

Annual Assessment Report

Literature: English-Education/Literature
Department/School: Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages
Assessment period: 2013-2014

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 2013-14.

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]).*

We eliminated our Department Learning Outcomes (DLOs) at the recommendation of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee since they were really duplicated in our individual Program Learning Outcomes.

We made changes to all of our PLOs. We made these revisions to bring the PLOs into closer alignment with what we are actually doing in our current instruction, with the key concepts we wanted to retain from our DLOs, and to embed all five WASC Core Competencies into the language of our PLOs. Changes to the existing PLOs are indicated in bold, WASC Core Competencies in red, and Bloom's Taxonomy in multicolor.

Alignment of our Program Learning Outcomes to Institutional Learning Outcomes are 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 updated our Differentiated Curriculum Maps to reflect the revisions made to our PLOs. No other changes were made.

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.

We also expanded the Senior Literature Portfolio to include one new assignment to directly assess PLO 1. With this addition all PLOs will be directly assessed in the Senior Literature Portfolio and/or in stand-alone key assignments in courses from 2013-14 forward. A student focus group was used to design the key assignment to assess PLO 1. Their input was excellent and the exchange of ideas very rewarding.

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

NEW

- 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 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.

CONTINUED

- 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.
- For PLOs 2 & 3: The ETS Field Test in Literature.

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 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. Bettina Tate Pedersen, Fall section (August-December 2013), and by Dr. James Wicks, Spring section (January-May 2014). 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 posted on LIVETEXT. You may see that rubric and the evaluated literary analyses on LIVETEXT for LIT 250 sec. 1 Fall 2013 and LIT 250 sec. 1 Spring 2014. A copy of that ***LIT 250 Literary Analysis Rubric*** is also posted in the **EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING** portion of our Assessment Wheel.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS for LITERARY ANALYSIS were as follows:

- 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 2013-14 Totals*** in section six below. Results are also posted in the **EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING** portion of our Assessment Wheel.

PERFORMANCE TARGET for FINAL EXAM for each student was a score of 70% or higher. For results please see the ***Results Grid LIT 250 Final Exam 2013-14 Totals*** in section six below. Results are also posted in the **EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING** portion of our Assessment Wheel.

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 both courses and gave and assessed the key assignment.

Our performance target for each student on the key assignment was a score of 80% or higher. For results please see the **Results Grid LIT 250 Final Exam 2013-14 Totals** in section six below. Results are also posted in the **EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING** portion of our Assessment Wheel.

The results for all students in both classes on the key assignment are reported 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. Carol Blessing. 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 2, 2014 and the Senior Literature Portfolios submitted and assessed at the end of spring semester 2014.

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. 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 SENIOR PORTFOLIO were as follows:

PERFORMANCE TARGETS						
Key Assignment	Information Literacy	Written Communication	Critical Thinking	Integrative Learning	Lifelong Learning	Local Linguistics Rubric
Linguistics Essay	--	--	--	--	--	80%
Reflective Essay	--	--	--	87.50% (selected criteria)	81.25% (selected criteria)	--
Upper Division Paper	80% (average)	80% (average)	--	--	--	--
LIT 495 Major Paper	--	85% (average)	85% (average)	--	--	--

INDIRECT MEANS OF ASSESSMENT: The indirect means of assessment was our Graduating Senior/Alumni Survey. Our survey is sent to graduating seniors and alumni via a link to a Qualtrics Survey during the summer. We revised the survey to include the revised Program Learning Outcome, to adjust one survey area, to add one question in the Post-Graduation Outcomes section, and to prune and revise the survey overall. 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. (Beginning in 2014-15 we will no longer be surveying the Department Learning Outcomes, because we decided as a department, at the recommendation of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, to eliminate them.)

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 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.

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 for both sections of LIT 250 (Fall 2013, Spring 2014) and rubric scores for those essays were determined by Drs. Pedersen and Wicks. Scores were compiled in the **Results Grid LIT 250 Literary Analysis 2013-14 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— both Literature and Writing 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 (*This target replaces our previous group average target. This change was made in consultation with Greg Crow about what would be the better, more statistically valuable measure.*)

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

- 70.8% (or 17 of 24) of all LIT 250 students met the 3% Individual Performance Target; 29.1% (or 7 of 24) did not. We met our overall performance target for all students taking LIT 250.
- **Disaggregated Results for Literature Program:** 10 out of 24 LIT 250 students were Literature majors or minors. Of these ten, seven students (70%) met the individual goal of a 3% improvement in their ability to write literary analysis. Three students (30%) did not. We met our overall performance target in the Literature Program.

TABLE 1 Results Grid LIT 250 Literary Analysis 2013-14 Totals (Also posted in the EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING portion of our Assessment Wheel)

LIT 250: Introduction to the Study of Literature Spring 2014						
Finding	M/F	Major	First Literary Analysis	Final Literary Analysis	Difference	3% Improvement Target Met
1	M	WRI	93%	96%	3%	Y
2	M	WRI	68%	71%	3%	Y
3	F	WRI	75%	82%	7%	Y
4	M	WRI	68%	71%	3%	Y
5	F	LIT-EE	93%	100%	7%	Y
6	F	WRI	89%	95%	6%	Y
7	F	LIT-LIT & SPA	87%	96%	9%	Y
8	F	SPA	89%	96%	7%	Y
9	F	LIT	89%	89%	0%	N
10	M	LIT	79%	82%	3%	Y
11	F	CRS-DSC TCH ED (BRIT LIT MINOR)	92%	92%	0%	N
12	F	CRS-DSC TCH ED	79%	86%	7%	Y
13	M	WRI & PHIL/THE	65%	95%	30%	Y
14	F	WRI	79%	75%	-4%	N
15	F	LIT-LIT	89%	92%	3%	Y
16	M	LIT-EE	79%	92%	13%	Y
17	M	WRI	75%	68%	-7%	N
18	F	LIT	85%	90%	5%	Y
19	F	LIT-EE	97%	86%	-11%	N
20	F	WRI	86%	82%	-4%	N
21	F	LIT	88%	92%	4%	Y
22	F	WRI	68%	88%	20%	Y
23	F	WRI	85%	89%	4%	Y
24	F	WRI	68%	68%	0%	N
			82.5%	87.0%	4.5%	

FINAL EXAM ALL SCORES: Each student in LIT 250 completed a comprehensive final exam at the end of the semester (Fall 2013, Spring 2014). Drs. Pedersen (in Fall 2013) and Wicks (in Spring 2014) administered the LIT 250 Final Exam. These scores are recorded in the **Results Grid LIT 250 Final Exam 2013-14 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 all 24 students.

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

LIT 250: Introduction to the Study of Literature Final Exam 2013-2014				
Finding	M/F	Major	Final Exam	70% Performance Target Met
1	M	WRI	80%	Y
2	M	WRI	78%	Y
3	F	WRI	87%	Y
4	M	WRI	71%	Y
5	F	LIT-EE	87%	Y
6	F	WRI	83%	Y
7	F	LIT-LIT & SPA	91%	Y
8	F	SPA	74%	Y
9	F	LIT	85%	Y
10	M	LIT	84%	Y
11	F	CRS-DSC TCH ED	85%	Y
12	F	CRS-DSC TCH ED	78%	Y
13	M	WRI & PHIL/THE	80%	Y
14	M	WRI	81%	Y
15	F	LIT-LIT	81%	Y
16	M	LIT-EE	77%	Y
17	M	WRI	86%	Y
18	F	LIT	78%	Y
19	F	LIT-EE	83%	Y
20	F	WRI	73%	Y
21	F	LIT	78%	Y
22	F	WRI	71%	Y
23	F	WRI	79%	Y
24	F	WRI	77%	Y
			80.2% (Class Average Score)	100% Met Target

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

LIT 250 Literary Analysis and Final Exam Averages				
	First Literary Analysis	Final Literary Analysis	% of Students Meeting 3% Individual Improvement Target on Literary Analysis	Final Exam
2011-12	77.9%	87%	80.7% (21 of 26)	83.1%
2012-13	84%	89%	75.0% (18 of 24)	83.0%
2013-14	82.5%	87%	70.8% (17 of 24)	80.2%
2014-15				
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 2013-14 show the following:

- Ten students met the individual performance target; nine did not.
- Only 52.6% of all linguistics students met the individual target; thus we did not meet our overall performance target.

TABLE 4 Multi-year Results Grid LIN 312 & LIN 365 (Also posted in the EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING portion of our Assessment Wheel)

Key Assignment - Linguistics (LIN 312 & 365) Academic Year 2013-14					
Finding	Status	Major	LIN Course	Score	Met Target of 80% on Local Rubric
1	PRE-SR	WRI	365	100	Yes
2	SR	WRI	312	60	No
3	PRE-SR	WRI	365	55	No
4	PRE-SR	LIT-EE	365	97	Yes
5	SR	LIT-EE	312	66	No
6	SR	LIT-LIT	312	73	No
7	PRE-SR	LIT-LIT	312	62	No
8	PRE-SR	WRI	312	62	No
9	PRE-SR	WRI	312	69	No
10	PRE-SR	LIT-LIT	312	65	No
11	PRE-SR	LIT-LIT	312	97	Yes
12	PRE-SR	WRI	365	66	No
13	PRE-SR	LIT-LIT	365	63	No
14	SR	WRI	365	87	Yes
15	PRE-SR	LIT-EE	312	86	Yes
16	PRE-SR	LIT-EE	365	86	Yes
17	PRE-SR	WRI	365	83	Yes
18	SR	WRI	312	80	Yes
19	SR	WRI	312	83	Yes

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 May 2014. 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 2014. 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.

Test scores reported for 2014 show the following results on our performance targets:

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

FINDING	TOTAL SCALED SCORE (OF 200)	TOTAL SCALED SCORE MEAN	SUBSCORE 1 LIT. PRE 1901 (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 HIST/ID (OF 100)	SUBSCORE 4 SCALED SCORE MEAN
1	158	154.7	56	54.3	61	54.5	54	54.6	56	53.9
2	182	154.7	73	54.3	97	54.5	76	54.6	81	53.9
3	168	154.7	65	54.3	71	54.5	59	54.6	74	53.9
4	172	154.7	74	54.3	66	54.5	66	54.6	71	53.9
5	191	154.7	88	54.3	92	54.5	91	54.6	86	53.9

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 assignment in the 2013-14 Senior Portfolio show the following:

- 100% of students met the target on the Upper Division Research Paper for Information Literacy
- 100% of students met the target on the Upper Division Research Paper for Written Communication
- 80% of students met the target on the LIT 495 Research Paper for Written Communication
- 100% of students met the target on the LIT 495 Research Paper for Critical Thinking
- 80% 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

We had strong success in achieving the targets we set for student performance in the Senior Portfolio this year. Only one student did not meet the target in Written Communication on the LIT 495 Research Paper, and only one student did not meet the target in Integrative Learning on the Reflective Essay. As this was the first year of implementing the Reflective Essay Key Assignment, there was some confusion in the roll out of this new assignment which may have contributed to the one student not taking the assignment as seriously as s/he might have done. The results are collected and summarized in Tables 5 and 6 below.

TABLE 5 Senior Literature Portfolio Results Grid 2013-14 Totals (Also posted in the EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING portion of our Assessment Wheel)

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	M	89	Y	85	Y	89	Y	90	Y	92	Y	94	Y
2	F	96	Y	94	Y	90	Y	93	Y	95	Y	91	Y
3	F	98	Y	90	Y	94	Y	91	Y	100	Y	100	Y
4	M	85	Y	90	Y	91	Y	90	Y	77	N	81	Y
5	M	88	Y	85	Y	83	N	86	Y	94	Y	94	Y

TABLE 6 Senior Literature Portfolio Performance Target Grid 2013-14 (Also posted in the EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING portion of our Assessment Wheel)

Senior Portfolio Piece	AAC&U Rubric	Individual Performance Target	% Meeting Target	% Not Meeting Target
Upper Division Research Paper	Information Literacy	80%	100%	0
Upper Division Research Paper	Written Communication	80%	100%	0
LIT 495 Research Paper	Written Communication	85%	80%	20%
LIT 495 Research Paper	Critical Thinking	85%	100%	0
Reflective Essay	Integrative Learning	87.50%	80%	20%
Reflective Essay	Lifelong Learning	81.25%	100%	100%

C. Our Literature Survey was sent to alums in June 2014. We sent surveys to alums from 2004-2014. Once the survey window closes, we will compile that data in a Literature Survey Report to be added to this report and posted on the Evidence of Student Learning portion of our Assessment Wheel. Survey data will be discussed and analyzed in our first Literature Section Meeting of 2014-15.

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.

No formal APC proposals for curricular changes were submitted for the Literature Program during 20114.

As a result of our assessment work and evaluation from 2013-14 and from needs or mandates that arose in 2013-14, we made and implemented the following changes in our assessment work this academic year 2013-14.

1. Revised Graduating Seniors/Alumni Survey to correct errors in survey questions and logistics
2. 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
3. Revised Senior Literature Portfolio Assignment Guidelines sheet
4. Added the Linguistics Prompt in Dr. Phil Bowles' second linguistics course this year
5. Created a new Key Assignment for the Senior Portfolio to assess PLO 1 and used a Student Focus Group to help us design this assignment and select the two AAC&U rubrics to be used to assess it
6. Confirmed a routine calibration and assessment meeting to assess all Senior Literature Portfolios during or immediately following finals week 2014.
7. Assessed all Senior Literature Portfolios
8. Reviewed assessment results of Senior Literature Portfolios in a debriefing meeting after assessment is complete and before faculty depart for summer
9. Embedded WASC Core Competencies into the language of our PLOs, and added competencies that were missing (Oral Communication, Quantitative Reasoning/Literacy)

10. Added to our Assessment Plan and indication of formative or summative for our key assignments
11. Created Google Drive documents to facilitate and streamline annual revisions to our assessment practices
12. Created a Google Drive document for tracking the post-graduation outcomes (graduate school acceptance rates and employment) of our alums and have begun collecting data
13. Drafted a tentative plan for our redesign of the Literature major (LIT-LIT & LIT-EE) in response to our ongoing Program Review and to university prioritization decisions.
14. Complete revisions to our web pages and presence that feature employability and student testimonials for Literature majors

We know that we want to take the following actions in 2014-15:

1. Review the Annual Assessment Report, the ETS Field Test Results and Report, and our Literature Program Survey results at our opening Literature Section meeting in August.
2. Determine final curricular changes for the Literature major and minor/s to be proposed in our Program Review Self-Study Report.
3. Draft APC Proposals for curricular changes to the Literature major or minor and submit these as part of our Program Review Self-Study Report and to APC. (APC deadlines are
 - **October 10**-Abstract to APC for curricular proposals
 - **November 7**-Last Day to submit curricular proposals to APC
4. Continue revisions to our web pages to best feature employability and student testimonials for Literature majors.
5. Continue to populate our Google Drive document, "LJML Grad School and Employment Rates for Alums" for tracking the post-graduation outcomes

The results we gathered from LIT 250 and LIT 495 were primarily gathered and compiled by Bettina Pedersen, James Wicks, and Carol Blessing, and will be shared with the Literature Section faculty via the annual Assessment Report during our August 2014 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 2014-15.

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

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

SENIOR LITERATURE PORTFOLIO 2013-14

GUIDELINES & ASSIGNMENTS

This assignment is part of the LJML assessment of the Literature and English Education programs.

Please submit a portfolio from your courses here in LJML, consisting of the following three papers:

1. **ASSIGNMENT 1**: Final Research Paper from an Upper Division Literature Course
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 doing this.

ASSIGNMENT ONE: SENIOR PORTFOLIO: UPPER DIVISION LITERATURE RESEARCH PAPER

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

Longer essay, 10 to 12 pages, journal quality

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.

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.

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

This essay will be part of your Senior Literature Portfolio. It will be assessed based on the AAC&U Critical Thinking and Written Communication VALUE Rubrics.

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

Reflective Essay—Senior Portfolio Piece

This personal essay is part of your Senior Portfolio but is not be part of your coursework in LIT 495. It is the key assignment to assess the Literature Program Learning Outcome #1 and asks you to reflect on all your years of study as a literature major:

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.

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 greyed-out criteria)
 - b. Foundation Skills for Lifelong Learning (excluding greyed-out criteria)
7. **Submission:**
 - a. Any time before Commencement Day, May 5, 2014
 - b. Please submit on **Live Text** in your LIT 495 class. The assignment is posted there.
8. **Our Thanks**
 - a. Thank you for taking the time to write this personal essay.
 - b. We so look forward to reading your reflection!