Discipline Outcome
Critical Reading Skills

Assessment Author(s)
Juliet Hubbell

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Rubric-graded report

Measure 1 Description:
Instructors use a short quiz at the outset of the semester to measure students' abilities to understand a particularly challenging text. At the end of the semester, instructors in the department are asked to submit 5 randomly selected essays which should reflect thorough understanding of a complex text.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
15

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
The department feels that 70% of all students sampled should have at least a passing grade for these measurements.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
The Literature courses assessed are almost entirely GT courses, and as such, they must enable the students who pass to bring both critical analysis skills and the vernacular necessary for that analysis.
Measure 2 Type:

Direct

Rubric-graded report

Measure 2 Description:

Instructors are asked to submit 5 randomly selected papers and the associated assignments and rubrics. The students' papers are then read by two faculty members using the departmental rubric.

Measure 2 Sample Size:

15

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

The department feels that at least 70% of the students must attain a passing grade or better in this written analysis.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Written critical analysis is vital to Literature, and students must apply their ability to evaluate and analyze literature. The 6 different criteria included in the department's rubric ensure this mastery.

This discipline outcome was

Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:
1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

Of the three different courses with three different instructors assessed, the total sample showed an overall passing rate of 3.3. This exceeds the benchmark of 2.5.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

This data is consistent with past years but represents a shift to a universal, departmental rubric.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong exceeds benchmark, neutral meets benchmark, or weak misses benchmark)?

Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

The department would like to establish a standardized rubric for all assignments rather than try to interpret various instructors' rubrics in a universal manner. This coming semester will be the first year we attempt to use a standardized rubric.

3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

Because our departmental rubric was developed using 4-year universities sample rubrics, we believe that it is superior to the very idiosyncratic rubrics each instructor has developed in the past for varying assignments.

Further Action:

Further Action Planned

Describe the action plan:

Dept meeting, Aug 2016
Person/ Group responsible for action
Juliet Hubbell

Target Date for implementation of the action
08/15/2016

Priority
Medium

Discipline Outcome
Knowledge of Literary Terminology

Assessment Author(s)
Juliet Hubbell

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Measure 1 Description:
Instructors are asked to administer a short quiz to students at the beginning of the semester. The quiz measures the student's understanding of particular literary terms as well as the student's ability to understand a challenging text.

At the end of the semester, instructors are again asked to survey their various assignments where those same literary terms were taught and to assess the improvement in knowledge.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
28

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
The department feels that at least 70% of students should attain a passing grade or better.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
Most of the LIT courses are GT courses, and, as such, they should ensure a broad base of expertise in those students who might take further LIT courses. This facility with the literary vernacular is vital.
This discipline outcome was 

Surpassed benchmark 

Measure 1 Results:

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

The department exceeded its benchmark. This speaks to the importance of reminding both adjuncts and faculty to establish a fundamental base of literary terms and to evaluate students’ abilities to use those terms effectively.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

The data are consistent with past years; however, these numbers are significantly improved from prior years. The department will continue to emphasize in its departmental meetings the importance of this foundational component.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong exceeds benchmark, neutral meets benchmark, or weak misses benchmark)?

Surpassed benchmark
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

These results will be used in three ways:

1) Potential texts will be evaluated based on their incorporation of literary vernacular.

2) Instructors will be asked to amend assignments so that these particular terms are part of the prompts or assignments given to students.

3) Instructors will be asked to use many examples in various texts of these key literary terms.

3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

These results will directly impact academic instruction in our department and will facilitate students' learning and abilities to analyze literature.

Describe the action plan:

Departmental meeting, FA2016

Person/ Group responsible for action
Juliet Hubbell

Target Date for implementation of the action
08/15/2016

Priority
Medium

Learning Outcome
Communication - Written
Learning Outcome
Responsibility and Accountability