1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area II: Humanities

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will:
   
   SLO 2: Students will be able to read analytically and critically.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**
   
   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You my cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method.]

   Method: The Core Literature Committee solicited packets consisting of the final paper from each section of Core Literature taught in Spring 2012. A total of 41 out of a total 88 sections of World Literature I & II, Honors World Literature I & II, British Literature I & II, and American Literature I & II submitted papers for assessment. Essays were not collected from the five new lecture courses. This return represents 47% of sections taught. Each packet was read by two different members of the Core Literature Committee against two sets of rubrics for each of two outcomes. Evaluators were asked to judge whether a student’s essay was satisfactory in demonstrating the learning outcome or whether it needed work. In the event of a split judgment between the two evaluators, a third evaluator read the paper to break the tie.

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**
   
   Outcome One (Gen Ed SLO #2): Students will be able to read analytically and critically. Rubric 1.1 Student work will engage the assigned text(s) in a way that shows an awareness of culture or history. 27 packets (or 66%) were deemed to be satisfactory. 14 packets (or 34%) were deemed to need work. Rubric 1.2 For an assigned text or texts, students will be able to discuss the development of one or more themes via close reading. 23 packets (or 56%) were deemed to be satisfactory. 18 packets (or 44%) were deemed to need work.

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**
   
   [What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

   The data presented three issues that need improvement. 1). Data collection: The percentage of packets relative to the number of sections taught is low, causing any conclusions based on this data to be debatable. That said, a higher percentage of packets must be collected. The committee will urge faculty members to return the packets and personally encourage those faculty members who have not returned their packets to do so before the end of Spring term. Packets will be collected from the lecture courses. 2). Additional Material: Some of the essays deemed to Need Work for Rubric 1.1 got that designation because the paper assignment did not call for the student to address culture or history. Because this issue was not part of the assignment, its absence does not necessarily mean that the student has not achieved this learning outcome only that the student was not asked to demonstrate it. Therefore, the committee will request that the final exam be included with the second paper and with the encouragement to faculty teaching Core Literature that some question or questions appear on the exam that tests a student’s ability to address issues of culture or history in his or her answers. 3). Writing: Regardless of their small number, the essays appear to show general inability among students to construct arguments that advanced and substantiated claims, supported these claims with textual analysis, or develop themes through close reading. The five faculty members who are piloting our new lecture courses in Core Literature have been working intensely on improving writing instruction in the Core Literature Lectures. We have begun a series of forums targeted to PhD students.
teaching Core Literature also addressing the issue of writing among other topics. A similar forum for Instructors and tenure-line faculty members on teaching writing is also in the works. All these initiatives were undertaken by different individuals within the past three months. What we plan to do in the coming year is to coordinate all of these efforts toward regular workshops and brownbag conversations among all teachers of Core Literature on improving student writing. Given the unacceptable percentages, the committee will continue to assess for all four of these rubrics for next year. The committee will also ask faculty teaching the Core Lit courses to self-assess their students relative to the rubrics and their outcome. The reasoning behind this request is two-fold: 1). To allow more faculty to engage with the process of assessment so that it does not seem to be a secretive procedure undertaken by a few faculty members; 2). To allow faculty members more flexibility to assess the objectives rather than require the paper to be the sole outcome. We also intend to have more students sampled from each class, thereby ensuring more (if not better) data. The Core Literature Committee will be developing new evaluative mechanisms in the next couple weeks to distribute to faculty teaching Core Literature in time for collecting the last papers and final exams for students in Fall semester classes.

6. **Additional Comments:**
   
   [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

   We have been assessing for SLO #3 for twelve years. We have requested permission to report these findings beginning next year (2012-2013).

7. **Committee Comments**
   
   Mean of rubric score = 3.83 (out of 4) This report identifies weaknesses and areas of improvement. There is a desire to make the assignments similar, to request the same complexity of response from the students. There is concern about the number of sections and the changing faculty that teach. In a class of this nature where there are so many faculty, a minimum level of consistency between sections would seem appropriate and essential.