER DIVISION LITERATURE PAPER						
AAC&U RUBRIC	Student 1	Student 2	Student 3	Student 4	Student 5	Student 6
Information Literacy (Scores Average)	83%	81%	81%	95%	78%	89%
Written Communication (Scores Average)	85%	84%	84%	99%	82%	91%

LIT 495 MAJOR RESEARCH PAPER						
AAC&U RUBRIC	Student 1	Student 2	Student 3	Student 4	Student 5	Student 6
Written Communication (Scores Average)	79%	70%	88%	97%	67%	93%
Critical Thinking (Scores Average)	80%	69%	84%	95%	70%	89%

**TABLE 5 Senior Literature Portfolio Performance Target Grid 2012-13 (Appendix 18)** (Also posted in the EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING portion of our Assessment Wheel)

Senior Portfolio Piece	AAC&U Rubric	Performance Target	# of Students Meeting Target	# of Students Not Meeting Target
Upper Division Paper	Information Literacy	80%	5	1
Upper Division Paper	Written Communication	80%	6	0
LIT 495 Paper	Written Communication	85%	3	3
LIT 495 Paper	Critical Thinking	85%	2	4

We had mixed success in meeting our performance targets for the Senior Literature Portfolio. Student performance was stronger on the Upper Division paper in the portfolio, but the performance targets were 5% lower there. We met our performance target of 80% minimum on the AAC&U Rubric for Information Literacy for 5 of 6 students. We met our performance target of 80% minimum on the AAC&U Rubric for Written Communication for 6 of 6 students. On the LIT 495 Major Research Paper student performance fell below our performance targets by 50% or more. We met our performance target of 85% minimum on the AAC&U Rubric for Written Communication for only 3 of 6 students; **thus, three students did not meet this target.** We met our performance target of 85% minimum on the AAC&U Rubric for Critical Thinking for only 2 of 6 students; **thus, four students did not meet this target.**

Appendix 17: Senior Literature Portfolio 2012-13 Results Grid ([16. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT Senior Portfolio Results.pdf](#))

Appendix 18: Senior Literature Portfolio Performance Targets Grid 2012-13 ([17. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT Senior Portfolio Targets.pdf](#))

Appendix 19: AAC&U Rubric for Information Literacy ([AAC&U VALUE Information Li...pdf](#))

Appendix 20: AAC&U Rubric for Written Communication ([AAC&U VALUE Written Commun...pdf](#))

Appendix 21: AAC&U Rubric for Critical Thinking ([AAC&U VALUE Critical Think...pdf](#))

(Located in the **EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING** portion of our Assessment Wheel.)

See also the Report for Literature in the [Degree Qualifications Profile](#)

**C. The *Literature Survey*** was sent to graduating seniors in June 2013. Once the surveys are completed, we will be able to compile and analyze that data. Afterwards, a report of the data will be added to this report and posted on the Assessment Wheel.

Please see Appendix 22: Literature Survey 2012-13 Report ([21. LJML-Evidence 2012-2013 Assess Report LIT Exit Survey Results.pdf](#))

(Located 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.

As a result of our assessment work and evaluation from 2011-12, we made and implemented the following changes in our assessment work this academic year 2012-13:

1. Revised our Multi-year Assessment Plan and wrote a more comprehensive Assessment Plan following the guidelines in then Assessment Manual (pp. 31-38).
2. Revised Senior Literature Portfolio Guidelines & Assignments
3. Created Key Assignment for Upper Division Major Paper for Senior Portfolio
4. Established AAC&U rubrics to be used for assessing the two major research papers submitted in the Senior Literature Portfolios
5. Determined Performance Targets for Senior Literature Portfolio
6. Assessed all Senior Literature Portfolios
7. Created Key Assignment for Linguistics Response for Senior Portfolio
8. Set the performance targets for the key assignment: Linguistics Prompt.
9. Piloted the Linguistics Prompt in Dr. Phil Bowles' linguistics courses this year.
10. Decided that Reflective Essay should be added to the Senior Literature Portfolio
11. Revised Graduating Seniors/Alumni Survey to align with our DLOs and PLOs more directly

12. Created a draft tracking file for collecting data on the employment and graduate school acceptance rates of our graduates. Have begun collecting data.
13. Identified revisions to our web pages and presence that feature employability and student testimonials for Literature majors
14. Identified one curricular change to be proposed in an APC proposal in Fall 2013—to replace the three existing literature minors (American, British, and World) with one Literature minor.

---

We know that we want to take the following actions in 2013-14:

1. Review assessment results from LIT 250, Senior Literature Portfolio, and ETS Field Test in Literature to determine if our performance targets were met and were reasonable, if our means of assessment were adequate and effective, and if any curricular changes need to be made.
2. Review assessment results from LIT 250, the Senior Literature Portfolio, and ETS Field Test in Literature to determine if our performance targets were met, were reasonable, and if any curricular changes need to be made.
3. Review results from Graduating Seniors/Alumni Survey to determine if our literature program is achieving its Program Learning Outcomes.
4. Review results from Graduating Seniors/Alumni Survey to determine if our literature program is achieving our Department Learning Outcomes.
5. Incorporate the Linguistics Prompt assignment into the 2013-14 Senior Literature Portfolio.
6. Form Student Focus Group and create the Reflective Essay assignment for the Senior Literature Portfolio with input from a student focus group during 2013-14 academic year.
7. Add the Reflective Essay assignment to the 2013-14 Senior Literature Portfolio.
8. Confirm a routine calibration and assessment meeting to assess all Senior Literature Portfolios during or immediately following finals week 2014.
9. Review assessment results of Senior Literature Portfolios in a debriefing meeting after assessment is complete and before faculty depart for summer.
10. Complete revisions to our web pages to best feature employability and student testimonials for Literature majors.
11. Complete Excel document for tracking graduate school acceptance rates and career placement of our Literature graduates, and enter data we have.
12. Draft any APC Proposals for curricular changes to the Literature major or minor and submit these as part of our Program Review Self-Study Report.

The results we gathered from LIT 250 and LIT 495 were primarily gathered and compiled by James Wicks, Carol Blessing, and Bettina Pedersen and will be shared with the Literature Section faculty during our August 2013 meeting. Assessment data was generated by Carol Blessing, Phil Bowles, Karl Martin, Bettina Pedersen, and James Wicks. We will review all results and reports in our ongoing Literature Section and/or department meetings over the course of 2013-14.

## APPENDICES & LOCATIONS ON LJML ASSESSMENT WHEEL

### MISSION STATEMENT portion of LJML Assessment Wheel

1. Appendix 1: Mission Statement ([LJML Mission 2012-2013 Mission Statement LJML.pdf](#))

### STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES portion of LJML Assessment Wheel

2. Appendix 2: PLO—DLO—ILO LIT & LIT-EE Alignment ([04. LJML Outcomes 2012-2013 Literature \(LIT, EE\).pdf](#))
3. Appendix 3: Course Learning Outcomes ([06. LJML Outcomes 2012-2013 Course Learning Outcomes.pdf](#))

### CURRICULUM MAPS portion of LJML Assessment Wheel

4. Appendix 4: Differentiated Curriculum Map LJML LIT-LIT ([03. LJML Map 2012-2013 Curriculum Map LIT-LIT.pdf](#))
5. Appendix 5: Differentiated Curriculum Map LJML LIT-EE ([04. LJML Map 2011-2012 Curriculum Map LIT-English Education.pdf](#))

### ASSESSMENT PLAN portion of LJML Assessment Wheel

6. Appendix 6: Assessment Plan Literature 3YR Cycle 2012-13 ([05. LJML Plan 2012-2013 3YR Cycle Literature \(LIT, EE\).pdf](#))
7. Appendix 7: Assessment Plan Literature 2012-13 ([06. LJML Plan 2012-2013 Assessment Plan Literature \(LIT, EE\).pdf](#))

### EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING portion of LJML Assessment Wheel

8. Appendix 8: 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT ([07. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT.pdf](#))
9. Appendix 9: 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT 250 Rubric ([08. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT 250 Rubric for Lit. Analysis.pdf](#))
10. Appendix 10: Senior Literature Portfolio Guidelines & Assignments ([09. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT Senior Portfolio.pdf](#))
11. Appendix 11: Literature Survey 2012-13 (Blank) ([10. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT Exit Survey June 14.pdf](#))
12. Appendix 12: Results Grid LIT 250 Literary Analysis 2012-13 Total ([11. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT 250 Lit AnalysisTotal.pdf](#))
13. Appendix 13: Results Grid LIT 250 Final Exam 2012-13 Total ([12. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT 250 Final Exam Total.pdf](#))
14. Appendix 14: Multi-year Results Grid LIT 250 Literary Analysis and Final Exam Averages ([13. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT 250 Analysis-Final Exam.pdf](#))
15. Appendix 15: ETS Literature Field Test Results & Narrative 2012-13 ([14. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT ETS Field Test Results.pdf](#))
16. Appendix 16: 2006-2013 ETS Comparative Report ([15. LJML Evidence 2006-2011 Assessment Report LIT ETS Comparative Results.pdf](#))
17. Appendix 17: Senior Literature Portfolio 2012-13 Results Grid ([16. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT Senior Portfolio Results.pdf](#)) See also the report for Literature in the [Degree Qualifications Profile](#)
18. Appendix 18: Senior Literature Portfolio Performance Targets Grid 2012-13 ([17. LJML Evidence 2012-2013 Assessment Report LIT Senior Portfolio Targets.pdf](#))
19. Appendix 19: AAC&U Rubric for Information Literacy ([AAC&U VALUE Information Li...pdf](#))
20. Appendix 20: AAC&U Rubric for Written Communication ([AAC&U VALUE Written Commun...pdf](#))
21. Appendix 21: AAC&U Rubric for Critical Thinking ([AAC&U VALUE Critical Think...pdf](#))

22. Appendix 22: Literature Survey 2012-13 Report ([21. LJML-Evidence 2012-2013 Assess Report LIT Exit Survey Results.pdf](#))