**Assessment Overview**

**Discipline/Program Name:** Literature   **Assessment Year:** 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome Type</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Strength of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Information Management</td>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>Annotated Bibliography</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>70% score &lt; 3.0</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe the Learning Outcome That You Have Measured

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome Type</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Strength of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO, Discipline or Other</td>
<td>Pre-Post Test, Judged Competition, Embedded Questions, Rubric Graded Essay</td>
<td>Number of Students Assessed</td>
<td># of Years This Outcome Has Been Assessed</td>
<td>Measurement Standard</td>
<td>Report the Results of Your Data Analysis</td>
<td>Strong: Exceeds Benchmark Neutral: Meets Benchmark Weak: Misses Benchmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation: Complete this Assessment Overview Table after you have completed your Assessment Summary in the following template.
Program / Discipline Assessment Report

Program/Discipline: Literature
Responsibility: Lance Rubin

Program/Discipline's Mission Statement:
Congruent with the purposes, goals, and character of Arapahoe Community College, the main objective of the Literature discipline is to promote, through the study of literature, the intellectual, academic, professional, moral, and spiritual development of students. Encouraging consideration of the idea that literature offers – in addition to entertainment and aesthetic enjoyment – important insights concerning human nature and the human experience, the program strives to generate a dialogue revolving around the definition, character, and potential practical consequences/applications of literature and literary study, as well as other disciplines within the humanities.

Program/Discipline's Assessment History:
By using the assessment process as an evaluative technique, how has it previously affected your program's curricula and/or teaching strategies?
The assessment process has, in the past, forced us to maintain high academic standards, as many of our students have scored well on pre-test assessments, suggesting that they have been introduced to many of the concepts before attending our classes. This is more applicable to Literature 115, Introduction to Literature. As a result, faculty and instructors have been breaking away from the traditional genre model (3 units of fiction, poetry and drama) and have clustered various genres around specific themes or introducing students to the basics of literary theory.

Students in the 200-level surveys are not as familiar with the more cultural/historical approaches of those courses. Thus, the assessment has not had as much impact.

By using the assessment process as an evaluative technique, what changes to student learning have been noted?
They have been challenged to become stronger writers, researchers and critical thinkers.

What unintended consequences, if any, have occurred because of the assessment process?
None

Who receives information about your department's assessment and why? (Please note if you plan on altering either of these items for the coming year.)
All Literature faculty/instructors, the LAPP Dean, the Vice-President of Instruction and the Assessment Committee

Part 1: Previous Academic Year Assessment Summary

Previous Academic Year: 2011

Please not that Literature was part of a pilot program to develop and implement new SLO goals. Thus the only area faculty was asked to measure this year was Information Management. Please see Part 2 for Literature assessment plans for 2012.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome #: 1</th>
<th>Outcome Title: Information Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Type: SLO – Information management</td>
<td>Outcome Description: Students were asked to produce a detailed annotated bibliography in order to demonstrate their ability to identify, retrieve and synthesize academic, college-level research sources and apply the information – critically and creatively – to a researched oral presentation or essay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark for success**
1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

| 1) 70% of students should be able to score a “3” or better on a scale of 5 (Outstanding) to 1 (Poor). |
| 2) 70% was chosen as the benchmark because historically, Literature retention has been consistent with other liberal arts retention rates throughout the college. |

**Description of assessment process:**
1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4) How many students made up the sample size?

| In the first year of this project, students were asked to produce an annotated bibliography to accompany their oral presentations and/or researched papers in their literature classes. The students were given detailed instructions as to how this differs from a traditional bibliography, the most important being that after each individual entry, they write a short summary (five to seven sentences—1/3 to 1/2 page in length) of the contents each source. They were also asked to provide a sentence or two explaining how the source information was applicable to their topic, and to use a meaningful quote with proper citation. |

This will show whether students are (a) finding credible, college-level sources (not anonymous encyclopedias or websites); (b) able to synthesize this material; (c) use specific information from the sources to use in their presentations; and (d) use the information ethically (crediting sources with ideas; not using research for information that is common knowledge; using information in its correct context.)

This pilot-program was done over the spring and fall of 2011. The students produce one annotated bibliography per class.

The sample size was 110 students.

**Results**
What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

| On a scale of 5 (excellent) to 1 (poor), annotated bibliographies were scored on accessing appropriate, academic sources, critically evaluating the arguments or positions in those sources; synthesizing the needed information and incorporating it into their work; and using the information ethically (not plagiarizing, but attributing ideas correctly). |
| The average score: **3.88 out of 5.0.** The % of students scoring above 3.0 (proficient): **80% (88 of 110)** |

**What did the department learn?**
1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

| 1) We were quite pleased with this initial success of this pilot SLO, as the benchmark of 70% was surpassed. |
| 2) Though we had asked for traditional bibliographies/Works Cited pages for researched projects in the past, we had not used the annotated bibliography. We will compare these numbers to the upcoming year's numbers to see any trends. |
| 3) Some faculty scored each measure individually, while some used a holistic grade. Thus, we do not have accurate information that breaks down the measures by themselves. Anecdotally, of the 4 primary measures of the annotated bibliography, the one that seemed weakest, not surprisingly, |
was the students’ ability to synthesize the information critically/placing it in a larger context, as well as quoting from the sources correctly. On the latter point, it is a matter of reminding students some of the basics of quotation formatting (i.e., using quotes in their own sentences).

| Student performance summary | 1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?  
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods? |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) We would rate the student performance as strong, especially given that this is the first year that several faculty offered this assignment. We were happy to see that once introduced to more academic databases and being reminded of the need to know who they are quoting (and thus avoiding anonymous websites), the students responded.  
2) We have had discussions about whether a longer annotated bibliography project might be more valuable than writing an essay. In other words, focusing more on the research itself, some faculty believe that students might benefit from being more exposed to the academic conversations, interpretations and commentary within a certain area of literary studies. This will be the subject of future conversations at department meetings, but at least two of the courses find this a preferable assignment than the traditional research paper.  
The primary concern, however, is that the ACC library does not subscribe to the literature-centered databases (such as the MLA International Bibliography) and thus, without going to other college libraries, is limited in the information (books, articles) on their topics. |
**Part 2: Current Academic Year Assessment Plan**

- Two or more instruments of measuring an objective may provide greater clarity and validity, but only one is required. The department or program makes the decision. The Program Assessment committee and deans are available for consultation.

- In the past, some programs have been identified purely by prefix or in some cases by the type of section offered. Sometimes, a very limited pool of students have been available for such a program to assess, or the program lacks full-time faculty to plan, assess, and report outcomes. If your program has such difficulties, please contact either the Program Assessment committee’s chair or your School’s Program Assessment committee representative. We will work with you to find a solution.

- CTE programs with external accreditation may use the accreditation report to in addition or in lieu of these forms, please contact the Program Assessment committee representative if this format is desired. In absence of this contact, these forms are expected.

- Outcomes are to be measured annually. Exceptions are made with VPI approval for outcomes that clearly need a less (or more) frequent review.

**Outcome minimums**

- At least two outcomes are to be program/discipline-related.

- At least two outcomes must be chosen from the new Learning Outcomes for Student and Employee Enrichment (page 11). One Learning Outcome should be continued from the prior year to develop a historical trend. Learning Outcomes must be assessed and reported annually, regardless of the frequency of reporting for other outcomes.

- Both outcomes above are classified as "student learning" outcomes, requiring benchmarks and analysis. It is strongly recommended that you use the table provided in Part 1 of this report for this function. Definitions and examples of these outcomes are provided in Appendix A at the end of this document. Your Program Assessment committee is available to assist.

- An assessment report is requested annually.
Current Academic Year: 2012

Intended Learning Outcomes (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
1. Information Management (SLO)
2. Written Communication (SLO)
3. Develop/demonstrate analytical reading skills (LIT)
4. Develop/demonstrate the presence of basic cultural and/or historical contexts of literary works (LIT)

Assessment Method(s) (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
1. Annotated bibliography
2. Essays
3. Essays
4. Essays

Benchmarks (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
70% of students should score “Proficient” or better (<3.0 on a 5-point scale)

Have you submitted a separate budget worksheet? (Choose by bolding; for information about this worksheet, please refer to the specific budgeting e-mail sent by the committee chairperson.)
Yes  No

Please submit this report (including both last year's summary and this year's plan) in a Word document to the Program Assessment committee chairperson (Cheyne Bamford: cheyne.bamford@arapahoe.edu). If you have any questions about the process, please contact the chairperson.