

Institutional Effectiveness Report

Name of Program/Department:	BA/Liberal Arts Program
Year	2017-2018
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 2017-2018 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 seventeen 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 6% from 2.83 (71% in 2016/2017) to 2.61 (65%). Our target was 2.5; so, we reached the target. In 2015/2016, the average was 3.14.

For SLO 2 (a.), students' ability to synthesize and document sources, the derived score increased 5.5% from 2.25 (56.25% in 2016/2017) to 2.47 (61.75%). This score did not meet our target of 2.5. In 2015/2016, the average was 2.68 (67%).

For SLO 3 (a.), students' ability to understand how texts interact with cultures, the derived score increased 7.5% from 2.94 (73.5% in 2016/2017) to 3.24 (81%). This score met our target of 2.5. In 2015/2016, the average was 2.89 (72.5%).

For SLO 4 (a.), students' ability to understand the context around a text improved 7.7% from 2.85 (71.3% in 2016/2017) to 3.16 (79.0%). The department exceeded the 2.5 target. In 2015/2016, the average was 2.78 (69.5%).

The department's chair and curriculum committee chair have developed seven action items for the department's curriculum committee to consider and develop in August 2018. The English department will discuss and act on the Spring 2018 assessment and recommended action items in September 2108.

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

With these three sets of data, the department will set a benchmark and target in September 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.” 15 out of 15 (100%) strongly agreed. No student disagreed. This result improves on last year’s “strongly agree” average of 82%.

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.” 13 out of 15 (86.7%) strongly agreed, and 2 out of 15 (13.3%) agreed. No student disagreed. This result improves on last year’s “strongly agree” average of 77%. During the exit interview and discussion of the survey, three students mentioned that more direct instruction for finding and using sources would be helpful.

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.” 14 out of 25 (93.3%) strongly agreed, and 1 out of 15 (6.7%) agreed. No student disagreed. This result improves on last year’s “strongly agree” average of 70%.

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.” 14 out of 25 (93.3%) strongly agreed, and 1 out of 15 (6.7%) agreed. No student disagreed. This result improves on last year’s “strongly agree” average of 70%.

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 launch 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 2018, 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 2018, 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 2018, 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 2018, 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 17 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. Twelve English professors who taught at least one course in the major for 2017/2018 scored the papers on 30 April 2018 from 3 to 5 PM: Doctors Clemons, Cowles, Edwins, Flannagan, Johnson, Marley, Miller, Rooks, Smolen-Morton, Tuttle, Washington, and Woosley-Goodman. 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 2.61 out of a possible 4.0, this target was achieved since the goal was 2.5.

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.” 15 out of 15 (100%) strongly agreed. No student disagreed. The department has not set a benchmark or a target for this survey, because it was administered for the third time this year.

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 2.47 out of a possible 4.0, this target was not achieved since the goal was 2.5.

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, 13 of 15 (86.7%) students strongly agreed and the remainder, 2 of 15 agreed. The department has not set a benchmark or a target for this survey, because it was administered for the second time this year.

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 3.25 out of a possible 4.0, this target was achieved since the goal was 2.5.

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, 14 of 15 (93.3%) students strongly agreed and the remainder, 1 of 15 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 3.16 out of a possible 4.0, this target was achieved since the goal was 2.5.

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, 14 of 15 (93.3%) students strongly agreed and the remainder, 1 of 15 agreed.

Action Items

A. Planned Actions for Academic Year 2018-19 to address the 2017-2018 IE Report

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

1. Require students to revise essays for capstone that already have a research component.
2. In capstone, emphasize the requirements of this student learning outcome.
3. After the success of the workshops for this SLO in Spring 2018, offer workshops for handling sources in the fall and spring semesters. Motivate every student to attend at least one workshop.

The new assessment model.

1. Review the new assessment model and expectations with English faculty.
2. Inform all English majors about the new assessment methods and expectations, including the revised Student Learning Outcomes (see Appendix). Use handouts and in-class presentations, instruction in capstone, and guidance in the Writing Center.
3. Set benchmarks and targets for the indirect assessment of the new SLO's. Revise these survey questions to reflect the wording and spirit of the new SLOs.
4. Determine how to incorporate the N/A scores into the calculations.

B. Actions Taken during the 2017-18 Academic Year

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

1. Included a score of NA (not applicable or not appropriate). Many essays received a score of 1 (lowest) because those essays have no sources. N/A was available but not used, because of the next action item.
2. Required students to revise essays for capstone that already have a research component.
3. Emphasized in capstone, the requirements of this student learning outcome.
4. The Writing Center presented two workshops for proper citation and integration of sources. Nine capstone students attended.

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. Emphasized to faculty the importance of cultural context in some student research papers.
2. Included an NA score for essays not addressing a literary work's context. This score was not used for SLO 3, but was marked four times for SLO 4.
3. In capstone, the instructor directed students to select papers that, at least in part, report and analyze cultural context.

VII. 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 benchmark (2.5) with an average of 2.61 (65.25%). Last year's average (2.83) exceeded the benchmark, a year after the department took action to raise faculty awareness of this goal.

Out of 34 total scores (17 papers read twice by two different faculty members), 11 scores were a 4, 5 scores were a 3, 12 scores were a 2, and 6 scores were a 1. 10 out of 17 papers (58.8%) received an average score of 2.5 or higher. Thus, the target was met, but the goal of continuous improvement was not. High scores by a few papers mask a real decreased performance in this SLO. Last year, 18 out of 24 papers (75%) received an average score of 2.5 or higher.

Students' use of sources was poor again for SLO 2.0 (a.), with an average score of 2.47 out of a possible 4.0 (61.75%). There were 7 scores of 4, 9 scores of 3, 11 scores of 2 and 7 scores of 1. The target, 2.5, was not met. Averaging the essays' two scores, only 9 out of 17 (53%) 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 3.24 out of a possible 4.0 (81%), improving last year's average score of 2.94. There were 16 scores of 4, 11 scores of 3, 6 scores of 2 and 1 score of 1. The target, 2.5, was met and exceeded. Considering the averages of each paper, 15 of the 17 essays averaged 2.5 or higher. These results demonstrate continuous improvement for SLO 3 (a).

With an average score of 3.16 out of a possible 4.0 (79%) for SLO 4.0 (a.), students were able to determine a text's context most of the time. There were 14 scores of 4, 9 scores of 3, 5 scores of 2 and 2 scores of 1. The target, 2.5, was met and exceeded. 11 out of 17 papers (64.7%) received an average score of 2.5 or higher. The new N/A score makes this result misleading. Removing the N/A papers, 11 of 13 essays met the 2.5 goal.

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 to 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.