<u>Learning Outcomes</u>
Students should be able to:

1. Demonstrate familiarity with and understanding of:
    a. British, American, and related traditions of literary history
    b. Major literary eras and works
    c. Literary genres and their conventions
    d. Literary terms and vocabulary
    e. Major critical theories and interpretive methods
    f. The means and ends of literary scholarship
2. Closely read literary texts, making effective use of the knowledge acquired under 1
3. Write clear and persuasive arguments, with appropriate use of literary evidence
4. Make effective use of oral communication and presentation techniques
5. Make effective use of works of literary criticism and scholarship in order to deepen the understanding of primary texts
    a. Conduct research using secondary sources
    b. Cite such sources correctly
6. Combine close reading, argumentative skills, and research in longer works of literary analysis

An Assessment Plan for the English Department, 2009-2019 (adopted 5/24/10)

The English Department adopted a set of Student Learning Outcomes in Spring 2008. It adopted a revised Major in Fall 2009. Our large goal for the coming assessment period is, therefore, to ensure that our Student Learning Outcomes are appropriately integrated with our new Major.

Our Assessment Plan needs two parts: i) a system for collection of evidence, and ii) a schedule for discussion and analysis of that evidence.

In order to collect evidence, we need to construct rubrics for each learning outcome and determine where we will assess for it. We should try, as far as possible, to use Comps and Senior Seminars as collection points.

Since the new Major is only on the books for rising juniors of the class of 2012, it makes sense that our immediate areas for analysis should be general rather than Major-specific, and that we should attempt, while assessing such areas, to ensure the proper integration of SLOs, rubrics, and the new major. Since we launch in Spring 2010 our first Senior Symposium, we start this year by examining SLO 4: oral presentation. We can return to this in Spring 2011, to assess the

immediate effect of any curricular changes we make. During the academic year 2010-11 a small subcommittee should work on revising the SLOs and assessment rubrics.

i)   Data Collection Points
Comps, Senior Symposium, Senior Exit Interviews, Senior Survey

ii)   Data Collection
2009-10 SLO#s 3, 4

iii)   Data Analysis
2009-10 SLO 4: Oral Presentation (Senior Symposium)
2010-11 SLO 4: a. Oral Presentation (Senior Symposium); b. Calibrate SLOs with New Major and Rubrics
2011-12 SLO 1. c: Genre (in the "Foundations" 100s and beyond)
2012 -13 SLO 1. a and b: Literary History (in the 200s and beyond)
2013-14 SLO 1. d, e, and f: Methods (in 295 and beyond)
2014-15 SLO 5: Use of criticism (in the 200s and beyond)
2015-16 SLO 6: Research (in the 300s)
2016-17 SLO 7: Longer papers (in 395)
2017-18 SLO 2: Close reading (100-400)
2018-19 SLO 3 Writing (400)

Colloquium Evaluation Rubric

Focus (SLO 3)	Demonstrates little to no ability to address a manageable literary, critical and/or theoretical question or problem	Does not clearly address a manageable literary, critical and/or theoretical question or problem	Addresses a literary, critical and/or theoretical question or problem	Successfully addresses a literary, critical and/or theoretical question or problem
Thesis (SLO 3)	Demonstrates little to no ability to articulate a cogent thesis in answer to this question or problem	Does not clearly articulate a cogent thesis in answer to this question or problem	Articulates a cogent thesis in answer to this question or problem	Articulates a cogent and insightful thesis in answer to this question or problem
Argument (SLO 3)	Demonstrates little to no ability to develop this thesis into a coherent argument	Does not fully develop this thesis into a coherent argument	Develops this thesis into a coherent argument	Develops this thesis into a coherent and illuminating argument
Evidence (SLO 3)	Argument is based upon insufficient evidence	Argument is based upon barely adequate evidence	Argument is based upon adequate evidence	Argument is based upon exceptional evidence
Analysis (SLO 2)	Demonstrates little to no ability to show the pertinence of such evidence by analysis, close reading, and/or careful exposition	Does not clearly show the pertinence of such evidence by analysis, close reading, and/or careful exposition	Shows the pertinence of such evidence by analysis, close reading, and/or careful exposition	Shows the pertinence of such evidence by sophisticated analysis, close reading, and/or careful exposition
Knowledge (SLO 1, 5)	Shows little to no command of relevant literary, critical, methodological and/or theoretical concepts and texts	Shows an adequate command of relevant literary, critical, methodological and/or theoretical concepts and texts	Shows a competent command of a broad range of relevant literary, critical, methodological and/or theoretical concepts and texts	Shows a sophisticated command of a broad range of relevant literary, critical, methodological and/or theoretical concepts and texts
Structure (SLO 3)	Paper does not exhibit an effective organizing structure	Paper inconsistently exhibits an effective organizing structure	Paper consistently exhibits an effective organizing structure	Paper clearly exhibits an extremely effective organizing structure
Writing (SLO 3)	Is poorly written	Is acceptably written	Is clearly written	Is precisely and/or eloquently written.
Editing (SLO 3)	Is heavily encumbered by mechanical error	Is often marked by mechanical error	Is largely free from mechanical error	Is almost entirely free from mechanical error

11/15/10

Creative Comps Evaluation Rubric

Creative Work

Vision	Displays little or no insight, originality, and/or sense of scope	Displays some insight or originality, and/or sense of scope	Displays considerable insight or originality, and/or sense of scope	Displays exceptional insight or originality, and/or sense of scope
Form (SLO 1)	Work demonstrates little to no command of relevant aesthetic forms	Work demonstrates adequate command of relevant aesthetic forms	Work demonstrates competence in handling relevant aesthetic forms	Work demonstrates mastery of relevant aesthetic forms
Style	Writing is of poor quality and lacks sophistication	Writing is of acceptable quality but may lack sophistication	Writing is competent but not exceptionally sophisticated	Writing is of high quality and sophistication
Structure	Work does not exhibit (an) effective structure(s)	Work inconsistently exhibits (an) organizing structure(s)	Work consistently exhibits (an) organizing structure(s)	Work clearly exhibits (an) extremely effective structure(s)
Editing	Is heavily encumbered by mechanical error	Is often marked by mechanical error	Is largely unencumbered by mechanical error	Is almost entirely unencumbered by mechanical error

Artist's Statement

Goal (SLO 1, 3)	Fails to clearly articulate a viable goal and rationale for the work	Adequately articulates a viable goal and rationale for the work	Clearly articulates a viable goal and rationale for the work	Clearly articulates a viable goal and compelling rationale for the work
Knowledge (SLO 1)	Shows little to no command of relevant aesthetic and critical concepts, texts, and contexts	Shows an adequate command of relevant aesthetic and critical concepts, texts, and contexts	Shows a competent command of relevant aesthetic and critical concepts, texts, and contexts	Shows a sophisticated command of relevant aesthetic and critical concepts, texts, and contexts
Writing (SLO 3)	Is poorly written	Is acceptably written	Is clearly written	Is precisely and/or eloquently written
Editing (SLO 3)	Is heavily encumbered by mechanical error	Is often marked by mechanical error	Is largely unencumbered by mechanical error	Is almost entirely unencumbered by mechanical error

11/15/10

Project Comps Evaluation Rubric

Project

Vision (SLO 1)	Displays little or no interdisciplinary insight, originality, and/or sense of scope	Displays some interdisciplinary insight or originality, and/or sense of scope	Displays considerable interdisciplinary insight or originality, and/or sense of scope	Displays exceptional interdisciplinary insight or originality, and/or sense of scope
Practice (SLO 1)	Interdisciplinary vision is inadequately realized within a medium	Interdisciplinary vision is adequately realized within a medium	Interdisciplinary vision is very effectively realized within a medium	Interdisciplinary vision is expertly realized within a medium
Form (SLO 1)	Work demonstrates little to no command of relevant aesthetic forms	Work demonstrates adequate command of relevant aesthetic forms	Work demonstrates competence in handling relevant aesthetic forms	Work demonstrates mastery of relevant aesthetic forms
Style	Work is of poor quality and lacks sophistication	Work is of acceptable quality but may lack sophistication	Work is competent but not exceptionally sophisticated	Work is of high quality and sophistication
Structure	Work does not exhibit (an) effective structure(s)	Work inconsistently exhibits (an) effective structure(s)	Work consistently exhibits (an) effective structure(s)	Work clearly exhibits (an) extremely effective structure(s)
Editing (where appropriate)	Is heavily encumbered by mechanical error	Is often marked by mechanical error	Is largely unencumbered by mechanical error	Is almost entirely unencumbered by mechanical error

Interpretive Essay

Goal (SLO 1, 3)	Fails to clearly articulate a viable goal and rationale for the work	Adequately articulates a goal and rationale for the work	Clearly articulates a viable goal and rationale for the work	Clearly articulates a viable goal and compelling rationale for the work
Knowledge (SLO 1)	Shows little to no command of relevant aesthetic and critical concepts, texts, and contexts	Shows an adequate command of relevant aesthetic and critical concepts, texts, and contexts	Shows a competent command of relevant aesthetic and critical concepts, texts, and contexts	Shows a sophisticated command of relevant aesthetic and critical concepts, texts, and contexts
Structure (SLO 3)	Fails to exhibit an effective organizing structure	Inconsistently exhibits an effective organizing structures	Consistently exhibits an effective organizing structure	Work clearly exhibits an extremely effective organizing structure
Writing (SLO 3)	Is poorly written	Is acceptably written	Is clearly written	Is precisely and/or eloquently written
Editing (SLO 3)	Is heavily encumbered by mechanical error	Is often marked by mechanical error	Is largely free from mechanical error	Is almost entirely free from mechanical error

Focus (SLO 3, 7)	Demonstrates little to no ability to define a manageable literary, critical and/or theoretical question or problem	Does not clearly define a manageable literary, critical and/or theoretical question or problem	Defines a manageable literary, critical and/or theoretical question or problem	Defines a significant but manageable literary, critical and/or theoretical question or problem
Thesis (SLO 3, 7)	Demonstrates little to no ability to articulate a cogent thesis in answer to this question or problem	Does not clearly articulate a cogent thesis in answer to this question or problem	Articulates a cogent thesis in answer to this question or problem	Articulates a cogent and insightful thesis in answer to this question or problem
Argument (SLO 3, 7)	Demonstrates little to no ability to develop this thesis into a coherent argument	Does not fully develop this thesis into a coherent argument	Develops this thesis into a coherent argument	Develops this thesis into a coherent and illuminating argument
Evidence (SLO 3, 6, 7)	Argument is based upon insufficient evidence drawn from appropriate sources	Argument is based upon barely adequate evidence drawn from appropriate sources	Argument is based upon adequate evidence drawn from appropriate sources	Argument is based upon exceptional evidence drawn from appropriate sources
Analysis (SLO 2, 7)	Demonstrates little to no ability to show the pertinence of such evidence by analysis, close reading, and/or careful exposition	Does not clearly show the pertinence of such evidence by analysis, close reading, and/or careful exposition	Shows the pertinence of such evidence by analysis, close reading, and/or careful exposition	Shows the pertinence of such evidence by sophisticated analysis, close reading, and/or careful exposition
Knowledge (SLO 1, 5)	Shows little to no command of relevant literary, critical, methodological and/or theoretical concepts	Shows an adequate command of relevant literary, critical, methodological and/or theoretical concepts	Shows a competent command of relevant literary, critical, methodological and/or theoretical concepts	Shows a sophisticated command of relevant literary, critical, methodological and/or theoretical concepts
Context (SLO 1, 7)	Demonstrates little to no ability to locate its argument in relevant literary, critical, and/or theoretical contexts	Does not clearly or consistently locate its argument in relevant literary, critical, and/or theoretical contexts	Locates its argument in relevant literary, critical, and/or theoretical contexts	Economically and insightfully locates its argument in relevant literary, critical, and/or theoretical contexts
Structure (SLO 3, 7)	Paper does not exhibit an effective organizing structure	Paper inconsistently exhibits an effective organizing structure	Paper consistently exhibits an effective organizing structure	Paper clearly exhibits an extremely effective organizing structure
Writing (SLO 3, 7)	Is poorly written	Is acceptably written	Is clearly written	Is precisely and/or eloquently written.
Editing (SLO 3, 7)	Is heavily encumbered by mechanical error	Is often marked by mechanical error	Is largely free from mechanical error	Is almost entirely free from mechanical error