

Annual Assessment Report
Literature: English-Education/Literature
Department/School: Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages
Assessment Period: 2014-2015

Assessment Plan Description:

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

Our current Mission Statement continues to describe and guide our work and commitments well. No changes were made in 2014-15.

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.

Please see 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]).*

Our PLOs continue to cover the full range of Bloom's Taxonomy, embed the WASC Core Competencies (as directed), and reflect our pedagogical commitments and practice in the classroom. We made no revisions to our PLOs. WASC Core Competencies are indicated in red and Bloom's Taxonomy in multicolor. Alignment of our Program Learning Outcomes to Institutional Learning Outcomes is indicated in the documents loaded on our Assessment Wheel-Student Learning.

LITERATURE: Concentrations in LIT and in ENG-ED (with Bloom's & WASC Core Included)

Students who complete the program will be able to:

1. Integrate (**Synthesis**) their literature studies with ongoing reflection and hospitable engagement with a diverse world. [**Integrative Learning, Lifelong Learning, Critical Thinking**]
2. Identify and articulate (**Knowledge, Analysis**) characteristics and trends of diverse literatures and historical periods: dates, styles, authors, and canon formation. [**Quantitative Reasoning/Literacy**]
3. Develop and support (**Synthesis, Evaluation**) close readings of texts using literary theory and terminology. [**Critical Thinking, Written Communication**]
4. Articulate (**Comprehension, Analysis**) the difference between a traditional pedagogical and a modern linguistics notion of language. [**Critical Thinking**]
5. Employ (**Application**) strong research, rhetorical, literary, and analytical skills in their writing. [**Written Communication, Information Literacy, Critical Thinking**]
6. Present (**Evaluation**) literary analysis to formal audiences, demonstrating strategies for audience engagement and oral communication of written work. [**Oral Communication**]

WASC Core Competencies: Written Communication, Oral Communication, Information Literacy, Qualitative Reasoning/Literacy, Critical Thinking

BLOOM'S TAXONOMY: Knowledge, Comprehension, Application, Analysis, Synthesis, Evaluation

Please see the Student Learning Outcomes portion of our Assessment Wheel. See also our Course Learning Outcomes there.

3. **Curriculum Map:** See Assessment Wheel. *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 revisions to our Differentiated Curriculum Maps in 2014-15.

Please see the Curriculum Map 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).*

We continued an annual approach to assess all our Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) in Literature (LIT-LIT, LIT-EE). Please see our 3 Year Cycle Plan on the Assessment Plan portion of our Assessment Wheel.

Summative assessment results may be found in the Senior Literature Portfolio uploaded in Live Text under course LIT 495.

We also did a first run in designing a Quantitative Reasoning assignment for our capstone course, LIT 495. The assignment needs further revisions from literature faculty before we begin data collection for the Senior Portfolio should WASC accreditation require QR assessment in the discipline.

The current components of the Senior Literature Portfolios include each of the following:

- For PLO 1: 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. The essays will be assessed using criteria from the AAC&U Rubrics: *Integrative Learning, Lifelong Learning*.
- For PLOs 2 & 3: The ETS Field Test in Literature.
- For PLO 4: An essay assignment common to all upper division linguistics courses. This key assignment will be assessed by the linguistics professor in those courses using the local rubric we designed to suit both the program and course learning outcomes for our linguistics courses. These key assignments and their assessment are loaded and stored in Live Text.
- For PLOs 5 & 6: A standard research paper assignment for upper division literature courses so that any major paper written during the senior year for any upper division literature class could be submitted as part of the Senior Literature Portfolio. The research papers were assessed in common by literature faculty using the AAC&U Rubrics: Information Literacy, Written Communication.
- For PLOs 3, 5 & 6: A researched essay assignment, though we added clarifying guidelines in the assignment sheet to better explain the specific components we wanted to see in these papers. These papers continue to be submitted as part of the Senior Literature Portfolio and to be assessed in common by literature faculty using the AAC&U Rubrics: Written Communication, Critical Thinking.

We made no changes to the key assignments for LIT 250 Introduction to the Study of Literature, nor their assessment. These are key assignments at the introductory level and are loaded, assessed, and stored in Live Text but we are no longer including them in the Senior Portfolio because they are not summative assignments for the entire program.

Please see 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 PLOs 2, 3, 5, 6 in 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); thus, the assessment of these PLOs was done at the introductory level only.

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. In LIT 250 students wrote and/or presented literary analysis of fiction, poetry, drama, and non-fiction. They also 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, *LIT 250 Literary Analysis Rubric*, posted on LIVETEXT in LIT 250. You may see the assignments and collected results in Live Text for LIT 250 (Spring 2015).

A copy of that *LIT 250 Literary Analysis Rubric* is also posted as **Appendix 1** of this report.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS for LITERARY ANALYSIS were

- 3% individual improvement from the first to the final literary analysis
- 70% of students meeting the individual performance target

For results please see the **Results Grid LIT 250 Literary Analysis 2014-15 Totals** in section six below.

PERFORMANCE TARGET for FINAL EXAM for each student was

- a score of 70% or higher
- 70% of students meeting the individual performance target

For results please see the **Results Grid LIT 250 Final Exam 2014-15 Totals** in section six below.

LIN 312: INTRODUCTION TO LINGUISTICS & LIN 365: ENGLISH GRAMMAR & USAGE

We assessed PLO 4 in each of these two linguistics courses.

Dr. Phil Bowles taught and gave and assessed the key assignment in both courses. The key assignment and rubric were distributed in both classes and are included in this report as **Appendix 2**.

Our performance target for each student on the key assignment was a score of 80% or higher. The results for all students in both Linguistics classes (LIN 312, LIN 365) are reported in the **Results Grid LIN 2014-15 Totals** in section six below.

LIT 495: LITERARY THEORY AND SCHOLARSHIP

We assessed PLOs 1, 2, 3, and 5 in LIT 495. 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. Bettina Tate Pedersen. Two direct means of assessment were used to assess PLOs 1, 2, 3, and 5.

DIRECT MEANS OF ASSESSMENT: The direct means of assessment were the ETS Field Test in Literature given on May 1, 2015 and the Senior Literature Portfolios submitted and assessed at the end of spring semester 2015.

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 our capstone course, LIT 495 and are attached as **Appendix 3** in this report. As outlined in our Assessment Plan, we established uniform key assignments and rubrics for evaluating all of the components of the Senior Literature Portfolios.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS for the Linguistics Key Assignment and the Senior Portfolio

PERFORMANCE TARGETS (AVERAGES OF ALL ASSESSOR SCORES)						
Key Assignment	Local Linguistics Rubric	Information Literacy	Written Communication	Critical Thinking	Integrative Learning	Lifelong Learning
Linguistics Essay	80%	--	--	--	--	--
Upper Division Paper	--	80%	80%	--	--	--
Major Researched Essay	--	--	85%	85%	--	--
Reflective Essay	--	--	--	--	87.50% (selected criteria)	81.25% (selected criteria)

INDIRECT MEANS OF ASSESSMENT: The indirect means of assessment we use is our Graduating Senior/Alumni Survey. This survey was sent out in June 2013, revised and then sent out again in June 2014. We did not send it out in June 2015 because we do not want to over-survey our alumni.

Currently, we plan to send out the survey every five years. The survey is sent to alumni via a link to a Qualtrics Survey. The current 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.

Going forward our survey will no longer contain the section on Department Learning Outcomes because we removed them from our assessment structure at the recommendation of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. Key skills were incorporated into our Program Learning Outcomes. Our survey will be revised accordingly before it is sent out for the next cycle.

Please see 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 annually. Once we have several years of data compiled and thus a larger data sample, we may be able to draw more statistically sound conclusions from our data. Please note—because of the small sample, our results are easily skewed because of anomalous high or low scores.

LIT 250 ASSESSMENT RESULTS:

LITERARY ANALYSIS ALL SCORES: We use the students' final literary analysis as a direct means of assessment. Each literary analysis in LIT 250 was graded using the rubric loaded in LIVETEXT and rubric scores for those essays were determined by Dr. James Wicks. Scores were compiled in the **Results Grid LIT 250 Literary Analysis 2014-15 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.

Data gathered for LIT 250 in the Tables 1 and 2 includes all students taking LIT 250—Literature, Writing, Language, and Cross-Disciplinary majors are included in the results. This key assignment is included here as Appendix 1: LIT 250 Key Assignment and Local Rubric

PERFORMANCE TARGETS for LITERARY ANALYSIS:

- 3.0% individual improvement
- 70% of Students to Meet the Individual Target

PERFORMANCE TARGETS for LITERARY ANALYSIS and student results are listed in the table below and show the following:

- 71.4% (or 15 of 21) of all LIT 250 students met the 3% Individual Performance Target; 28.5% (or 6 of 24) did not. We met our overall performance target for all students taking LIT 250.
- **Disaggregated Results for Literature Program:** 7 out of 21 LIT 250 students were Literature majors or minors. Of these seven, five (71.4%) met the individual goal of a 3% improvement in their ability to write literary analysis. Two (28.5%) did not: one of those was a strong writer to begin and maintained a 96% performance level first to final literary analysis assignment; one declined in performance. We met our overall performance target in the Literature Program.

TABLE 1 Results Grid LIT 250 Literary Analysis 2014-15 Totals

LIT 250: Introduction to the Study of Literature 2014-15						
Finding	M/F	Major	First Literary Analysis	Final Literary Analysis	Difference	3% Improvement Target Met
1	F	LIT	89	92.86	4%	Y
2	F	WRI	89	89.29	4%	Y
3	F	WRI	86	92.86	7%	Y
4	F	LIT-EE	79	29	-50%	N
5	F	CRS-DSC TCH ED	89	96.43	7%	Y
6	F	WRI	93	96.43	3%	Y
7	F	LIT-EE	71	82.14	11%	Y
8	F	WRI	89	96.43	7%	Y
9	M	LIT-EE	89	92.86	4%	Y
10	M	LIT-EE	96	96.43	0%	N*
11	F	FRE MINOR	93	92.86	0%	N*
12	F	SPA	86	78.57	-7%	N
13	F	SPA	89	92.86	4%	Y
14	M	SPA MINOR	86	92.86	7%	Y
15	F	SPA	96	96.43	0%	N*
16	M	LIT-EE	82	92.86	11%	Y
17	M	LIT	89	92.86	4%	Y
18	F	SPA	79	89.29	10%	Y
19	M	WRI	82	85.71	3%	Y
20	F	WRI	93	96.43	3%	Y
21	F	SPA	96	96.43	0%	N*
			87.66%	89.13%	1.47%	90% of all findings met or *maintained performance target

*Results indicate a positive writing performance from first to final analysis assignment rather than a negative one even though the performance target of 3% improvement was technically not met.

FINAL EXAM ALL SCORES: Each student in LIT 250 completed a comprehensive final exam at the end of the semester (Spring 2015). Dr. Wicks administered the LIT 250 Final Exam. These scores are recorded in the *Results Grid LIT 250 Final Exam 2014-15 Totals* (Tables 2 & 3 below).

PERFORMANCE TARGETS for LIT 250 FINAL EXAM and student results are listed in the table below. We met our performance target of 70% or higher on the Final Exam for 19 of 21 (90%) students.

TABLE 2 Results Grid LIT 250 Final Exam 2014-15 Totals

LIT 250: Introduction to the Study of Literature Final Exam 2014-2015				
Finding	M/F	Major	Final Exam	70% Performance Target Met
1	F	LIT	95	Y
2	F	WRI	91.8	Y
3	F	WRI	80.4	Y
4	F	LIT-EE	71.8	Y
5	F	CRS-DSC TCH ED	90	Y
6	F	WRI	94.5	Y
7	F	LIT-EE	80.4	Y
8	F	WRI	93.1	Y
9	M	LIT-EE	71.8	Y
10	M	LIT-EE	80.9	Y
11	F	FRE MINOR	98.1	Y
12	F	SPA	68.6	N
13	F	SPA	87.2	Y
14	M	SPA MINOR	89	Y
15	F	SPA	94.5	Y
16	M	LIT-EE	84.5	Y
17	M	LIT	81.3	Y
18	F	SPA	52.2	N
19	M	WRI	83.6	Y
20	F	WRI	95.4	Y
21	F	SPA	90.4	Y
			84.5% (Class Average Score)	90% of all findings met performance target

TABLE 3 Multi-year Results Grid LIT 250 Literary Analysis and Final Exam Averages

LIT 250 Literary Analysis and Final Exam Averages					
	First Literary Analysis Average	Final Literary Analysis Average	% of Students Meeting 3% Individual Improvement Target on Literary Analysis	Final Exam Average	% of Students Meeting 70% Individual Performance Target on Final Exam
2011-12	77.9%	87%	80.7% (21 of 26)	83.1%	96% (25 of 26)
2012-13	84%	89%	75.0% (18 of 24)	83.0%	87.5% (21 of 24)
2013-14	82.5%	87%	70.8% (17 of 24)	80.2%	100% (24 of 24)
2014-15	87.66%	89%	71.4% (15 of 21)	84.5%	90% (19 of 21)
2015-16					
2016-17					
2017-18					
2018-19					
2019-20					
2020-21					
2021-22					
2022-23					
2023-24					
2024-25					

LIN 312 & 365 ASSESSMENT RESULTS: For the LIN 312 & 365 Assessment we used an essay assignment as a direct means of assessment. This key assignment is included here as Appendix 2: Linguistics Key Assignment and Local Rubric.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS for LINGUISTICS:

- 80% individual student’s score on local rubric for linguistics essay
- 70% of all linguistics students to meet the individual target

Scores recorded for LIN 312 & 365 key assignment in 2014-15 show the following:

- Nineteen students met the individual performance target; thirteen did not. Of the thirteen who did not meet the target, two of them did not complete the assignment.
- **Only 52.6%** of all linguistics students met the individual target; thus we did not meet our overall performance target.
- **Disaggregated Results:** Literature majors’ results are bold and shaded blue. Of the eight literature majors (LTLT & LTEE), four met the target and four did not. Of the four who did not, one did not complete the assignment at all. Thus **only 50%** of literature majors met the performance target in linguistics, and their results are consistent with the overall results of all majors represented in the data set.

This was only our second year of implementing this key assignment. Going forward, we will continue to review the key assignment and results gathered to see what in the course content or key assignment or both needs to be adjusted.

TABLE 4 Results Grid LIN 312 & LIN 365

Key Assignment - Linguistics (LIN 312 & 365) Academic Year 2014-15					
Findings	Status	Major	Courses	Score (%)	Met Target of 80% on Local Rubric
1	SO	WRI	LIN 365	61	N
2	JR	WRI	LIN 365	66	N
3	SR	JOUR	LIN 365	86	Y
4	SO	LIT-EE	LIN 365	None	N
5	SR	CRS-DSC TCH ED	LIN 365	83	Y
6	JR	WRI	LIN 365	97	Y
7	SR	LIT-EE	LIN 365	67	N
8	JR	LIT-EE	LIN 365	86	Y
9	JR	CRS-DSC TCH ED	LIN 365	68	N
10	JR	PHLTHE, WRI	LIN 365	90	Y
11	JR	LIT-EE	LIN 365	64	N
12	SO	LIT-EE	LIN 365	96	Y
13	SR	WRI	LIN 365	98	Y
14	SO	WRI	LIN 365	86	Y
15	SO	WRI	LIN 365	80	Y
16	JR	WRI	LIN 365	100	Y
17	SR	WRI	LIN 365	88	Y
18	SR	WRI	LIN 365	86	Y
19	SR	INTLST	LIN 312	70	N
20	SO	BIO	LIN 312	None	N
21	JR	WRI	LIN 312	89	Y
22	SO	WRI	LIN 312	86	Y
23	SR	WRI	LIN 312	99	Y
24	JR	LIT-EE	LIN 312	72	N
25	SO	WRI	LIN 312	100	Y
26	JR	LIT-EE	LIN 312	96	Y
27	SR	LIT-EE	LIN 312	90	Y
28	SR	WRI	LIN 312	62	N
29	SR	WRI	LIN 312	66	N
30	SR	WRI	LIN 312	65	N
31	SR	WRI	LIN 312	76	N
32	SR	SP, WRI	LIN 312	87	Y
TOTAL					52.6 % of all findings met performance target

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 and indirect)
- C. *Literature Survey* (indirect, used on a five-year cycle)

A. ETS LITERATURE FIELD TEST RESULTS: Each student in LIT 495 completed the ETS Literature Field Test. Dr. Pedersen proctored the test in May 2015. 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 summer 2015. This report will be added to the Evidence of Student Learning portion of our Assessment Wheel.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS for ETS FIELD TEST IN LITERATURE:

- Students scoring at least 5 points above the *scaled score mean of all schools tested 2005-2010* in their total score
- Students scoring at least 5 points above the *scaled score mean of all schools tested 2005-2010* in each subscore of the ETS Test:
 - LIT. PRE 1901
 - LIT. TO 1901-LATER
 - LITERARY ANALYSIS
 - LITERARY HISTORY & IDENTIFICATION

While the ETS reports scores on groups as small as ours, it also cautions that “care must be taken in interpreting the results from very small groups,” noting further that reliability of results “would be appropriate for evaluating curriculum but not...teacher evaluation or group to group comparisons.” In addition, as we have noted elsewhere, one student’s scores can significantly skew results higher or lower. Once we have collected data on several years’ cohorts of literature majors taking the field test, we may be able to identify some statistically valid trends. The ETS Field test remains our only externally benchmark means of assessment.

Test scores reported for 2015 show the following results on our performance targets:

- Total Score: **4 of 6** students met or exceeded the target
- Subscores:
 - Subscore 1-LIT. PRE 1901: **3 of 6** students met or exceeded the target
 - Subscore 2-LIT. 1901-LATER: **5 of 6** students met or exceeded the target
 - Subscore 3-LIT. ANALYSIS: **2 of 6** students met or exceeded the target
 - Subscore 4-LIT. HIST/ID: **1 of 6** students met or exceeded the target

FINDING	TOTAL SCALED SCORE (OF 200)	TOTAL SCALED SCORE MEAN	SUBSCORE 1 LIT. 1900 & EARLIER (OF 100)	SUBSCORE 1 SCALED SCORE MEAN	SUBSCORE 2 LIT 1901 & LATER (OF 100)	SUBSCORE 2 SCALED SCORE MEAN	SUBSCORE 3 LIT ANALYSIS (OF 100)	SUBSCORE 3 SCALED SCORE MEAN	SUBSCORE 4 LIT HISTORY & ID (OF 100)	SUBSCORE 4 SCALED SCORE MEAN	PERCENTILE RANK
1	175	154.7%	71	54.3%	79	54.5%	69	54.6%	84	53.9	88
2	132		28		43		27		38		10
3	161		53		76		59		63		65
4	158		53		69		54		66		57
5	161		61		61		51		79		65
6	184		88		71		81		94		95

B. SENIOR PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENTS RESULTS: For the *Senior Portfolios* students were given the *Senior Literature Portfolio Guidelines & Assignments (Appendix 3)* posted on LIVE TEXT to guide their compilation of their Senior Literature Portfolio. All means of assessment used in the portfolios were direct. Portfolios were assessed using the *AAC&U Rubrics for Information Literacy, Written Communication, Critical Thinking, Integrative Learning, and Lifelong Learning*.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS for the SENIOR PORTFOLIO

- 80% AAC&U Information Literacy and Written Communication Rubrics for Upper Division Literature Paper
- 85% AAC&U Written Communication and Critical Thinking Rubrics for LIT 495 Research Paper
- 87.5% AAC&U Integrative Learning Rubric for Reflective Essay
- 81.25% AAC&U Lifelong Learning Rubric for Reflective Essay

Scores recorded for the key assignments in the 2014-15 Senior Portfolios show the following:

- 67% of students met the target on the Upper Division Research Paper for Information Literacy
- 67% of students met the target on the Upper Division Research Paper for Written Communication
- 67% of students met the target on the LIT 495 Research Paper for Written Communication
- **33% of students met the target on the LIT 495 Research Paper for Critical Thinking**
- 67% of students met the target on the Reflective Essay for Integrated Learning
- 100% of students met the target on the Reflective Essay for Lifelong Learning

The small data sample of six students makes drawing broad conclusions about the effectiveness of the program difficult to determine.

The greatest area of concern these results would seem to indicate is in the Critical Thinking scores where only two of the six students met the performance target of an 85% average of all assessors' scores.

The greatest area of success would seem to be in the Lifelong Learning scores where all six students met the performance target of an 81.25% average of all assessors' scores.

All results are recorded and summarized in Tables 5 and 6 below.

TABLE 5 Senior Literature Portfolio Results Grid 2014-15 Totals

Finding	M/F	Up Div Paper IL	Met Target of 80%	Up Div Paper WC	Met Target of 80%	LIT 495 Research Paper WC	Met Target of 85%	LIT 495 Research Paper CT	Met Target of 85%	Reflective Essay INTGL	Met Target of 87.5%	Reflective Essay LFL	Met Target of 81.25%
1	F	98		98		98		97		98		100	
2	M	77	N	73	N	75	N	70	N	77	N	92	
3	F	73	N	72	N	62	N	67	N	94		88	
4	F	85		82		80		82	N	90		96	
5	F	88		87		87		80	N	77	N	88	
6	F	97		97		95		95		94		96	

TABLE 6 Senior Literature Portfolio Performance Target Grid 2014-15

Senior Portfolio Piece	AAC&U Rubric	Individual Performance Target	% Meeting Target	% Not Meeting Target
Upper Division Research Paper	Information Literacy	80%	67%	33%
Upper Division Research Paper	Written Communication	80%	67%	33%
LIT 495 Research Paper	Written Communication	85%	67%	33%
LIT 495 Research Paper	Critical Thinking	85%	33%	67%
Reflective Essay	Integrative Learning	87.50%	67%	33%
Reflective Essay	Lifelong Learning	81.25%	100%	0%

- D. Our **Literature Survey** is sent out on a five-year cycle. It was last sent to alums in June 2014 and included alums from 2004-2014. The June 2014 Literature Survey Report is posted on the Evidence of Student Learning portion of our Assessment Wheel. Survey data was discussed in connection with relevant program changes made in 2014-15. We will continue to consider survey data in future program changes as appropriate.
- E. Results of the first round of GE LIT assessment data are posted as [LJML Evidence 2014-2015 GELO 2.b Literature](#) also included as **Appendix 4** in this report.

Please see 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 or from mandates that arose in 2014-15, we did the following:

1. Monitored and maintained the ongoing schedule for all aspects of our program and GE assessment per the University Assessment Calendar and WASC mandates.
2. Submitted two APC proposals to APC addressing curricular changes to the Literature Program and to Literature General Education courses as a result of assessment work and Prioritization mandates. Both proposals were approved by vote of the full faculty on February 25, 2015. Proposals may be found on the Use of Evidence of Student Learning portion of our Assessment Wheel at these links:
 - a. [LJML Use 2014-2015 APC GE Lit and Writing FINAL](#)
 - b. [LJML Use 2014-2015 APC Lit Majors FINAL](#)
3. Submitted our portion of the LJML Self-Study Program Review Report to the Program Review Committee.
4. Reviewed and confirmed assessment results from LIT 250, Senior Literature Portfolio, and ETS Field Test in Literature—including means of assessment, performance targets, and data collection.
5. Revised Senior Literature Portfolio Assignment Guidelines sheet and uploaded the new sheet in Live Text for LIT 495 (Spring 2015).
6. Confirmed a routine calibration and assessment meeting to assess all Senior Literature Portfolios during or shortly following finals week.

7. Assessed all Senior Literature Portfolios in summer 2015.
8. Created Google Drive documents to facilitate and record annual Literature Section work, including meeting agendas and minutes.
9. Continued to input information into the Google Drive document for tracking the post-graduation outcomes (graduate school acceptance rates and employment) of our alumni.

For the Coming Year: We will review all results and reports in routine Literature Section and/or department meetings in 2015-16. We plan to take the following actions in 2015-16:

Opening Meeting: August 26, 2015

1. Review the Annual Assessment Report, the ETS Field Test Results and Report, and our Senior Portfolio performance targets and results including
 - a. Discuss observations and possible revisions to some portfolio assignment details.
 - b. Discuss and determine how often we want to send out our survey to alums.
 - c. Discuss how we may want to address performance targets in LIT 250 for students who demonstrate a consistent high level of proficiency in writing literary analysis from first to last analysis assignment.
 - d. Discuss and determine how we want to record data from two LIN courses in our data grids.
2. Discuss CLOs for new upper-division GE Literature classes, especially any new key assignments or revisions to outcomes.

Ongoing Meetings: 2015-2016

3. Continue any unfinished review of annual report data as needed.
4. Revise assessment documents to reflect changes made to our program in Prioritization
5. Monitor and maintain the ongoing schedule for all aspects of assessment per the University Assessment Calendar.
6. Update and revise WASC Core Competency assessment as indicated by our WSCUC Vice President & CEO liaison (Dr. Christopher Oberg) for our 2016 WASC Review, especially the assessment of Quantitative Reasoning.
7. Request ongoing revisions to our web pages to best feature employability and student testimonials for Literature majors, including creating new videos.
8. Continue to populate our Google Drive document, "LJML Grad School and Employment Rates for Alums" for tracking the post-graduation outcomes.
9. Meet with our New Dean, Provost, and Marketing and Creative Services to put together an intentional plan for better marketing of the Literature Major and LJML Department on the web.

Results from LIT 250 and LIT 495 were gathered and compiled primarily by Bettina Pedersen and James Wicks. Assessment data was generated by Phil Bowles, Karl Martin, Bettina Pedersen, and James Wicks.

GE LIT assessment data was gathered by LJML faculty who participated in the Spring 2015 GE assessment.

Please see the Use of Evidence of Student Learning portion of our Assessment Wheel.

Appendices

1. Appendix 1: LIT 250 Key Assignment and Local Rubric
2. Appendix 2: Linguistics Key Assignment and Local Rubric
3. Appendix 3: Senior Literature Portfolio Guidelines & Assignments
4. Appendix 4: GE LIT Assessment—Key Assignment and Results

Appendix 1: LIT 250 Key Assignment and Local Rubric

KEY ASSIGNMENT: LIT 250 LITERARY ANALYSIS

For our purposes in LIT 250 this paper will be the **Major Paper** because it will represent your cumulative and most skilled literary analysis of the semester; it should be informed by all the formal and informal feedback you have received on previous analyses; it should use MLA style *flawlessly*.

Writing Task:

Please construct a 4-5 page analysis of James Joyce's story "The Dead" based on a main claim of your own choosing and using one or a combination of critical approaches identified in your DiYanni text, Bressler text, and/or in the case study book for "The Dead." You might design your main claim to address a particular

- effect or meaning that seems dominant in the work;
- key question and/or issue that become apparent as a result of a particular critical approach;
- genre that the work seems to embody interestingly;
- literary device that seems uniquely significant in the work;
- structural feature (scene, recurring pattern, archetype, plot closure, etc.) that defines the thematic message of the work or the predominant effect of the work;

Your analysis **must use** the primary source of "The Dead" and a minimum of **three (3) secondary sources** which may include the readings in the case study book. Outstanding papers, however, will show evidence of research that goes beyond assigned course texts. All sources **must be listed** in a Works Cited page at the end of your analysis.

Your paper **should include** a full introduction and conclusion following the rhetorical components outlined in the handout on introductions and conclusions that you were given for Analysis 3.

You will find that beginning your pre-writing work by responding to the *Close Reading Frames of Analysis* handout (*see Eclass*) will help you explore the meaning of the story and identify the literary devices, issues, themes, and effects that are of interest to you.

Research:

Please use the information covered in the Baker and Huling text to assist you in researching your paper if need be.

Matters to Remember:

1. Be sure to structure your analysis in terms of **main claim, sub-claims (reasons), and textual evidence**. (*See template handout and Eclass.*)
2. Remember that your **evidence is not self-evident**; it requires **explanatory commentary** preceding it to direct readers to what specifically in the evidence illustrates your sub-claim and main claim and often following it for full elaboration and/or summarizing. Remember **quotes may not stand alone** as sentences on their own. (*See handout on Hamlet example from early in the semester and Eclass.*)

3. Remember as well, that you need to use the same set of **key words and ideas** from your claim statement throughout your discussion. This practice builds **coherence and clarity** in your argument. (*See revision guide handouts to coherent papers and Eclass.*)
4. Remember to include a full **introduction** and **conclusion** that follow the rhetorical components outlined in class and on handout. (*See handout on introductions and conclusions and Eclass.*)

MLA Style: *MLA Handbook for Writers*

Please follow MLA guidelines in formatting, mechanics and stylistics. Papers that do not follow MLA style will be returned ungraded. Please see ***MLA Handbook Chapter 4*** for correct format.

Include your secondary and primary sources in a “List of Works Cited” page at the end of your analysis. See ***MLA Handbook, Chapter 5 “Documentation: Preparing the List of Works Cited”***, especially sections **5.1-5.3** for the correct arrangement of this page. Please use the applicable sections **5.4-5.8** in the remainder of **Chapter 5** as your sources dictate.

Review **Chapter 3 “The Mechanics of Writing”** (especially **section 3.7**). Review also **Chapter 2 “Plagiarism and Academic Integrity,”** if you have any questions about what you should/should not cite. Also give careful attention to the pertinent examples for citing sources in the text of your paper which are covered in **Chapter 6 “Documentation: Citing Sources in the Text.”**

You would do well to also carefully consult **Chapter 4 “The Format of the Research Paper”** as it applies to your particular paper. See also Citation Machine website:

<http://citationmachine.net/>

Special Components of Major Paper not Required for Preceding Literary Analysis Papers:

- Additional Length
- Primary **and** Several Secondary Sources Required

RUBRICS FOR ASSESSMENT: Local Rubric (Loaded into LIVE TEXT)

LIT 250 Rubric for Literary Analysis (Fiction, Poetry, Drama, Non-Fiction)

	Advanced (4.000 pts)	Proficient (3.000 pts)	Developing (2.000 pts)	Beginner (1.000 pt)
Thesis and Title (1.000, 14%)	Demonstrates mastery of one-sentence arguable thesis: clear, concise, specific, original, and relevant with compelling and nuanced set of key terms/concepts; in creating an original two-part title derived from the thesis that effectively communicates the key ideas of paper	Demonstrates clear and active use of one-sentence arguable thesis: clear, concise, specific, original, and relevant with strong set of key terms/concepts; of a title derived from the thesis that communicates the key ideas of paper	Attempts use of one-sentence arguable thesis: clear, concise, specific, original, and relevant with set of key terms/concepts; of a title connected to the assignment that inadequately communicates the key ideas of paper	Lacks one-sentence arguable thesis: clear, concise, specific, original, and relevant to the assignment; lacks consistent set of key terms/concepts; lacks an original two-part title derived from the thesis that communicates the key ideas of paper
Organization: Introduction, Conclusions, Point Sentences, Order of Discussion, (1.000, 14%)	Includes a thesis/main claim and key terms appropriately placed; begins each discussion section with precise point sentences substantively connected to the main claim and that clearly articulate discussion material and elegantly link it to preceding and following points; sub-claims/reasons are discussed in the order established by the main claim	Includes a thesis/main claim and key terms appropriately placed; begins each discussion section with appropriate point sentences fundamentally connected to the main claim and that present the discussion material well; sub-claims/reasons are discussed in the order established by the main claim	May include a thesis/main claim and/or key terms inappropriately placed; begins some discussion sections with point sentences that may unevenly connect to the main claim and/or poorly present the discussion material; may discuss sub-claims/reasons in a different order from that established by the main claim	Does not appropriately place a clear thesis/main claim and/or key terms; discussion sections lack point sentences and/or any connection to main claim and/or poorly present discussion material; the order of sub-claims/reasons in the discussion is not governed by the main claim
Commentary (Quotation Sandwich) (1.000, 14%)	Demonstrates elegant and nuanced original commentary before and after quoted, paraphrased, or summarized textual evidence; compellingly connects commentary to the evidence, sub-point/reason, and thesis/main claim	Demonstrates solid original commentary before and after quoted, paraphrased, or summarized textual evidence; connects commentary to the evidence, sub-point/reason, and thesis/main claim	Uses some original commentary before and/or after quoted, paraphrased, or summarized textual evidence; may not connect commentary to the evidence, sub-point/reason, and thesis/main claim	Lacks sufficient original commentary before and after quoted, paraphrased, or summarized textual evidence; lacks a connection between the commentary, sub-points/reasons, and the thesis/main claim

Evidence (1.000, 14%)	Always uses attributed or integrated quotations; always introduces sources when they are first used; uses block quotations only when needed; includes adequate and judicious textual evidence from primary, secondary, and tertiary sources as required by the assignment. Evidence cited powerfully illustrates the reasons and the claim.	Almost always uses attributed or integrated quotations; introduces sources when they are first used; may overuse block quotations; includes textual evidence from primary, secondary, and tertiary sources as required by the assignment. Evidence cited generally illustrates the reasons and the claim.	Sometimes uses attributed or integrated quotations; unevenly introduces sources when they are first used; overuses block quotations; unevenly includes textual evidence from primary, secondary, and tertiary sources as required by the assignment. Evidence cited may/may not illustrate the reasons and/or the claim.	Lacks or incorrectly uses attributed or integrated quotations; does not introduce sources when they are first used; lacks or incorrectly uses block quotations; lacks appropriate textual evidence from primary, secondary, and tertiary sources as required by the assignment. Evidence cited does not illustrate the reasons and/or the claim.
MLA Style (1.000, 14%)	Demonstrates mastery of MLA Style--including parenthetical citations, works cited pages, headings, and overall format	Demonstrates solid and active use of MLA Style--some errors in parenthetical citations, works cited pages, headings, and overall format	Demonstrates inconsistent and incorrect use of MLA Style throughout parenthetical citations, works cited pages, headings, and overall format	Demonstrates inadequate, and incorrect use of MLA Style--lacking parenthetical citations, works cited pages, headings, and correct overall format
Writing Style (1.000, 14%)	Uses elegant and sophisticated writing style; demonstrates mastery of grammar and mechanics	Uses solid and effective writing style; demonstrates strong use of grammar and mechanics	Sometimes uses solid writing style; demonstrates some incorrect use of grammar and mechanics	Lacks a solid writing style; lacks correct use of grammar and mechanics
Writing Task (1.000, 14%)	Executes writing task with precision and mastery; meets length requirements	Executes writing task well; meets length requirements	Attempts to follow the writing task in part; may meet length requirements	Does not follow the writing task; does not meet length requirements

Appendix 2: Linguistics Key Assignment and Local Rubric

LITERATURE PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOME #4

4. Articulate the difference between a philological and a modern linguistics notion of language.

PROMPT FOR LINGUISTICS SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENT

Please provide a 250-word explanation to a peer who asks the following question:

How is a linguistic approach to language different from a philological/traditional pedagogue's approach to language?

Cover the basics; then offer explanation, examples, and implications.

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:

Appendix 3: Senior Literature Portfolio Guidelines & Assignments

CAPSTONE COURSE—LIT 495: LITERARY THEORY AND SCHOLARSHIP

This course is the capstone course for the Literature Program (LIT and EE Concentrations). This course also serves as one of the culminating experiences for the French Program. Students from both programs take the course together.

WASC Core Competencies Assessed: Written Communication, Information Literacy, Critical Thinking, and Oral Communication

***Senior Literature Portfolio 2014-15* GUIDELINES & ASSIGNMENTS**

This assignment is part of the LJML assessment of the Literature Programs (LIT and EE concentrations).

Please submit a portfolio from your Literature courses taken here in LJML during your senior year, consisting of the following three papers:

1. **ASSIGNMENT 1:** Final Research Paper from an Upper Division Literature Course taken during senior year
2. **ASSIGNMENT 2:** Final Research Paper from LIT495
3. **ASSIGNMENT 3:** Reflective Essay

Please upload these assignments into your Live Text account. Thank you for completing your portfolio. We look forward to reading your work.

Senior French Portfolio 2014-15

GUIDELINES & ASSIGNMENTS

This assignment is part of the LJML assessment of the French Program.

Please submit a portfolio from LIT 495 taken here in LJML during your senior year, consisting of the following two papers:

1. **ASSIGNMENT 1:** ACTFL Oral Interview (Assesses language proficiency)
2. **ASSIGNMENT 2:** Final Research Paper from LIT495
3. **ASSIGNMENT 3:** Reflective Essay

Please upload these assignments into your Live Text account. Thank you for completing your portfolio. We look forward to reading your work.

ASSIGNMENT ONE: SENIOR PORTFOLIO: UPPER DIVISION LITERATURE RESEARCH PAPER

Purpose: Use your skills in close reading to deeply study and critically interpret a work of literature, and to articulate your reading in a formal piece of literary analysis.

Length: 10-15pp.

Major Paper Text: Compose a **main claim-driven/thesis-driven** argument that identifies a significant but arguable interpretation of a work, works, or issue. Your paper should demonstrate skilled close reading and *could* draw on one or more theoretical approaches to the work (Formalist, Feminist, Marxist, New Historicist/Cultural Poetics, etc.)—though a theoretical approach is not required. If you take a particular theoretical approach in your research paper, you do not need to explicitly name the critical approach since it will be implicitly communicated by the way you frame your thesis and discussion.

Sources: You will need to research, read, and cite material from scholarly sources outside the primary text you choose to analyze. These scholarly materials will include books, articles, essays, internet periodicals, etc. written about the primary text or issue you've selected. Please exercise good judgment in the internet sources you select and cite. Please consult the MLA Bibliography as well as additional library databases for the most reliable and up-to-date sources for your research.

Your paper should include 10-20 of these sources.

Major Paper Style Guide: Follow MLA Style explicitly.

RUBRICS FOR ASSESSMENT: AAC&U Informational Literacy, AAC&U Written Communication (Loaded into LIVE TEXT)

ASSIGNMENT TWO: SENIOR PORTFOLIO: LIT 495 FINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Purpose: Use your skills in close reading to deeply study and critically interpret a work of literature from a theoretical framework, to articulate your reading in a formal (journal quality) piece of literary analysis, and to present your paper to an audience. **This essay will be part of your Senior Literature Portfolio.**

Guidelines:

A. Format: Approximately 3000-3500 words (not including Works Cited), double-spaced, MLA format, using parenthetical citations and proper MLA format for Works Cited at the end. You may use sub-headings to help organize the paper.

As this class builds upon LIT 250, you are expected to apply what you have learned about writing a research paper in that class.

B. Sources: Use at least ten sources besides the work itself. These can be both writings of the theoreticians and essays by critics applying theories to the works.

Your sources must include AT LEAST four journal articles. For all sources, try to use ones written after 1985, unless historical research is germane to your approach. Do NOT use general encyclopedia or Wikipedia type of sources. Use the Ryan library databases, not the Web, to find materials; use LINK+ and ILLiad as needed to supplement our library's book and journal resources.

When using sources, be sure to properly introduce all quotations, summaries, and paraphrases, and to follow source material with your commentary/analysis ("quotation sandwich"). Do not just "drop in" quotations.

C. Content:

1. An introduction to your work and the critical question/issue with which you will be dealing. (Example: "In *The Awakening*, the interpretation of the ending, in which Edna walks out into the sea, is a major subject of debate among critics.")
2. A review of the critical literature on this aspect of the work (the discussion of the critical question), including those essays that use the theory you are using and other ones, as desired.
3. A discussion of what critical theory you will be using and why it is helpful in answering the question or dealing with the issue you chose. A statement of your thesis. (Example: "Lacanian theory provides a cogent interpretation of the conclusion. With its emphasis on maternal attachment, the theory provides a helpful window into Edna's connections to the sea, which can be viewed as a return to the womb.")
4. Your theoretically-based analysis of the work, which will also reference other critics as well. Demonstrate that you have thoroughly engaged with your sources, not just reproduced what the critics have said. Question, probe, agree, and disagree with the critical sources in regard to their use of theory and analysis of the literature.
5. A strong conclusion to reinforce why your approach and findings are an important way to interpret the work. Your conclusion should focus upon how your essay contributes to the ongoing critical conversation regarding the literary work you chose and possibly point to more research that needs to be done. Remember the work you did on conclusions in LIT 250.

D. Rubrics: AAC&U Critical Thinking, AAC&U Written Communication (Loaded into LIVE TEXT)

ASSIGNMENT THREE: SENIOR PORTFOLIO: REFLECTIVE ESSAY

Purpose

This personal essay will be part of your Senior Portfolio; it will be part of your coursework in LIT 495; and most importantly, it will give you a formal opportunity to let us, your professors, know some of your thoughts about the effects your major studies have had on your worldview. This essay is the key assignment to assess the Literature Program Learning Outcome #1 and the French Program Learning Outcome #6.

Literature Program Learning Outcome #1

Students who complete the Literature Program will be able to:

1. Integrate their literature studies with ongoing reflection and hospitable engagement with a diverse world.

French Program Learning Outcome #6

Students who complete the French Program will be able to:

6. Discuss the influence of their own perspective on cultural interconnections through engagement with local, national, or international communities.

Essay Prompt

Please describe how your studies as a literature major have shaped your worldview (including your faith and life philosophies).

Essay Guidelines & Expectations

1. **Literature Program Learning Outcome:** Written in view of Literature PLO #1
2. **Genre:** Reflective personal essay
3. **Senior Portfolio:** One piece of your Senior Portfolio
4. **MLA Style:**
 - a. Length: 4-5 pages (Word Count: 1500-1875)
 - b. Size & Font: 12 pt. Times/Palatino/Calibri
5. **Content, Structure, Tone:**
 - a. Main claim/Thesis
 - b. Strong conclusion to reinforce claim/thesis
 - c. Specific and tangible examples from literature throughout essay
 - d. First-person, personal tone
6. **Rubrics: AAC&U**
 - a. Integrative Learning (excluding Criteria #4-Integrated Communication)
 - b. Foundation Skills for Lifelong Learning (excluding Criteria #1-Curiosity; #2-Initiative; #3-Independence)
7. **Submission:**
 - a. Please submit your essay on **Live Text** in your LIT 495 class. The assignment is posted there.
 - b. Any time before Commencement Day, or as directed: (1) First: Jan. 21, 2015; (2) Final: April 24, 2015

Appendix 4: GE LIT Assessment—Key Assignment & Results for GELO 2b

Spring 2015

GE Student Learning Outcome to Be Assessed

2b. Students will understand and appreciate diverse forms of artistic expression

2014-15 Catalog Description of GE Area for Literature

V. Seeking Cultural Perspectives

A survey of human endeavors from a historical, cultural, linguistic, and philosophical perspective, including developing critical appreciation of human expression—both artistic and literary.

CLOs for our GE Literature Courses (LIT 201-209 and LIT 325)

Students will be able to:

1. Closely read (**comprehension**, **analysis**) and critically analyze (**analysis**) texts in their original languages and/or in translation. (**GELO 1d, 2b**) (LIT PLO 2, 3, 5)
2. Recall (**knowledge**), identify (**knowledge**), and use (**application**) fundamental concepts of literary study to read and discuss texts
 - a. Standard literary terminology
 - b. Modes/genres of literature
 - c. Elements of literary genres
 - d. Literary periods (dates, writers, characteristics, and important developments)
 - e. Extra-literary research (**GELO 1d, 2b**) (LIT PLO 2, 3, 5)
3. Connect (**synthesis**) the works with their own lives and with the social, cultural, and historical contexts of the works and their authors. (**GELO 1d, 2b**) (LIT PLO 1)

Outcome Measures:

LIT 201-209 and LIT 325 Take Home Final Essay Exam

Spring 2015 Assignment Prompt:

Instructions: Choose one work from our course readings that has impacted your understanding and appreciation of cultural perspectives to some degree and write a response to the prompt below.

Prompt: In what ways and to what degree has this literary work (novel, play, poem, short story, essay, creative nonfiction, film) impacted your cultural perspectives, AND what connections have you made between this work and other university courses and/or your own life experience?

Specifications:

- Your essay response should be thesis-driven, elaborated by reasons, and supported with textual evidence properly cited with MLA style from the work itself.
- Length of essays should be 2-3 double-spaced pages in 12-point font type.
- Essays earning highest marks must address both aspects (impact, connections) of the prompt.
- Hard Copy & Live Text submission due by the beginning of your Final Exam Period

Longitudinal Data:

In Fall 2014, the General Education Learning Outcomes were revised, and it was determined that the Critical Thinking and Reading Value Rubrics would be used to assess student artifacts. The scores below reflect data gathered by taking a random sample of the students in each section of each course.

Critical Thinking Value Rubric - Average Student Scores:

Course	Semester	N	Explanation of Issues	Evidence	Influence of Context and Assumptions	Student's Position	Conclusions and related outcomes	Total
LIT 201	Spring 2015	11	3.45	3.55	3.27	3.45	3.55	3.45
LIT 203	Spring 2015	23	3.39	3.39	3.30	3.26	3.39	3.35
LIT 208	Spring 2015	11	3.09	2.82	2.64	2.45	2.45	2.69
LIT 325	Spring 2015	10	2.90	3.20	3.60	3.40	2.70	3.16

Reading Value Rubric - Average Student Scores:

Course	Semester	N	Comprehension	Genres	Relationship to Text	Analysis	Interpretation	Reader's Voice	Total
LIT 201	Spring 2015	11	3.64	NA	NA	NA	3.55	NA	3.59
LIT 203	Spring 2015	23	3.57	NA	NA	NA	3.52	NA	3.54
LIT 208	Spring 2015	11	3.09	NA	NA	NA	2.73	NA	2.91
LIT 325	Spring 2015	10	3.40	NA	NA	NA	3.60	NA	3.50

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

None at this time. Continue to collect data.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this time. Continue to collect data

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

Definition: Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion. Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone (4)	Milestones (3)	Milestones (2)	Benchmark (1)
Explanation of issues	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
Evidence <i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</i>	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.
Influence of context and assumptions	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.
Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.
Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

READING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

Definition: Reading is "the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language" (Snow et al., 2002). (From www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB8024/index1.html) *Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.*

	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
Comprehension	Recognizes possible implications of the text for contexts, perspectives, or issues beyond the assigned task within the classroom or beyond the author's explicit message (e.g., might recognize broader issues at play, or might pose challenges to the author's message and presentation).	Uses the text, general background knowledge, and/or specific knowledge of the author's context to draw more complex inferences about the author's message and attitude.	Evaluates how textual features (e.g., sentence and paragraph structure or tone) contribute to the author's message; draws basic inferences about context and purpose of text.	Apprehends vocabulary appropriately to paraphrase or summarize the information the text communicates.
Genres	Uses ability to identify texts within and across genres, monitoring and adjusting reading strategies and expectations based on generic nuances of particular texts.	Articulates distinctions among genres and their characteristic conventions.	Reflects on reading experiences across a variety of genres, reading both with and against the grain experimentally and intentionally.	Applies tacit genre knowledge to a variety of classroom reading assignments in productive, if unreflective, ways.
Relationship to Text <i>Making meanings with texts in their contexts</i>	Evaluates texts for scholarly significance and relevance within and across the various disciplines, evaluating them according to their contributions and consequences.	Uses texts in the context of scholarship to develop a foundation of disciplinary knowledge and to raise and explore important questions.	Engages texts with the intention and expectation of building topical and world knowledge.	Approaches texts in the context of assignments with the intention and expectation of finding right answers and learning facts and concepts to display for credit.
Analysis <i>Interacting with texts in parts and as wholes</i>	Evaluates strategies for relating ideas, text structure, or other textual features in order to build knowledge or insight within and across texts and disciplines.	Identifies relations among ideas, text structure, or other textual features, to evaluate how they support an advanced understanding of the text as a whole.	Recognizes relations among parts or aspects of a text, such as effective or ineffective arguments or literary features, in considering how these contribute to a basic understanding of the text as a whole.	Identifies aspects of a text (e.g., content, structure, or relations among ideas) as needed to respond to questions posed in assigned tasks.
Interpretation <i>Making sense with texts as blueprints for meaning</i>	Provides evidence not only that s/he can read by using an appropriate epistemological lens but that s/he can also engage in reading as part of a continuing dialogue within and beyond a discipline or a community of readers.	Articulates an understanding of the multiple ways of reading and the range of interpretive strategies particular to one's discipline(s) or in a given community of readers.	Demonstrates that s/he can read purposefully, choosing among interpretive strategies depending on the purpose of the reading.	Can identify purpose(s) for reading, relying on an external authority such as an instructor for clarification of the task.
Reader's Voice <i>Participating in academic discourse about texts</i>	Discusses texts with an independent intellectual and ethical disposition so as to further or maintain disciplinary conversations.	Elaborates on the texts (through interpretation or questioning) so as to deepen or enhance an ongoing discussion.	Discusses texts in structured conversations (such as in a classroom) in ways that contribute to a basic, shared understanding of the text.	Comments about texts in ways that preserve the author's meanings and link them to the assignment.