

Institutional Effectiveness Report

Name of Program/Department:	BA/Liberal Arts Program
Year	2016-2017
Name of Preparer:	<i>Shawn R. Smolen-Morton</i>

Program Mission

The mission of the Liberal Arts Program is to introduce students to their literary and linguistic heritage and acquaint them with a variety of genres, periods, themes, critical approaches, and individual writers ranging from ancient to modern. Courses in creative and expository writing, composition theory, the history of the language, modern theories of grammar, film studies, and literary criticism are also offered. Students may also earn either a minor or a collateral in English.

Program Learning Outcomes

PLO 1.0 Demonstrate knowledge of a variety of critical approaches for studying and appreciating literature.

PLO 2.0 Understand how to research key aspects of literature and the producing cultures.

PLO 3.0 Demonstrate knowledge of American and British literary heritage.

PLO 4.0 Understand how literature is crafted in a variety of genres and across periods.

PLO 5.0 Demonstrate knowledge of individual writers ranging from ancient to modern.

PLO 6.0 Apply knowledge about literature and exercise an array of critical skills using effective communication.

Executive Summary

For the 2016-2017 academic year, the English department's curriculum committee and professors teaching in the major assessed four Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the Liberal Arts Program. The four SLO's were assessed directly (SLO a) by scoring student papers against a rubric (see Appendix 2), and indirectly (SLO b) with students' responses to a questionnaire. Results are discussed in Appendix 1.

The department's four SLO's are:

SLO 1.0: Ability to Read Texts Critically

SLO 2.0: Ability to Synthesize External Sources in Documented Writing

SLO 3.0: Ability to Demonstrate how literary texts both shape and are shaped by
the cultures around them

SLO 4.0: Ability to Determine a Text's Context

The benchmark for each SLO measured directly was 2.5, using the Score Point Indicators (rubrics) in Appendix 2. This number indicates a point between fully satisfying the SLO (a 3 score) and partially satisfying the SLO (a 2 score).

On average for SLO 1.0 (a.), students' ability to read texts critically dropped 9% from 3.14 (78.5% in 2015/2016) to 2.83 (70%). Our target was 2.5; so, the target was achieved.

For SLO 2 (a.), students' ability to synthesize and document sources, the derived score of 2.25 (56.25%) did not meet our target of 2.5. This year's score represents an 11% drop from last year's derived score of 2.68 (67%).

For SLO 3 (a.), students' ability to understand how texts interact with cultures increased from 2.89 (2015/2016) to 2.94 (+2% change). This average exceeded the 2.5 target and demonstrated a slight improvement over the previous year.

For SLO 4 (a.), students' ability to understand the context around a text improved very slightly from 2.78 (2015/2016) to 2.85 (+3.0% change). The department exceeded the 2.5 target and demonstrated a modest improvement over the previous year.

The department's chair and curriculum committee have developed seven action items, and in Fall 2017, the department will discuss and act on the Spring 2017 assessment.

For a second year, the questions added to the department's exit survey provide baseline data for a new, indirect method for assessing our SLO's ("b").

Four writing majors responded to this survey, and their responses are included, when applicable, to the general English curriculum. With these two sets of data, the department plans to set a benchmark for these indirect measurements of the four SLO's.

For SLO 1.0 (b.), students responded to this statement: “My English courses have helped me learn how to read literary texts more closely and critically.” 23 out of 28 (82%) strongly agreed, and 5 out of 28 (18%) agreed. No student disagreed. This result improves on last year’s “strongly agree” average of 72.7%.

For SLO 2 (b.), students responded to this statement: “My English courses have helped me learn how to find and evaluate sources to support my arguments about literary texts.” 20 out of 26 (77%) strongly agreed, and 6 out of 26 (23%) agreed. No student disagreed. This result improves on last year’s “strongly agree” average of 72.7%.

For SLO 3 (b.), students responded to this statement: “My English courses have helped me learn how to understand a text in its historical and cultural context.” 19 out of 27 (70%) strongly agreed, and 8 out of 27 (30%) agreed. No student disagreed. This result is about the same as last year’s “strongly agree” average of 72.7%.

For SLO 4 (b.), students responded to this statement: “My English courses have helped me learn how to see how literature serves a purpose beyond the purely aesthetic and helps define cultural and personal identities.” 22 out of 27 (81%) strongly agreed, and 5 out of 27 (19%) agreed. No student disagreed. This result improves on last year’s “strongly agree” average of 72.7%.

Narrative Summary

Two and a half years ago, the English Department implemented a new curriculum for the English Major, Liberal Arts Program. Additionally, the Department’s assessment of that program had not been significantly revised in at least a decade. For these reasons, the Curriculum/Liberal Arts Advisory Committee (CLAAC) undertook to review and revise the assessment model in Fall 2014. The Department approved the new assessment model and procedures on 22 March 2016. CLAAC and the Department are creating the culture and practices to implement the new assessment in Fall 2016. See the Appendix for 3. Assessment Revision Overview, 4. Portfolio Assessment Procedures, and 5. Portfolio Assessment. The new assessment model and the revised SLO’s will be piloted in Spring 2018.

Student Learning Outcomes

SLO 1.0 (a.) Skills Outcome: Ability to READ Texts Critically. In one revised essay from an upper division literature course, students will DEMONSTRATE an ability to UNDERSTAND literary texts in original and personal ways and be able to DISCUSS literary works beyond a simple reporting of what professional critics have already said. Ideally, students will demonstrate understanding of aesthetic and thematic implications of literary works and be able to make defensible critical judgments about them. On average, students should score 2.5 or above on the 4 point scale, where the department set the benchmark at 2.5.

SLO 1.0 (b.) Opinion Outcome: Perceptions of the ability to READ Texts Critically. Students will respond to the statement “My English courses have helped me learn how to read literary texts more closely and critically.” In Fall 2017, the department will set a benchmark and target for this SLO.

SLO 2.0 (a.) Skills Outcome: Ability to SYNTHESIZE External Sources in Documented Writing. In one revised essay from an upper division literature course, students will DEMONSTRATE the ability to USE CONVENTIONS of documentation and INTEGRATE BORROWED IDEAS AND QUOTATIONS gracefully into their own writing. On average, students should score 2.5 or above on the 4 point scale, where the department set the benchmark at 2.5.

SLO 2.0 (b.) Opinion Outcome: Perceptions of the ability to SYNTHESIZE External Sources in Documented Writing. Students will respond to the statement: “My English courses have helped me learn how to find and evaluate sources to support my arguments about literary texts.” In Fall 2017, the department will set a benchmark and target for this SLO.

SLO 3.0 (a.) Skills Outcome: Ability to DEMONSTRATE how literary texts both shape and are shaped by the cultures around them. In one revised essay from an upper division literature course, students’ writing will COMMUNICATE awareness that literature serves a purpose beyond the purely aesthetic and helps

define cultural and personal identities. On average, students should score 2.5 or above on the 4 point scale, where the department set the benchmark at 2.5.

SLO 3.0 (b.) Opinion Outcome: Perceptions of the ability to DEMONSTRATE how literary texts both shape and are shaped by the cultures around them. Students will respond to the statement: “My English courses have helped me learn how to see how literature serves a purpose beyond the purely aesthetic and helps define cultural and personal identities.” In Fall 2017, the department will set a benchmark and target for this SLO.

SLO 4.0 (a.) Knowledge Outcome: Ability to DETERMINE a Text’s Context. In one revised essay from an upper division literature course, students will DEVELOP A SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE of literary history and tradition to DEMONSTRATE an AWARENESS of the social, artistic, and intellectual climate in which literary works have been written and read. On average, students should score 2.5 or above on the 4 point scale, where the department set the benchmark at 2.5.

SLO 4.0 (b.) Opinion Outcome: Perceptions of the ability to DETERMINE a Text’s Context. Students will respond to the statement: “My English courses have helped me learn how to understand a text in its historical and cultural context.” In Fall 2017, the department will set a benchmark and target for this SLO.

Assessment Methods

1. Through the capstone course, English 496, English Liberal Arts majors revise one major paper from a previous upper division English class, bearing in mind the four Student Learning Outcomes. Papers from 24 graduating seniors were assessed in order to evaluate directly Student Learning Outcomes 1.0 (a.), 2.0 (a.), 3 (a.) and 4 (a.), using the Score Point Indicators (rubrics) in Appendix 1.

2. Fourteen English professors who taught at least one course in the major for 2016/2017 scored the papers. Each reader scored every paper for one Student Learning Outcome, and each SLO was read by two readers for direct assessment.
3. The benchmark for the directly measured SLO's has been 2.5 for at least the last fifteen years. This number indicates a point between fully satisfying the SLO (a 3 score) and partially satisfying the SLO (a 2 score).
4. Each Student Learning Outcome is measured indirectly through the department's exit survey. Students respond to a statement of each outcome with "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," or "strongly disagree." During an exit interview conducted after the survey with the capstone professor, students are invited to make follow-up or clarifying comments about the SLO's.

Assessment Results

SLO 1.0 (a.) Skills Outcome: Ability to Read Texts Critically. In one revised essay from an upper division literature course, students DEMONSTRATED an ability to UNDERSTAND literary texts in original and personal ways and be able to DISCUSS literary works beyond a simple reporting of what professional critics have already said. Students DEMONSTRATED AN understanding of aesthetic and thematic implications of literary works and were able to make defensible critical judgments about them. With an average score of 2.83 out of a possible 4.0, this target was achieved.

For SLO 1.0 (b.), students responded to this statement: "My English courses have helped me learn how to read literary texts more closely and critically." 23 out of 28 (82%) strongly agreed, and 5 out of 28 (18%) agreed. No student disagreed. This result improves on last year's "strongly agree" average of 72.7%. The department will set a target and benchmark for this SLO in in fall 2017.

SLO 2.0 (a.) Skills Outcome: Ability to Synthesize External Sources in Documented Writing. In one revised essay from an upper division literature course, not enough students DEMONSTRATED the ability to USE CONVENTIONS of documentation and INTEGRATED BORROWED IDEAS AND QUOTATIONS gracefully into their own writing. With an average score of 2.25 out of a possible 4.0, this target was not achieved.

For SLO 2.0 (b.), when asked if courses in the major have helped them learn how to find and evaluate sources to support arguments about literary texts, 20 of 26 (77%) students strongly agreed and the remainder, 6 of 26 agreed. The department will set a target and benchmark for this SLO in in fall 2017.

SLO 3.0 (a.) Skills Outcome: Ability to Demonstrate how literary texts both shape and are shaped by the cultures around them. In one revised essay from an upper division literature course, students' writing COMMUNICATED awareness that literature serves a purpose beyond the purely aesthetic and helps define cultural and personal identities. With an average score of 2.89 out of a possible 4.0, this target was achieved.

For SLO 3.0 (b.), when asked if courses in the major have helped them learn how to understand a text in its historical and cultural context, 19 of 27 (70%) students strongly agreed and the remainder, 8 of 27 agreed.

SLO 4.0 (a.) Knowledge Outcome: Ability to determine a Text's Context. In one revised essay from an upper division literature course, students DEVELOPED A SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE of literary history and tradition to DEMONSTRATE an AWARENESS of the social, artistic, and intellectual climate in which literary works have been written and read. With an average score of 2.85 out of a possible 4.0, this target was achieved.

For SLO 4.0 (b.), when asked if courses in the major have helped them learn how to see how literature serves a purpose beyond the purely aesthetic and helps define cultural and personal identities, 22 of 27 (81%) students strongly agreed and the remainder, 5 of 27 agreed.

Action Items

Planned Actions for Academic Year 2017-18 to address the 2016-2017 IE Report

SLO 2.0 (a.) Ability to Synthesize External Sources in Documented Writing.

1. Include a score of NA (not applicable or not appropriate). Many essays receive a score of 1 (lowest) because those essays have no sources. Apparently, these essays were revised during capstone from assignments that did not originally ask for sources.
2. Require students to revise essays for capstone that already have a research component.
3. Emphasize in capstone, the requirements of this student learning outcome.
4. Ask the department to strengthen and expand instruction for research methods and documentation format in the discipline. In the exit interviews, several students noted that research methods and documentation format are not systematically covered in foundation courses, specifically ENG 300, Foundations for Literary Studies.

SLO 3.0 (a.) Ability to Demonstrate how literary texts both shape and are shaped by the cultures around them and SLO 4.0 (a) Ability to determine a Text's Context.

1. Emphasize to faculty the importance of cultural context in some student research papers.
2. Consider an NA score for essays not addressing a literary work's context.
3. In capstone, direct students to select papers that, at least in part, report and analyze cultural context.

Appendices: 1. Assessment Results Discussion; 2. Score Point Indicators for Student Learning Outcomes; 3. Assessment Revision Overview; 4. Portfolio Assessment Procedures; and 5. Portfolio Assessment.

1. Assessment Results Discussion

For SLO 1.0 (a.), students' critical reading skills just met the target (2.5) with an average of 2.83 (70.75%). Last year's average (3.14) exceeded the target, a year after the department took action to raise faculty awareness of this goal. Out of 48 total scores (24 papers read twice by two different faculty members), 17 scores were a 4, 11 scores were a 3, 15 scores were a 2, and 2 scores were a 1. 18 out of 24 papers (75%) received an average score of 2.5 or higher. Thus, the target was met.

Students' use of sources was poor for SLO 2.0 (a.), with an average score of 2.25 out of a possible 4.0 (56.25%). There were 9 scores of 4, 11 scores of 3, 11 scores of 2 and 17 scores of 1. The target, 2.5, was not met. This means that only 12 out of 24 (50%) students demonstrated command of sources when making an argument. Since the target was not met, the Department will address this deficiency.

For SLO 3.0 (a.), students understood how texts interact with cultures, with an average score of 2.94 out of a possible 4.0 (73.5%), meeting last year's average score of 2.89. There were 18 scores of 4, 12 scores of 3, 15 scores of 2 and 3 scores of 1. The target, 2.5, was met and slightly exceeded. This means that 17 out of 24 papers (70.8%) received an average score of 2.5 or higher.

With an average score of 2.85 out of a possible 4.0 (71.25%) for SLO 4.0 (a.), students were able to determine a text's context most of the time. There were 16 scores of 4, 9 scores of 3, 14 scores of 2 and 9 scores of 1. The target, 2.5, was met and slightly exceeded. However, only 15 out of 24 papers (62.5%) received an average score of 2.5 or higher. This is a case where the calculation of the old benchmark can be misleading. The fact that almost 48% of the students' papers did not meet the benchmark will be shared with the department for guidance.

The wording of the survey question for SLO 4.0 (b) does not correspond well with the SLO's definition. The department will revise the question for 2017/2018.

2. Score Point Indicators for Student Learning Outcomes

SLO 1.0 (a.) Skills Outcome: Ability to Read Texts Critically.

Score 4: Sophisticated and original argument; balances that argument with source material; expands on--rather than repeats--source material.

Score 3: Perhaps too much survey of critical material, or a synthesis of pre-existing/pre-fabricated ideas/principles. Somewhat divergent from primary text; overemphasizes critical material to the detriment of primary text.

Score 2: Relies too heavily on plot summary; disappears too frequently (or too far) behind source material; argument itself more obvious than original.

Score 1: Primary plot summary; argument proceeds mechanically/predictably; argument even more obvious than original.

SLO 2.0 (a.) Skills Outcome: Ability to Synthesize External Sources in Documented Writing.

Score 4: No errors in MLA format; proper mixture of quote/paraphrase, smooth attribution and lead-ins; connections between differing sources; clear differentiation between external source ideas and writer's ideas.

Score 3: No errors in MLA format; at least some attempt at attribution in citation introduction; solid support for thesis.

Score 2: Some minor errors in MLA format; insertion of cited material not always smooth or appropriate.

Score 1: Errors in MLA format; insufficient quantity or quality of support material, abrupt or awkward insertion of cited material.

SLO 3.0 (a.) Skills Outcome: Ability to demonstrate how literary texts both shape and are shaped by the cultures around them.

Score 4: The student is conspicuously able to find significance in a literary text. The student engages with a text's cultural or historical ramifications, with substantial depth and quality of thought. The commentary is pertinent and insightful. Establishing something important to discuss, the student rises well above mechanical response to assignment and obvious matters of fact and plot.

Score 3: The student demonstrates with some skill that a literary text has cultural or historical implications. The writing is not bound to mechanical assignment matters alone, but rises above factual summary to pertinent commentary. The student conveys a fairly original awareness of literature's importance as a cultural production.

Score 2: The student shows basic, somewhat limited ability to see something of importance in literature. Insights into cultural or historical ramifications may be unoriginal, predictable, or rehashed. More attention is focused on satisfying mechanical aspects of assignment than on developing ideas in depth. Literature seems regarded primarily as a classroom exercise.

Score 1: The student has difficulty rising above the level of obvious fact and summary to sense any wider significance in the text. The response to the text is narrow, perfunctory, or mechanical, as if the discussion occurs only because the assignment made it occur. The writing is assignment-bound in a very limited way, and resists engagement with cultural or historical significance. Literature is rendered trivial.

SLO 4.0 (a.) Knowledge Outcome: Ability to Determine a Text's Context.

Score 4: The context is clearly delineated and fully integrated into the thesis.

Score 3: References to the context are clear but are not well developed or integrated into the paper. The contextual elements do not drive the thesis.

Score 2: Paper has superficial or passing reference to the context in which the work was composed and/or received.

Score 1: Paper has no contextual references or has inappropriate references.

3. Assessment Revision Overview

Resolved to assess only the English Major, Liberal Arts Program.

Proposed to revise the "Program Goals," renamed Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's).

Currently the 4 SLO's would be expanded to 7 (4 Skills and 3 Knowledge).

Proposed to revise the Score Point Indicators for the new SLO's.

Proposed to revise the assessment model.

The current model has these components:

Exit Interview,

Exit Questionnaire,

Capstone essay read and scored by CLAAC.

The revised model would have these components:

Exit Interview,

Exit Questionnaire,

A portfolio of 6 essays from each student. Under CLAAC supervision, faculty

regularly teaching upper division literature courses score the portfolios.

4. Portfolio Assessment Procedures

- Assessment Process
 - Lit professors teaching English upper-level courses should be involved in assessment.
 - If the assessment was managed digitally, faculty could complete the assessment by a set deadline. The assessment does not need to be completed in a group during one sitting, as it is performed now.
 - Each portfolio should have three readers. This would likely mean that participating faculty would each read two or three portfolios.
 - A pre-meeting would need to be held to calibrate assessment procedures. A post-meeting would also need to be held to review the results.

- Collection Process
 - Papers should be uploaded by students in a continuous Blackboard class site.
 - Papers would need to be submitted at the end of each semester. Professors would need to require/strongly encourage students to upload their papers before the end of the class.

- Portfolios
 - Five different papers from the following list:
 1. Block 1 (Fundamentals/300-level courses)
 2. Blocks 2, 3, or 5 (British courses)
 3. Block 4 (American courses)
 4. One paper of students' choice from any block
 5. Another paper of students' choice from any block
 - From these five papers, **one** of these papers will be revised in capstone, and **one** paper included in the portfolio should have a strong theoretical component.
 - One reflection paper (to be completed in capstone with a directed prompt to reflect on the revised paper in addition to their work through the major)

2. Portfolio Assessment

I. Student Learning Outcomes

Skills Outcomes (to be assessed for the entire portfolio except the reflection paper)

- A. Ability to Analyze Texts Critically. The portfolio will demonstrate the student's ability to understand literary texts in original ways and be able to discuss literary works beyond a simple reporting of what professional critics have already said. Ideally, the student will demonstrate understanding of aesthetic and thematic implications of literary works and be able to make defensible critical judgments and construct coherent arguments.
- B. Ability to Synthesize External Sources in Documented Writing. The portfolio will demonstrate the student's ability to use conventions of documentation and integrate borrowed ideas and quotations gracefully into the student's own writing.
- C. Ability to Connect Literary Texts to their Contexts. The portfolio will communicate awareness that literature serves a purpose beyond the purely aesthetic and helps reflect and define cultural and personal identities.
- D. Ability to Apply Theory. The portfolio will demonstrate the student's ability to apply rhetorical, literary, and/or film theory in a textual analysis.

Knowledge Outcomes (items A, B, and C will be assessed for appropriate papers within the portfolio)

- A. Demonstrate specific knowledge of American Literature. The student will demonstrate a specific knowledge of a key writer, genre, movement or period in American Literature.

- B. Demonstrate specific knowledge of British Literature. The student will demonstrate a specific knowledge of a key writer, genre, movement or period in British Literature.
- C. Demonstrates a Broad Knowledge of American Literature, British Literature, or International Literature. The student's portfolio covers a range of canonical and non-canonical writers and texts across a broad range of American or British literature. Note: to be assessed with the portfolio as a whole.

II. Score Point Indicators

Skills Outcome A. Ability to Analyze Texts Critically.

The portfolio will demonstrate the student's ability to understand literary texts in original ways and be able to discuss literary works beyond a simple reporting of what professional critics have already said. Ideally, the student will demonstrate understanding of aesthetic and thematic implications of literary works and be able to make defensible critical judgments and construct coherent arguments.

Score 4: Excels. Sophisticated, original, and persuasive argument with a clear, debatable thesis; student's argument converses with source material; source material does not replace the student's argument.

Score 3: Satisfies the SLO. The student's argument and thesis engage the text critically but contain weaknesses in originality or persuasiveness; the argument frequently depends on or is replaced by plot summary and/or secondary sources.

Score 2: Partially satisfies the SLO. The student's argument proceeds mechanically/predictably, without a clear thesis, purpose, or direction; argument may follow the primary text's explicit meanings or the source's explicit arguments.

Score 1: Fails to satisfy the SLO. The student's argument does not contain a clear thesis and demonstrates a lack of knowledge about the text; plot and/or sources summary replaces all or almost all of the student's argument; there may be an argument, but the discussion is not supported by primary or secondary sources.

Skills Outcome B. Ability to Synthesize External Sources in Documented Writing.

The portfolio will demonstrate the student's ability to use conventions of documentation and integrate borrowed ideas and quotations gracefully into the student's own writing.

Score 4: Excels. Proper mixture of quote/paraphrase, smooth attribution and lead-ins; connections between differing sources; clear differentiation between external source ideas and writer's ideas. Sources support the argument well. The essay adheres to MLA documentation format.

Score 3: Satisfies the SLO. Attempts to cite and/or introduce sources in the essay and the Works Cited; significant but not complete support for thesis from sources; attribution for sources not always clear. The essay adheres to MLA documentation format.

Score 2: Partially satisfies the SLO. Insertion of cited material not always smooth or appropriate; writer's ideas and source's ideas often not effectively synthesized. MLA documentation format incomplete, often missing, or confusing.

Score 1: Fails to satisfy the SLO. Insufficient quantity or quality of support material; abrupt or awkward insertion of cited material; no distinction between student's argument and source material; paper's argument may be a plot or source summary, an unsupported argument, or a combination of the two.

Much of the MLA documentation *is* missing or incorrect. Works Cited is so poorly done that the citations are not comprehensible.

Skills Outcome C. Ability to Connect Literary Texts to their Contexts. The portfolio will communicate awareness that literature serves a purpose beyond the purely aesthetic and helps define cultural and personal identities. The student shows how literary texts both shape and are shaped by the cultures around them.

Score 4: Excels. The student's writing indicates an understanding of the social, political, or cultural context of the primary text(s).

Score 3: Satisfies the SLO. References to the social, political, or cultural context are clear but are not well developed or integrated into the paper.

Score 2: Partially satisfies the SLO. The student's writing has superficial or passing reference to the social, political, or cultural context of the primary text(s).

Score 1: Fails to satisfy the SLO. The student's writing has no contextual references or has inappropriate and/or inaccurate references.

Skills Outcome D. Ability to Apply Theory. The portfolio will demonstrate the student's ability to apply rhetorical, literary, and/or film theory in a textual analysis.

Score 4: Excels. The portfolio demonstrates a mature ability to apply at least one important perspective from literary, rhetorical, or film theory in a textual analysis. The student understands the theoretical approach and uses it appropriately to produce sophisticated insight about the text.

Score 3: Satisfies the SLO. The portfolio demonstrates an adequate ability to apply at least one important perspective from literary, rhetorical, or film theory in a textual analysis. The student mostly understands the theoretical approach and uses it appropriately to produce some insight about the text.

Score 2: Partially satisfies the SLO. The portfolio demonstrates a partial ability to apply at least one important perspective from literary, rhetorical, or film theory in a textual analysis. The student somewhat understands the theoretical approach and uses it unevenly or inadequately to produce limited insight about the text.

Score 1: Fails to satisfy the SLO. The portfolio demonstrates little or no ability to apply at least one important perspective from literary, rhetorical, or film theory in a textual analysis. The student fails to understand the theoretical approach and uses it inappropriately to produce facile insight about the text.

Knowledge Outcome A. Ability to Demonstrate Specific Knowledge of American Literature. The student will demonstrate a specific knowledge of a key writer, genre, movement or period in American Literature.

Score 4: Excels. The student's writing demonstrates a substantial, specific, and accurate knowledge of at least one key writer, genre, movement or period in American Literature. This knowledge is coherent, relevant, and well developed. Facts are not piled up or tossed together without synthesis. The student has clearly worked to understand one key writer, genre, movement or period in American Literature. The exploration is thorough and complete.

Score 3: Satisfies the SLO. The student's writing demonstrates some significant, largely specific, and fairly accurate knowledge of at least one key writer, genre, movement or period in American Literature. Some facts and/or accounts may be obvious, slightly inaccurate, or poorly synthesized. The exploration is usually thorough and largely complete

Score 2: Partially satisfies the SLO. The knowledge is piled up or tossed together without synthesis. The knowledge is often general and easily accessible from basic reference materials (i.e. an encyclopedia). Some facts are inaccurate or inadequate. Conclusions are vague and unpersuasive.

Score 1: Fails to satisfy the SLO. The student's writing fails to demonstrate specific knowledge of at least one key writer, genre, movement or period in American Literature. There is little to no effort to understand the subject. Many facts are inaccurate or inadequate. Conclusions are meaningless and unpersuasive.

[These score point indicators will be used for knowledge Outcome B.]

Knowledge Outcome C. Demonstrates a Broad Knowledge of American, British, or International Literature. The student will demonstrate a significant knowledge of writers and texts across a broad range of American, British, or International Literature.

Score 4: Excels. The student's writing demonstrates a significant knowledge of American, British, or International Literature. This knowledge is substantial, coherent, accurate and well developed. The portfolio covers cover a variety of literary periods, movements, significant authors and genres.

Score 3: Satisfies the SLO. The student's writing demonstrates a fairly significant knowledge of American, British, or International Literature. This knowledge is adequate, usually coherent, mostly accurate and well developed. The portfolio covers a variety of literary periods, movements, significant authors and genres, but there are gaps in two or three areas.

Score 2: Partially satisfies the SLO. Knowledge of American, British, or International Literature is limited to a few areas, but a broad knowledge is not evident. The knowledge is often general and easily accessible from basic reference materials (i.e. an encyclopedia).

Score 1: Fails to satisfy the SLO. The student's writing fails to demonstrate knowledge of even a few areas of American, British, or International Literature. There is little to no comprehension of periods, movements, significant authors and genres in one literature. The facts and descriptions are too general, too well known, or incorrect.