

Literature, Journalism, Writing and Languages
Literature General Education Assessment
2017-2018

Learning Outcome:

2b. Students will understand and appreciate diverse forms of artistic expression

Outcome Measures:

A common essay assignment is given to students in all sections of general education literature courses. A sample of these essays are scored using the Critical Thinking Value Rubric and two categories from the Reading Value Rubric (“Comprehension” and “Interpretation”).

Assignment Prompt:

Instructions: Choose one work from our course readings that has impacted your understanding and appreciation of cultural perspectives to some degree and write a response to the prompt below.

Prompt: In what ways and to what degree has this literary work (novel, play, poem, short story, essay, creative nonfiction, film) **impacted** your cultural perspectives, AND what **connections** have you made between this work and other university courses and/or your own life experience?

Specifications: Your essay response should be thesis-driven, elaborated by reasons, and supported with textual evidence properly cited with MLA style from the work itself. Length of essays should be 2-3 double-spaced pages in 12-point font type. Essays earning highest marks must address both aspects (impact, connections) of the prompt.

Criteria for Success:

The total score of the essays scored in each section of General Education Literature will average at least a 3.00 in all categories.

Longitudinal Data:

In Fall 2014, the General Education Learning Outcomes were revised, and it was determined that the Critical Thinking and Reading Value Rubrics would be used to assess student artifacts. The scores below reflect data gathered by taking a random sample of the students in each section of each course.

Critical Thinking Value Rubric - Average Student Scores:

Course	Semester	N	Explanation of Issues	Evidence	Influence of Context and Assumptions	Student's Position	Conclusions and related outcomes	Average Score
LIT 201	Spring 2015	11	3.45	3.55	3.27	3.45	3.55	3.45
LIT 203	Spring 2015	23	3.39	3.39	3.30	3.26	3.39	3.35
LIT 208	Spring 2015	11	3.09	2.82	2.64	2.45	2.45	2.69
LIT 325	Spring 2015	10	2.90	3.20	3.60	3.40	2.70	3.16
LIT 200	Fall 2015	56	2.75	2.61	2.82	2.66	2.66	2.70
LIT 352	Fall 2015	19	3.21	3.37	3.21	3.16	3.21	3.23
LIT 353	Fall 2015	19	3.42	3.42	3.26	3.11	3.00	3.24
LIT 200	Spring 2016	93	3.30	3.35	3.34	3.32	3.31	3.33
LIT 350	Spring 2016	33	3.48	3.24	3.33	3.12	3.24	3.28
LIT 353	Spring 2016	19	3.79	3.47	3.16	3.47	3.68	3.52
LIT 200	Fall 2016	42	3.33	3.08	3.13	3.10	3.10	3.16
LIT 353	Fall 2016	23	3.17	3.00	3.04	2.91	3.35	3.10
LIT 200	Spring 2017	50	3.18	3.24	3.12	2.94	3.06	3.11
LIT 350	Spring 2017	20	3.60	3.55	3.50	3.55	3.75	3.59
LIT 351	Spring 2017	20	3.45	3.60	3.65	3.20	3.45	3.47
LIT 353	Spring 2017	22	3.55	3.23	3.73	3.59	3.82	3.58
LIT 350	Fall 2017	12	3.17	2.67	3.00	2.67	2.83	2.87
LIT 352	Fall 2017	24	3.71	3.17	3.04	3.29	3.17	3.28
LIT 353	Fall 2017	24	3.58	3.21	3.38	3.21	3.54	3.38
LIT 351	Spring 2018	20	3.60	3.40	3.65	3.70	3.65	3.60
LIT 352	Spring 2018	20	3.15	3.35	3.05	3.35	3.70	3.32
LIT 353	Spring 2018	23	3.65	3.43	3.57	3.70	3.65	3.60
LIT 353	Summer 2018	21	3.48	3.19	3.38	3.48	3.52	3.41

Reading Value Rubric - Average Student Scores:

Course	Semester	N	Comprehension	Genres	Relationship to Text	Analysis	Interpretation	Reader's Voice	Total
LIT201	Spring 2015	11	3.64	NA	NA	NA	3.55	NA	3.59
LIT203	Spring 2015	23	3.57	NA	NA	NA	3.52	NA	3.54
LIT208	Spring 2015	11	3.09	NA	NA	NA	2.73	NA	2.91
LIT325	Spring 2015	10	3.40	NA	NA	NA	3.60	NA	3.50
LIT200	Fall 2015	56	2.31	NA	NA	NA	2.5	NA	2.40
LIT352	Fall 2015	19	3.21	NA	NA	NA	3.16	NA	3.18
LIT353	Fall 2015	19	3.37	NA	NA	NA	3.26	NA	3.32
LIT200	Spring 2016	93	3.52	NA	NA	NA	3.45	NA	3.49
LIT350	Spring 2016	33	3.27	NA	NA	NA	3.27	NA	3.27
LIT353	Spring 2016	19	3.79	NA	NA	NA	3.67	NA	3.73

LIT200	Fall 2016	42	3.31	NA	NA	NA	3.23	NA	3.31
LIT353	Fall 2016	23	3.17	NA	NA	NA	3.30	NA	3.24
LIT200	Spring 2017	50	3.42	NA	NA	NA	3.12	NA	3.27
LIT350	Spring 2017	20	3.60	NA	NA	NA	3.70	NA	3.65
LIT351	Spring 2017	20	3.20	NA	NA	NA	3.75	NA	3.48
LIT353	Spring 2017	23	3.77	NA	NA	NA	3.73	NA	3.75
LIT350	Fall 2017	12	3.25	NA	NA	NA	2.67	NA	2.96
LIT352	Fall 2017	24	3.38	NA	NA	NA	3.29	NA	3.33
LIT353	Fall 2017	24	3.67	NA	NA	NA	3.58	NA	3.63
LIT351	Spring 2018	20	3.75	NA	NA	NA	3.55	NA	3.65
LIT352	Spring 2018	20	3.45	NA	NA	NA	3.40	NA	3.43
LIT353	Spring 2018	23	3.74	NA	NA	NA	3.70	NA	3.72
LIT353	Summer 2018	21	3.48	NA	NA	NA	3.57	NA	3.52

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

None at this time. Continue to collect data.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this time. Continue to collect data.

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

For more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition: Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion. Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone (4)	Milestones (3)	Milestones (2)	Benchmark (1)
Explanation of issues	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
Evidence <i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</i>	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.
Influence of context and assumptions	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.
Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.
Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

READING VALUE RUBRIC

For more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

Reading is "the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language" (Snow et al., 2002). (From www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB8024/index1.html)

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
Comprehension	Recognizes possible implications of the text for contexts, perspectives, or issues beyond the assigned task within the classroom or beyond the author's explicit message (e.g., might recognize broader issues at play, or might pose challenges to the author's message and presentation).	Uses the text, general background knowledge, and/or specific knowledge of the author's context to draw more complex inferences about the author's message and attitude.	Evaluates how textual features (e.g., sentence and paragraph structure or tone) contribute to the author's message; draws basic inferences about context and purpose of text.	Apprehends vocabulary appropriately to paraphrase or summarize the information the text communicates.
Genres	Uses ability to identify texts within and across genres, monitoring and adjusting reading strategies and expectations based on generic nuances of particular texts.	Articulates distinctions among genres and their characteristic conventions.	Reflects on reading experiences across a variety of genres, reading both with and against the grain experimentally and intentionally.	Applies tacit genre knowledge to a variety of classroom reading assignments in productive, if unreflective, ways.
Relationship to Text <i>Making meanings with texts in their contexts</i>	Evaluates texts for scholarly significance and relevance within and across the various disciplines, evaluating them according to their contributions and consequences.	Uses texts in the context of scholarship to develop a foundation of disciplinary knowledge and to raise and explore important questions.	Engages texts with the intention and expectation of building topical and world knowledge.	Approaches texts in the context of assignments with the intention and expectation of finding right answers and learning facts and concepts to display for credit.
Analysis <i>Interacting with texts in parts and as wholes</i>	Evaluates strategies for relating ideas, text structure, or other textual features in order to build knowledge or insight within and across texts and disciplines.	Identifies relations among ideas, text structure, or other textual features, to evaluate how they support an advanced understanding of the text as a whole.	Recognizes relations among parts or aspects of a text, such as effective or ineffective arguments or literary features, in considering how these contribute to a basic understanding of the text as a whole.	Identifies aspects of a text (e.g., content, structure, or relations among ideas) as needed to respond to questions posed in assigned tasks.
Interpretation <i>Making sense with texts as blueprints for meaning</i>	Provides evidence not only that s/he can read by using an appropriate epistemological lens but that s/he can also engage in reading as part of a continuing dialogue within and beyond a discipline or a community of readers.	Articulates an understanding of the multiple ways of reading and the range of interpretive strategies particular to one's discipline(s) or in a given community of readers.	Demonstrates that s/he can read purposefully, choosing among interpretive strategies depending on the purpose of the reading.	Can identify purpose(s) for reading, relying on an external authority such as an instructor for clarification of the task.
Reader's Voice <i>Participating in academic discourse about texts</i>	Discusses texts with an independent intellectual and ethical disposition so as to further or maintain disciplinary conversations.	Elaborates on the texts (through interpretation or questioning) so as to deepen or enhance an ongoing discussion.	Discusses texts in structured conversations (such as in a classroom) in ways that contribute to a basic, shared understanding of the text.	Comments about texts in ways that preserve the author's meanings and link them to the assignment.