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A. Program Mission Statement: MA/MS ENGLISH

The purposes of the graduate programs in English and the associated department sponsored activities (support of student groups, access to study abroad programs, publication of a literary journal, involvement in professional conferences) are to improve the reading, writing, and analytical skills of students; to offer insight into the use and structure of language; and to develop an understanding and appreciation of texts in a variety of genres and media (drama, fiction, film, poetry) as art forms and as socio-cultural productions. The MA/MS in English is designed to offer tracks that will enable students to choose between continuing toward a PhD program in English or to use to teach in high schools and/or community colleges, or to enter professions in government, non-profit, or corporate fields that value the skills taught in the Department of Literature and Languages. English graduate courses in the department teach the skills of reading, thinking, and writing critically and analytically, and understanding cultural and social differences.

B. Culminating Experience MA/MS English

The culminating experience for any graduate program is the final project: the English MA/MS offers two tracks: 595 (taught as an organized course, which also requires six more hours in coursework than the thesis track), and the 518 (thesis track); theses are not done in organized courses, but with individual committees.

In the past, the department has not done a separate analysis of learning outcomes for the 518/595s; the assessment chair recommends that starting in Summer 2012 that the department develop two methods for assessing learning outcomes as culminating experiences in this program (see Appendix D for details). The two methods are:

1. Graduate Portfolio: Faculty teaching all graduate courses turn in copies of the major projects from their graduate English classes to be assembled in a Portfolio which will be assessed by the English Assessment Committee when the student graduates. This process will be modeled on the English BA Senior Portfolio which was piloted Spring 2012.

2. 518/595 Assessment: The English 595 class has two faculty working with students; the teacher of record and the content specialist. The faculty communicate with each other, and the student, throughout the term. They could easily work together to complete a rubric assessing the learning outcomes based on the final project which would also be turned in as part of the Graduate Portfolio.

English 518 sections are still taught on the independent study model: the advisor works with the student, and a committee of at least two other faculty. At the final defense, the committee, as well as signing the graduate school form, can also discuss and complete a single rubric assessing the completed thesis.

The Department needs to develop a common rubric which would be used for all 595s, and another for the 518s.

GRADUATE COURSES IN ENGLISH: The Department of Literature and Languages (DLL) does not make a hard and fast distinction between "Master's" and "Doctoral" courses for the most part. Doctoral students must take a few courses, but master's students have the option of taking the classes as well if they
wish. The one exception is English 599 which is required for the thesis track of the master's degree and for all doctoral students.

This situation is fairly common in humanities programs.

All the graduate courses in the program are challenging; the more courses a student takes, the more they can meet those challenges. There is no meaningful difference between a "master's class on Shakespeare" and a "doctoral course on Shakespeare" in terms of course content.

Instead, the major differences between master's and doctoral students are that first, doctoral students must complete at least 30 more semester hours of graduate work in English and that second, dissertations must be longer and more complexly developed pieces of original scholarship than theses.

For the current purpose of evaluating the different graduate programs, Student Learning Outcomes Reports (SLORs) from 500-level graduate courses will be used for the MA and MS program review although no attempt was made to differentiate between master's and doctoral students in the courses.

The assessment chair recommends a survey be developed and used to have some way to assess the learning outcomes of doctoral vs. master's students in the program in addition to the learning outcomes rubrics for the final projects. See Appendix D for details.
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STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME # 1: READING.

A comprehensive list of the English MA/MS program goals is included in Appendix A. The process of developing the goals included faculty input during department meetings and the collection and incorporation of all student learning outcomes on English class syllabi during the 2011 calendar year. The top three (Reading, Writing, Critical Analysis) were selected for the 2011-2012 assessment cycle.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME #1: READING: MEANING  Students will:

A. produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) showing they understand written and visual texts from a variety of national traditions and historical periods.

B. produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) showing they understand the writings of scholars and critics about written and visual texts.

C. produce research/argument essays of substantive length (15-35 pages) showing they can integrate peer-reviewed scholarship with their analysis of written or visual texts in order to develop their own contribution to the scholarly dialogue.

2. LINKS TO CURRICULUM & PROGRAM FACULTY

ENG 510 - Introduction to Film Studies
ENG 530 - History of Narrative Film
ENG 610 - Studies in Film Genres
ENG 620 - Adaptation: Film, Literature, and other Influences
ENG 710 - Film Theory and Criticism
ENG 720 - Special Topics in Film Study
ENG 505 - The Invention of Children’s Literature and Childhood
ENG 506 - Problems in Adolescent Literature
ENG 507 - Narrative Transformations in Literature of Children and Adolescents
ENG 508 - Constructing Reality and Reconstructing History in Children's and Adolescent Literature
ENG 509 - Literary Genres
ENG 516 - Early American Literature
ENG 519 - American Literature in Transition: From Civil to World Wars
ENG 520 - Approaches to Critical Theory
ENG 521 - American Modernities
ENG 522 - Major Figures in American Literature
ENG 525 - Contemporary Literature
ENG 526 - Studies in Shakespeare
ENG 527 - Antebellum American Literature
ENG 531 - Major Figures and Movements in British Literature
ENG 534 - Medieval and Renaissance British Literature
ENG 536 - The Age of Reason
ENG 537 - Modern Transformations: British and Irish Literature
ENG 540 - Development of the British Novel
ENG 579 - Style and Stylistics
ENG 775 - Teaching of Literature in College
ENG 780 - Texts and Genders
ENG 781 - Major Figures in World Literature
NOTE: Not all the above courses are taught every semester or even every year. Most graduate students, after meeting a few specific requirements, work with the program advisor(s) and eventually the faculty member directing their 518/595 to develop a program best suited to their professional needs and scholarship interests. See Appendix B for the program requirements for an English MA/MS.

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT: An Assessment Committee consisting of two English and one Spanish faculty member worked on assessment procedures during 2011-12. In future, the committee has recommended that both an English Assessment and a Spanish Assessment Committee be formed to work with the Department head on assessment.

The Department of Literature and Languages (DLL) scheduled agenda items dealing with program assessment at all monthly meetings during the long terms for 2011-2012 academic year. During department meetings, faculty went into break-out groups relating to specific programs to set goals, content, and learning outcomes for these courses. The results of these meetings were compiled by the Assessment Chair and distributed to the faculty as a whole, with input being solicited at later meetings.

3. STRATEGIES/METHODS FOR OBSERVING STUDENT LEARNING

A. Student Learning Outcome Reports Collected: Every semester, selected Student Learning Outcome Reports generated by faculty for their courses are collected for use in program assessment. The full text of the SLORs used in this report are in Appendix C. Depending on the program assessment outcome, different parts of SLORs will be used in the program assessment for the 2011-12 cycle. The SLORs used in this cycle's program assessment are: English 509, English 525, English 595, and English 599 (two literature courses and two research and methods courses).

ENG 509 - Literary Genres: An examination of one or more literary genres. Topics and approaches may vary, but might include a focus on a particular historical period, theme, or critical approach to selected poetry, drama, non-fiction prose, fiction, or film.

ENG 525 - Contemporary Literature: A study of post-1945 and recent literature in the United States and/or the United Kingdom and Ireland. Special emphasis will be placed on the ways in which national and international phenomena, both social as well as aesthetic, have informed an increasingly diverse understanding of literary texts. Topics for analysis could include late Modernism and its links to postmodern thought, Cold War writing, literatures of nationhood, post colonialism, the institutionalization of theory, multiculturalism and its literary impact, and the ever-growing emphasis placed on generic hybridity, especially as it concerns visual and electronic media.

ENG 595 - Research Literature and Techniques: This course requires an extensive investigation into a topic agreed upon by the student and the advisory committee. Note Graded on a satisfactory (S) or unsatisfactory (U) basis. Required of students who opt for the 36-hour Master’s.

ENG 599 - Bibliography and Methods of Research: For beginning literature and languages graduate students who have not had an equivalent graduate-level course, this course covers manuscript preparation, format; research techniques for literary, linguistics, and composition/rhetoric studies.
4. ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME #1.A. Students will produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) showing they understand written and visual texts from a variety of national traditions and historical periods.

No Student Learning Outcome Report for individual courses can address this learning outcome. Since no other means of assessing outcomes for the MA/MS program was approved, this outcome cannot be assessed in this cycle.

RECOMMENDATION:

The assessment chair recommends the DLL adopt a Graduate Portfolio assessment process.

Faculty teaching all graduate courses will turn in copies of the major projects from their graduate English classes to be assembled in a Portfolio which will be assessed by the English Assessment Committee when the student graduates. This process will be modeled on the English BA Senior Portfolio which was piloted Spring 2012.

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME #1.B. Students will produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) showing they understand the writings of scholars and critics about written and visual texts.

70% is the standard for indicating a satisfactory outcome.

The data from the SLORs listed below indicate that the majority of faculty assessments of student work resulted in satisfactory, or above, outcomes.

ENG 509 - Literary Genres: An examination of one or more literary genres. Topics and approaches may vary, but might include a focus on a particular historical period, theme, or critical approach to selected poetry, drama, non-fiction prose, fiction, or film.

Faculty Assessment English 509 (full SLOR is in Appendix C)

Student Learning Outcome from Syllabus:
• Students will demonstrate their ability to synthesize ideas pertaining to the course as measured by a review of selected weekly responses from the students and by assessment of each student’s final project.

Assessment criteria
Format Options:
Research Paper:
• Must include appropriate critical and theoretical texts relevant to the course
• Cannot be only a lengthy explication of primary text(s)
• Contain potential for a significant, original contribution to scholarly inquiry [published article, conference presentation] or to enlarge the audience’s awareness and understanding of psychogeography in some other fashion
Online Blog or Other Electronic Project:
• Must include appropriate critical and theoretical texts relevant to the course
• Contain potential for a significant, original contribution to scholarly inquiry [published article, conference presentation] or to enlarge the audience’s awareness and understanding of psychogeography in some other fashion

6. Results:
Final Paper
Note: Five (5) students submitted a paper for the final project. The percentages in the chart below are for those students, not a percentage of the entire class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent (90-100%)</th>
<th>Above Average (80-89%)</th>
<th>Average (70-79%)</th>
<th>Fail (0-60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus</td>
<td>4 80%</td>
<td>1 20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students’ performance here is unsurprising. Because the students who wrote research papers for their final projects tend to be effective writers who wish to eventually publish or to present their work at a conference, these papers are of good quality. However, in the future I will adapt my rubric more explicitly for the assignment.

Electronic Project

Note: Seven (7) students submitted an electronic presentation for their project. The percentages in the chart below are for those students, not a percentage of the entire class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent (90-100%)</th>
<th>Above Average (80-89%)</th>
<th>Average (70-79%)</th>
<th>Fail (0-60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus</td>
<td>4 57%</td>
<td>1 14%</td>
<td>1 14%</td>
<td>1 14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that because I have attempted to round off the percentages some categories slightly exceed 100% while another falls just under 100%.

Overwhelmingly, the students who opted for the electronic project had more difficulties incorporating the critical and theoretical material into their projects and addressing audience concerns (category #2). I see now that I need to provide even advanced graduate students with more explicit written instructions on ways to include such information.

ENG 525 - Contemporary Literature: A study of post-1945 and recent literature in the United States and/or the United Kingdom and Ireland. Special emphasis will be placed on the ways in which national and international phenomena, both social as well as aesthetic, have informed an increasingly diverse understanding of literary texts. Topics for analysis could include late Modernism and its links to postmodern thought, Cold War writing, literatures of nationhood, post colonialism, the institutionalization of theory, multiculturalism and its literary impact, and the ever-growing emphasis placed on generic hybridity, especially as it concerns visual and electronic media.

Student Learning Outcome from Syllabus:
1. Learners will demonstrate that they understand the varying types of scholarship that have been published on Tolkien's novel over the decades, are able to identify peer-reviewed work, and can analyze where their work fits into the scholarly dialogue. This outcome will be assessed by evaluation of work on the Hobbit Bibliography and Review of Literature and by the final draft of the 15 page paper.

Two Instruments:
A. Hobbit Bibliography & Review of Literature (SLO #1)
B. Final Draft of Individual Project (SLO #1)

Faculty Assessment English 525 (full SLOR in Appendix C)

Student Learning Outcome from Syllabus:
1. Learners will demonstrate that they understand the varying types of scholarship that have been published on Tolkien's novel over the decades, are able to identify peer-reviewed work, and can analyze where their work fits into the scholarly
dialogue. This outcome will be assessed by evaluation of work on the Hobbit Bibliography and Review of Literature and by the final draft of the 15 page paper.

Two Instruments:

A. Hobbit Bibliography & Review of Literature (SLO #1)
B. Final Draft of Individual Project (SLO #1)

A. Hobbit Bibliography & Review of Literature (SLO #1)

Your discussion posts go in the Ongoing Hobbit Bibliography discussion.

INDIVIDUAL DISCUSSION PROMPTS OF ASSESSED DISCUSSIONS

DISCUSSION 1:
WEEK TWO: JAN 23-27 (NPZ 29)

Read: "Criteria for Identifying a Refereed Journal" by Miller and Serzan (pdf is uploaded to the discussion and in Doc.Sharing)

Post: A comment in The Hobbit Bibliography Discussion

Your comment should be 400-600 words long, and formatted in two paragraphs. Be sure you answer all the questions below, and be as specific as you can (what you tell me and the class here will help me help you on your individual project as well as with this assignment).

First, tell the class about your experience with bibliographic work in the past: have you done Annotated Bibliographies for your past courses (graduate or undergraduate)? Have you written Bibliographic essays or Reviews of Literature in your past courses (graduate or undergraduate)?

Have you taken English 599 or 595 (or their equivalent classes in research methods in your major department)? How much do you know about academic publications (journals, monographs, etc.)? How often have the faculty in your classes talked about academic publication? What topic (of the various approaches to The Hobbit that I give in the Project handout) are you thinking of focusing on? What sort of papers in past graduate seminars (if any) have you done that might connect in some way with this project (i.e. medieval topics, children's literature topics, poetry topics, etc.)? (200-300 words)

Second, what have you learned from reading Miller and Servan? What seems to be the most important points that are relevant to you and your understanding of the assignments in this class? What was most surprising to you in the article? What seemed familiar to you? (200-300 words)

DISCUSSION 3
WEEK FOUR FEB 6-10

Read: The Chronological Hobbit Bibliography and the Peer-Reviewed Hobbit Bibliography to find material relating to your focus (as determined in your Topic Statement). These two Bibliographies are uploaded to the Bibliography discussion and in Doc.Sharing.

Post: A comment in The Hobbit Bibliography Discussion

Length: 1000 words
REQUIRED: Subject Line Listing

List the three scholars' names and the three journals you're researching in your SUBJECT heading so others know not to replicate your work. You may, if you wish, post the names early in the week and add the post later on (you can edit posts).

You must find five peer-reviewed academic articles for your individual project (you may have more, and you may use some of the general articles in addition to the required minimum): remember that not everything published in a peer-reviewed journal is in fact a peer-reviewed article (there are more informal essays, book reviews).
MLA is not always accurate in identifying peer-reviewed journals (and some journals which are peer-reviewed today, were not in the past; plus, as Miller and Servan note, there are a range of criteria held to be self-identified peer-reviewed/refereed journals).

For this post, you should focus on your chosen (and approved by me) topic. You will go through the two bibliographies I prepared before class started and find all the articles (peer-reviewed and general) that relate to your topic--make a separate list for yourself by cutting/pasting from the ones I prepared.

You will be looking at more than five articles to see what is out there, and to select the five best articles (peer-reviewed) for your project.

Then analyze the patterns you see in the scholarship on your topic. I intend that this material do double-duty for your "Working Bibliography and Review of Literature" which is due Week 8 (and by double-duty, I mean, consider this group assignment to be a rough draft of that Project assignment!).

By analyze the patterns: I do not mean read all the articles (though you will eventually be reading the articles you choose for your project, and you can look at the PDFs I have uploaded if you wish.)

I mean, review the list you created, looking for key words in the titles that indicate the focus of articles (are medieval texts mentioned, such as Beowulf or Norse mythology; are genres mentioned, such as fairy tale, epic, myth, children's literature, etc.; are theorists mentioned, such as Jung or Plato; are specific elements of Tolkien's work mentioned (such as poetry, imagery, or Elvish languages); are themes mentioned (such as heroism, determinism, etc.); are languages, linguistics, or translation issues mentioned (I don't expect anybody to read the scholarship in other languages, but you need to know that Tolkien scholarship exists in a number of languages); are your articles mostly structural (focusing on elements of the text), source studies drawing on medieval elements, or using contemporary critical theories? What about dates of publication?

You can learn a lot from just critically reading titles although of course that does not replace reading the articles: it is simply a first step in the process of researching secondary scholarship.

After doing the work above, research THREE authors and THREE JOURNALS and Google them to see what you can find out about them (if there is NOTHING on your chosen author or journal, choose a replacement). (For an example of what to do, see my Sample Evaluation of Two Articles Handout.)

Your work in this discussion is a start at writing a collaborative Review of Literature.

DISCUSSION 5:
WEEK SEVEN   FEB 27-MAR 2 (NPZ 4)

Read: The Four Full-Text essays on The Hobbit (in pdf form in the Discussion and uploaded to Doc.Sharing).

Bibliographic citations given below:


Post: A Comment in The Hobbit Bibliography

Number the separate parts of your post:

1. Write an evaluation of the article you think is most relevant to your topic (i.e. this is where you can substitute one of the others I found; if you have another that you think is the most important, you can substitute it but you MUST send me a pdf of it). The questions your evaluation should answer are taken from MLA 7th Ed page 38, 1.6.4: "Who is the author? What are the author's credentials for writing and publishing this work? When judged against previous reading and your understanding of the topic, is information furnished by author correct? Is the argument presented logically and without bias? Are the author's sources clearly and adequately indicated, so they can be verified. Are the author's sources current (TO THE TIME OF PUBLICATION!),
or are they outdated? Who is the publisher, or what is the sponsoring organization of the work? Is the work peer-reviewed—that is, has it been read and recommended for publication by experts? Remember, I've uploaded a model/sample evaluation of two Articles for you to see.

2. Write two summaries and one paraphrase of the article you disagree with most. Your summaries and paraphrase should give a reader who has not read the essay the following information without in any way indicating your disagreement (that's what the rest of essays are for)?

Provide:

A one-sentence summary of the article (including name of author and title!) (focus on the claims/arguments, not the evidence).

A one-paragraph summary of the article (including name of author and title!) (focus on the claims/arguments, not the evidence).

A one-paragraph paraphrase of a "chunk" of the article (focusing on the evidence and explaining how it supports the claims in the above paragraphs).

Your summaries should convey the following information (in different levels of detail):

What is the main argument of the essay? Are any other scholars identified as making opposing arguments? What type of evidence is presented to support the argument (historical? Biographical? Textual/close reading? Structural elements (plot, character, symbolism, etc)? Stylistic evidence? Other scholarship? Something else?) What sorts of critical methods/theories are used (the theories/methods are related to the types of evidence).

3. Working with either article you used above, choose 1-3 selected quotes from the article and prepare a "quote sandwich" for each. The majority of use of secondary work in academic articles is via summary and paraphrase; one indicator of an inexperienced academic writer is the data dump of exact quotes without introduction or analysis. Pick quotes that you think are so stunning and brilliant that they deserve to be quoted directly.

Resources on how to do the quote sandwich, summarize, and paraphrase:
- http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/563/1/
- http://www.csun.edu/~hflrc006/quote.html
- http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/619/01/
- http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/563/03/
- http://www.utoronto.ca/ucwriting/paraphrase.html

Learning Criteria

Keep in mind the Bibliographic discussion is held in a threaded discussion for ease of collaborative work, but it's not a "discussion" in the same way the Hobbit or Wiki discussions are. Instead, it's a space to post your individual contributions. The criteria are somewhat different than the others which is why a different criteria and rubric are give here. To earn full credit in your online discussions, you need to meet the following criteria:

1. You post the assigned number of posts.
2. You post on time (by the No Penalty Zone is "on time").
3. Your posts meet the required format and assigned length requirements.
4. Your posts address the question(s) that I've asked and references the assigned readings.
5. Your original post is written to an informed audience (me and your classmates); writing to that audience (which is the default audience in academic essays, and you are able to summarize, analyze, paraphrase, identify issues in response to prompt questions, and has specific evidence.

RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: RUBRIC AND DATA

A. Hobbit Bibliography & Review of Literature (SLO #1)
## Bibliography and Review of Literature: Assessment of three of the five assigned discussions, organized chronologically

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 1</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 3</td>
<td>7 (55%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 5</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Timeliness |      |     |    |
| 20% |      |     |    |
| Discussion 1 | 8 (88%) |       | 1(11%) |
| Discussion 3 | 7 (78%) |       | 2(22%) |
| Discussion 5 | 7 (78%) |       | 2(22%) |

| 3. Length |      |     |    |
| 20% |      |     |    |
| Discussion 1 | 8 (88%) |       | 1(11%) |
| Discussion 3 | 5 (55%) | 2(22%) | 2 (22%) |
| Discussion 5 | 7 (78%) | 2(22%) |    |

| 4. Topic |      |     |    |
| 20% |      |     |    |
| Discussion 1 | 8 (88%) |       | 1(11%) |
| Discussion 3 | 5 (55%) | 2(22%) | 2(22%) |
| Discussion 5 | 7 (78%) | 2(22%) |    |

| 5. Audience |      |     |    |
| 20% |      |     |    |
| Discussion 1 | 8 (88%) |       | 1(11%) |
| Discussion 3 | 5 (55%) | 2 (22%) | 2 (22%) |
| Discussion 5 | 7 (78%) | 2 (22%) |    |

If 70% meet or exceed expectations, then I consider the learning outcome successful.
In this case, the expectation was met in most of the discussions (the middle discussion's numbers reflect a midterm crunch; the final one, one student's taking an Incomplete in the class).

Conclusions: I was aware from the start that this particular group of students was doing an excellent job in the online discussions: I attribute this in part to chance, i.e. a very good group of students; but in part to my designing very specific questions that were tied directly to the readings and the later work in the course (and giving them the rubrics). There is no significant change in the data over time.

I will continue to be very specific in crafting the discussion questions and connecting them directly to the individual projects, and giving students the rubrics.

B. Final Draft of Individual Project (SLO #1)

Due: WEEK 16 MAY 4 (NPZ May 6)

Each student will write a thesis-driven paper of a minimum length of fifteen pages, excluding bibliography and title page. The paper will focus on a specific focus or topic that will also inform the student's work in other assignments, including the Bibliography and Review of Literature.

This paper will be a literary/analytical paper, drawing on appropriate secondary scholarship in literary studies (i.e. the MLA database, NOT ERIC). Pedagogical papers will not be accepted; the pedagogical component of the class is covered in the wiki assignment.

You are expected to make The Hobbit the primary focus of your paper, but you are also required to use primary material from three of the four assigned types of readings: Anderson, Rateliff, Scull and Hammond, The Letters.

You are also required to have at least five peer-reviewed academic articles as secondary evidence (you may have more than five, and you may have Tolkien articles that were not published in refereed journals in addition to the five peer-reviewed).

Learning Criteria:

Argument: A well-developed thesis paragraph which makes an original argument and which is placed last in a multi-paragraph introductory section.

Evidence: The comprehensive use of assigned primary and secondary evidence in the body of the paper through the appropriately formatted and attributed use of quotations, paraphrases, and summaries

B. Final Draft of Individual Project (SLO #1)

Assessment of Final Drafts of Individual Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Criteria</th>
<th>EXCEEDS (90-100%)</th>
<th>MEETS (80-89%)</th>
<th>MEETS (70-79%)</th>
<th>FAILS (0-60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Argument 15%</td>
<td>Thesis paragraph which presents clear statement of debatable claim about meaning of primary text, situated in well-developed multi-paragraph introduction which includes review of literature and good blueprint statement. Located within first two pages (if review of literature precedes thesis paragraph).</td>
<td>A clear thesis statement in a multi-paragraph introduction that presents relevant context and review of literature. Located within first three pages (if review of literature precedes thesis paragraph).</td>
<td>An attempt at a thesis statement that does not quite make a debatable claim about primary text; or is situated halfway or more through paper (far too late), without blueprint statement, or context, but has minimal review of literature.</td>
<td>Fails to give any sense of argument in paper at all. No review of literature. No blueprint statement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I consider the results satisfactory if 70% of the students meet or exceed the criteria.

That result was met. Overall, I was happy with the ways in which the earlier discussion assignments led to the strength of the projects: I have encouraged at least three students to consider publication for their work.

However, this class is somewhat unusual in its tight focus (THE HOBBIT). I believe that the fact that the students were all working on the same text, albeit with different approaches and topics, and the fact that they were able to talk to each other about the text, and give each other responses, led to a fairly high success rate.

Most of my courses give students a wider range of project texts to work with. However, seeing how well having the students all working on the same text for their projects were able to move from discussions of their topic to the project in this class does lead me to think that in future courses with a more diverse set of readings, students might benefit from some similar focus, with some limits on their choice of texts for their projects.

CONCLUSION:

English 509:
Paper Option: 100% of students' papers were assessed as meeting the standard for a satisfactory outcome (70% or above).
Electronic Option: 85% of students' papers were assessed as meeting the standard for a satisfactory outcome (70% or above).

**English 525:**
Discussion: In two of the three discussions, 78-88% of students discussion posts were assessed as meeting the standard for a satisfactory outcome (70% or above). In one of the three discussions, 55% of the posts were assessed as meeting the standard for a satisfactory outcome; this was the second of the three discussions assessed.

Paper: 77% of students' papers were assessed as meeting the standard for a satisfactory outcome.

The Student Learning Outcome Reports show that in most cases, student work is meeting the standard for a satisfactory outcome in this area.

However, implementing a Graduation Portfolio assessment as a culminating experience would provide additional data from a wider range of faculty.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Department of Literature and Languages should carry-over this area to the next cycle and supplement the data with a Graduation Portfolio and a MA student survey in order to gather a range of data and more robust evidence regarding learning outcomes.

**ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME #1.C Students will produce research/argument essays of substantive length (15-35 pages) showing they can integrate peer-reviewed scholarship with their analysis of written or visual texts in order to develop their own contribution to the scholarly dialogue.**

70% is the standard for indicating a satisfactory outcome.

The data from the SLORs listed below indicate that the majority of faculty assessments of student work resulted in satisfactory, or above, outcomes.

**ENG 509 - Literary Genres:** An examination of one or more literary genres. Topics and approaches may vary, but might include a focus on a particular historical period, theme, or critical approach to selected poetry, drama, non-fiction prose, fiction, or film.

Student Learning Outcome from Syllabus:

• Students will demonstrate their ability to synthesize ideas pertaining to the course as measured by a review of selected weekly responses from the students and by assessment of each student’s final project.

Assessment criteria
Format Options:

Research Paper:
• Must include appropriate critical and theoretical texts relevant to the course
• Cannot be only a lengthy explication of primary text(s)
• Contain potential for a significant, original contribution to scholarly inquiry [published article, conference presentation] or to enlarge the audience’s awareness and understanding of psychogeography in some other fashion

Online Blog or Other Electronic Project:
6. Results:

Final Paper

Note: Five (5) students submitted a paper for the final project. The percentages in the chart below are for those students, not a percentage of the entire class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent (90-100%)</th>
<th>Above Average (80-89%)</th>
<th>Average (70-79%)</th>
<th>Fail (0-60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students’ performance here is unsurprising. Because the students who wrote research papers for their final projects tend to be effective writers who wish to eventually publish or to present their work at a conference, these papers are of good quality. However, in the future I will adapt my rubric more explicitly for the assignment.

Electronic Project

Note: Seven (7) students submitted an electronic presentation for their project. The percentages in the chart below are for those students, not a percentage of the entire class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent (90-100%)</th>
<th>Above Average (80-89%)</th>
<th>Average (70-79%)</th>
<th>Fail (0-60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that because I have attempted to round off the percentages some categories slightly exceed 100% while another falls just under 100%.

Overwhelmingly, the students who opted for the electronic project had more difficulties incorporating the critical and theoretical material into their projects and addressing audience concerns (category #2). I see now that I need to provide even advanced graduate students with more explicit written instructions on ways to include such information.

ENG 525 - Contemporary Literature: A study of post-1945 and recent literature in the United States and/or the United Kingdom and Ireland. Special emphasis will be placed on the ways in which national and international phenomena, both social as well as aesthetic, have informed an increasingly diverse understanding of literary texts. Topics for analysis could include late Modernism and its links to postmodern thought, Cold War writing, literatures of nationhood, post colonialism, the institutionalization of theory, multiculturalism and its literary impact, and the ever-growing emphasis placed on generic hybridity, especially as it concerns visual and electronic media.

Student Learning Outcome from Syllabus:

1. Learners will demonstrate that they understand the varying types of scholarship that have been published on Tolkien's novel over the decades, are able to identify peer-reviewed work, and can analyze where their work fits into the scholarly dialogue. This outcome will be assessed by evaluation of work on the Hobbit Bibliography and Review of Literature and by the final draft of the 15 page paper.

Instrument:

B. Final Draft of Individual Project (SLO #1)
Each student will write a thesis-driven paper of a minimum length of fifteen pages, excluding bibliography and title page. The paper will focus on a specific focus or topic that will also inform the student's work in other assignments, including the Bibliography and Review of Literature.

This paper will be a literary/analytical paper, drawing on appropriate secondary scholarship in literary studies (i.e. the MLA database, NOT ERIC). Pedagogical papers will not be accepted; the pedagogical component of the class is covered in the wiki assignment.

You are expected to make *The Hobbit* the primary focus of your paper, but you are also required to use primary material from three of the four assigned types of readings: Anderson, Rateliff, Scull and Hammond, *The Letters*.

You are also required to have at least five peer-reviewed academic articles as secondary evidence (you may have more than five, and you may have Tolkien articles that were not published in refereed journals in addition to the five peer-reviewed).

**Learning Criteria:**

- **Argument:** A well developed thesis paragraph which makes an original argument and which is placed last in a multi-paragraph introductory section.

- **Evidence:** The comprehensive use of assigned primary and secondary evidence in the body of the paper through the appropriately formatted and attributed use of quotations, paraphrases, and summaries

**B. Final Draft of Individual Project (SLO #1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Criteria</th>
<th>EXCEEDS (90-100%)</th>
<th>MEETS (80-89%)</th>
<th>MEETS (70-79%)</th>
<th>FAILS (0-60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Argument 15%</td>
<td>Thesis paragraph which presents clear statement of debatable claim about meaning of primary text, situated in well developed multi-paragraph introduction which includes review of literature and good blueprint statement. Located within first two pages, or top of third (if review of literature precedes thesis paragraph).</td>
<td>A clear thesis statement in a multi-paragraph introduction that presents relevant context and review of literature. Located within first three pages (if review of literature precedes thesis paragraph).</td>
<td>An attempt at a thesis statement that does not quite make a debatable claim about primary text; or is situated halfway or more through paper (far too late), without blueprint statement, or context, but has minimal review of literature.</td>
<td>Fails to give any sense of argument in paper at all. No review of literature. No blueprint statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (66%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4. Evidence 10%  | Extensive and clearly attributed source materials; skilled use of summaries, paraphrases, | Clearly attributed source materials attempts to present summaries, | Attributed source materials, tending toward more quotes than summaries and paraphrases. Primary evidence in body, a little secondary. Little attempt made to connect evidence to | Fails to attribute source materials; cannot summarize |
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I consider the results satisfactory if 70% of the students meet or exceed the criteria. That result was met.

Overall, I was happy with the ways in which the earlier discussion assignments led to the strength of the projects: I have encouraged at least three students to consider publication for their work.

However, this class is somewhat unusual in its tight focus (THE HOBBIT). I believe that the fact that the students were all working on the same text, albeit with different approaches and topics, and the fact that they were able to talk to each other about the text, and give each other responses, led to a fairly high success rate.

Most of my courses give students a wider range of project texts to work with. However, seeing how well having the students all working on the same text for their projects were able to move from discussions of their topic to the project in this class does lead me to think that in future courses with a more diverse set of readings, students might benefit from some similar focus, with some limits on their choice of texts for their projects.

CONCLUSION:

English 509:
Paper Option: 100% of students' papers were assessed as meeting the standard for a satisfactory outcome (70% or above).

Electronic Option: 85% of students' papers were assessed as meeting the standard for a satisfactory outcome (70% or above).

English 525:

Paper: 77% of students' papers were assessed as meeting the standard for a satisfactory outcome.

The Student Learning Outcome Reports show that in most cases, student work is meeting the standard for a satisfactory outcome in this area.

However, implementing a Graduation Portfolio assessment as a culminating experience would provide additional data from a wider range of faculty.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Department of Literature and Languages should carry-over this area to the next cycle and supplement the data with a Graduation Portfolio and a MA student survey in order to gather a range of data and more robust evidence regarding learning outcomes.
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME # 2 WRITING

A comprehensive list of the English MA/MS program goals is included in Appendix A. The process of developing the goals included faculty input during department meetings and the collection and incorporation of all student learning outcomes on English class syllabi during the 2011 calendar year. The top three (Reading, Writing, Critical Analysis) were selected for the 2011-2012 assessment cycle.

A. Produce a high-quality bibliographic essay and research-based conference-length paper of the student's own design.

B. Produce written work (primarily essays) that demonstrate the ability to use primary texts and secondary scholarship in ways that reflect the conventions associated with researched writing: summaries, paraphrase, quotations, with clear attribution with works cited or bibliography

C. Produce essays demonstrating they know the conventions of writing for an academic audience. The conventions include: a well developed thesis paragraph which makes an original argument and which is placed last in a multi-paragraph introductory section; the comprehensive use of primary and secondary evidence in the body of the paper through the appropriately formatted and attributed use of quotations, paraphrases, and summaries; and clear textual attribution plus the Works Cited page in MLA style.

2. LINKS TO CURRICULUM & PROGRAM FACULTY

ENG 513 - Learning Through Composing
ENG 515 - History and Theory of Rhetoric
ENG 570 - Strategies in Composition
ENG 677 - Theory and Practice of Argumentative Discourse
ENG 518 - Thesis
ENG 595 - Research Literature and Techniques
ENG 599 - Bibliography and Methods of Research

NOTE: Not all the above courses are taught every semester or even every year. Most graduate students, after meeting a few specific requirements, work with the program advisor(s) to develop a program best suited to their professional needs and scholarship interests. See Appendix B for the program requirements for an English MA/MS.

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT: An Assessment Committee consisting of two English and one Spanish faculty member worked on assessment procedures during 2011-12. In future, the committee has recommended that both an English Assessment and a Spanish Assessment Committee be formed to work with the Department head on assessment.

The Department of Literature and Languages (DLL) scheduled agenda items dealing with program assessment at all monthly meetings during the long terms for 2011-2012 academic year. During department meetings, faculty went into break-out groups relating to specific programs to set goals, content, and learning outcomes for these courses. The results of these meetings were compiled by the Assessment Chair and distributed to the faculty as a whole, with input being solicited at later meetings.
Since there is only one strategy for collecting data, using the SLORs, for all learning outcomes in this section, this report will give selected information from the SLORs (full text in Appendix C), then aggregate the results in a checklist.

3. STRATEGIES/METHODS FOR OBSERVING STUDENT LEARNING

A. Student Learning Outcome Reports Collected: Every semester, selected Student Learning Outcome Reports generated by faculty for their courses are collected for use in program assessment. The full text of the SLORs used in this report are in Appendix C. Depending on the program assessment outcome, different parts of SLORs will be used in the program assessment for the 2011-12 cycle. The SLORs used in this cycle's program assessment are: English 509, English 525, English 595, and English 599.

ENG 509 - Literary Genres: An examination of one or more literary genres. Topics and approaches may vary, but might include a focus on a particular historical period, theme, or critical approach to selected poetry, drama, non-fiction prose, fiction, or film.

Student Learning Outcome from Syllabus:

• Students will demonstrate their ability to synthesize ideas pertaining to the course as measured by a review of selected weekly responses from the students and by assessment of each student’s final project.

Assessment criteria
Format Options:

Research Paper:
• Must include appropriate critical and theoretical texts relevant to the course
• Cannot be only a lengthy explication of primary text(s)
• Contain potential for a significant, original contribution to scholarly inquiry [published article, conference presentation] or to enlarge the audience’s awareness and understanding of psychogeography in some other fashion

Online Blog or Other Electronic Project:
• Must include appropriate critical and theoretical texts relevant to the course
• Contain potential for a significant, original contribution to scholarly inquiry [published article, conference presentation] or to enlarge the audience’s awareness and understanding of psychogeography in some other fashion

6. Results:
Final Paper
Note: Five (5) students submitted a paper for the final project. The percentages in the chart below are for those students, not a percentage of the entire class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent (90-100%)</th>
<th>Above Average (80-89%)</th>
<th>Average (70-79%)</th>
<th>Fail (0-60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus</td>
<td>4 80%</td>
<td>1 20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development</td>
<td>4 80%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 20%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organization</td>
<td>5 100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Style</td>
<td>5 100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The students’ performance here is unsurprising. Because the students who wrote research papers for their final projects tend to be effective writers who wish to eventually publish or to present their work at a conference, these papers are of good quality. However, in the future I will adapt my rubric more explicitly for the assignment.

Electronic Project

Note: Seven (7) students submitted an electronic presentation for their project. The percentages in the chart below are for those students, not a percentage of the entire class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent (90-100%)</th>
<th>Above Average (80-89%)</th>
<th>Average (70-79%)</th>
<th>Fail (0-60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Style</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that because I have attempted to round off the percentages some categories slightly exceed 100% while another falls just under 100%.

Overwhelmingly, the students who opted for the electronic project had more difficulties incorporating the critical and theoretical material into their projects and addressing audience concerns (category #2). I see now that I need to provide even advanced graduate students with more explicit written instructions on ways to include such information.

**ENG 525 - Contemporary Literature:** A study of post-1945 and recent literature in the United States and/or the United Kingdom and Ireland. Special emphasis will be placed on the ways in which national and international phenomena, both social as well as aesthetic, have informed an increasingly diverse understanding of literary texts. Topics for analysis could include late Modernism and its links to postmodern thought, Cold War writing, literatures of nationhood, post colonialism, the institutionalization of theory, multiculturalism and its literary impact, and the ever-growing emphasis placed on generic hybridity, especially as it concerns visual and electronic media.

Student Learning Outcome from Syllabus:
1. Learners will demonstrate that they understand the varying types of scholarship that have been published on Tolkien's novel over the decades, are able to identify peer-reviewed work, and can analyze where their work fits into the scholarly dialogue. This outcome will be assessed by evaluation of work on the Hobbit Bibliography and Review of Literature and by the final draft of the 15 page paper.

Two Instruments:
A. Hobbit Bibliography & Review of Literature (SLO #1)
B. Final Draft of Individual Project (SLO #1)
A. Hobbit Bibliography & Review of Literature (SLO #1)

Your discussion posts go in the Ongoing Hobbit Bibliography discussion.

INDIVIDUAL DISCUSSION PROMPTS OF ASSESSED DISCUSSIONS

DISCUSSION 1:
WEEK TWO: JAN 23-27 (NPZ 29)

Read: "Criteria for Identifying a Refereed Journal" by Miller and Serzan (pdf is uploaded to the discussion and in Doc.Sharing)

Post: A comment in The Hobbit Bibliography Discussion

Your comment should be 400-600 words long, and formatted in two paragraphs. Be sure you answer all the questions below, and be as specific as you can (what you tell me and the class here will help me help you on your individual project as well as with this assignment).

First, tell the class about your experience with bibliographic work in the past: have you done Annotated Bibliographies for your past courses (graduate or undergraduate)? Have you written Bibliographic essays or Reviews of Literature in your past courses (graduate or undergraduate)?

Have you taken English 599 or 595 (or their equivalent classes in research methods in your major department)? How much do you know about academic publications (journals, monographs, etc.)? How often have the faculty in your classes talked about academic publication? What topic (of the various approaches to The Hobbit that I give in the Project handout) are you thinking of focusing on? What sort of papers in past graduate seminars (if any) have you done that might connect in some way with this project (i.e. medieval topics, children's literature topics, poetry topics, etc.)? (200-300 words)

Second, what have you learned from reading Miller and Servan? What seems to be the most important points that are relevant to you and your understanding of the assignments in this class? What was most surprising to you in the article? What seemed familiar to you? (200-300 words)

DISCUSSION 3
WEEK FOUR FEB 6-10

Read: The Chronological Hobbit Bibliography and the Peer-Reviewed Hobbit Bibliography to find material relating to your focus (as determined in your Topic Statement). These two Bibliographies are uploaded to the Bibliography discussion and in Doc.Sharing.

Post: A comment in The Hobbit Bibliography Discussion

Length: 1000 words
REQUIRED: Subject Line Listing

List the three scholars' names and the three journals you're researching in your SUBJECT heading so others know not to replicate your work. You may, if you wish, post the names early in the week and add the post later on (you can edit posts).

You must find five peer-reviewed academic articles for your individual project (you may have more, and you may use some of the general articles in addition to the required minimum): remember that not everything published in a peer-reviewed journal is in fact a peer-reviewed article (there are more informal essays, book reviews).

MLA is not always accurate in identifying peer-reviewed journals (and some journals which are peer-reviewed today, were not in the past; plus, as Miller and Servan note, there are a range of criteria held to be self-identified peer-reviewed/refereed journals).

For this post, you should focus on your chosen (and approved by me) topic. You will go through the two bibliographies I prepared before class started and find all the articles (peer-reviewed and general) that relate to your topic--make a separate list for yourself by cutting/pasting from the ones I prepared.

You will be looking at more than five articles to see what is out there, and to select the five best articles (peer-reviewed) for your project.
Then analyze the patterns you see in the scholarship on your topic. I intend that this material do double-duty for your "Working Bibliography and Review of Literature" which is due Week 8 (and by double-duty, I mean, consider this group assignment to be a rough draft of that Project assignment!).

By analyze the patterns: I do not mean read all the articles (though you will eventually be reading the articles you choose for your project, and you can look at the PDFs I have uploaded if you wish.)

I mean, review the list you created, looking for key words in the titles that indicate the focus of articles (are medieval texts mentioned, such as Beowulf or Norse mythology; are genres mentioned, such as fairy tale, epic, myth, children's literature, etc.; are theorists mentioned, such as Jung or Plato; are specific elements of Tolkien's work mentioned (such as poetry, imagery, or Elvish languages); are themes mentioned (such as heroism, determinism, etc.); are languages, linguistics, or translation issues mentioned (I don't expect anybody to read the scholarship in other languages, but you need to know that Tolkien scholarship exists in a number of languages); are your articles mostly structural (focusing on elements of the text), source studies drawing on medieval elements, or using contemporary critical theories? What about dates of publication?

You can learn a lot from just critically reading titles although of course that does not replace reading the articles: it is simply a first step in the process of researching secondary scholarship.

After doing the work above, research THREE authors and THREE JOURNALS and Google them to see what you can find out about them (if there is NOTHING on your chosen author or journal, choose a replacement). (For an example of what to do, see my Sample Evaluation of Two Articles Handout.)

Your work in this discussion is a start at writing a collaborative Review of Literature.

DISCUSSION 5:
WEEK SEVEN FEB 27-MAR 2 (NPZ 4)

Read: The Four Full-Text essays on The Hobbit (in pdf form in the Discussion and uploaded to Doc.Sharing). NOTE: These well full-text ones I downloaded from the databases; I order others via ILL, but I did not assign them since it's not always possible to get the assignments. But those I did get, I have uploaded, and you may substitute one of those for one in the list below IF the substitution is closer to your topic.

Bibliographic citations given below:


Post: A Comment in The Hobbit Bibliography

Number the separate parts of your post:

1. Write an evaluation of the article you think is most relevant to your topic (i.e. this is where you can substitute one of the others I found; if you have another that you think is the most important, you can substitute it but you MUST send me a pdf of it). The questions your evaluation should answer are taken from MLA 7th Ed page 38, 1.6.4: "Who is the author? What are the author's credentials for writing and publishing this work? When judged against previous reading and your understanding of the topic, is information furnished by author correct? Is the argument presented logically and without bias? Are the author's sources clearly and adequately indicated, so they can be verified. Are the author's sources current (TO THE TIME OF PUBLICATION!), or are they outdated? Who is the publisher, or what is the sponsoring organization of the work? Is the work peer-reviewed—that is, has it been read and recommended for publication by experts." Remember, I've uploaded a model/sample evaluation of two Articles for you to see.

2. Write two summaries and one paraphrase of the article you disagree with most. Your summaries and paraphrase should give a reader who has not read the essay the following information without in any way indicating your disagreement (that's what the rest of essays are for)?

Provide: A one-sentence summary of the article (including name of author and title!) (focus on the claims/arguments, not the evidence).
A one-paragraph summary of the article (including name of author and title!) (focus on the arguments, not the evidence).

A one-paragraph paraphrase of a "chunk" of the article (focusing on the evidence and explaining how it supports the claims in the above paragraphs).

Your summaries should convey the following information (in different levels of detail):

What is the main argument of the essay? Are any other scholars identified as making opposing arguments? What type of evidence is presented to support the argument (historical? Biographical? Textual/close reading? Structural elements (plot, character, symbolism, etc)? Stylistic evidence? Other scholarship? Something else?) What sorts of critical methods/theories are used (the theories/methods are related to the types of evidence).

3. Working with either article you used above, choose 1-3 selected quotes from the article and prepare a "quote sandwich" for each. The majority of use of secondary work in academic articles is via summary and paraphrase; one indicator of an inexperienced academic writer is the data dump of exact quotes without introduction or analysis. Pick quotes that you think are so stunning and brilliant that they deserve to be quoted directly.

Resources on how to do the quote sandwich, summarize, and paraphrase:
http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/563/1/
http://www.csun.edu/~hflrc006/quote.html
http://www.delmar.edu/engl/instruct/bcraig/help/quotsand.html
http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/619/01/
http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/563/03/
http://www.utoronto.ca/ucwriting/paraphrase.html

Learning Criteria

Keep in mind the Bibliographic discussion is held in a threaded discussion for ease of collaborative work, but it's not a "discussion" in the same way the Hobbit or Wiki discussions are. Instead, it's a space to post your individual contributions. The criteria are somewhat different than the others which is why a different criteria and rubric are give here. To earn full credit in your online discussions, you need to meet the following criteria:

6. You post the assigned number of posts.

7. You post on time (by the No Penalty Zone is "on time").

8. Your posts meet the required format and assigned length requirements.

9. Your posts address the question(s) that I've asked and references the assigned readings.

10. Your original post is written to an informed audience (me and your classmates); writing to that audience (which is the default audience in academic essays, and you are able to summarize, analyze, paraphrase, identify issues in response to prompt questions, and has specific evidence.

RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: RUBRIC AND DATA

A. Hobbit Bibliography & Review of Literature (SLO #1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Has posted assigned number of posts</td>
<td>Has only done half the assigned work (i.e. not full number of posts, or skimpy posts, not meeting length and assignment requirements), or both.</td>
<td>No postings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 1</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 3</td>
<td>7 (55%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 5</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If 70% meet or exceed expectations, then I consider the learning outcome successful.

In this case, the expectation was met in most of the discussions (the middle discussion's numbers reflect a midterm crunch; the final one, one student's taking an Incomplete in the class).

**Conclusions:** I was aware from the start that this particular group of students was doing an excellent job in the online discussions: I attribute this in part to chance, i.e. a very good group of students; but in part to my designing very specific questions that were tied directly to the readings and the later work in the course (and giving them the rubrics). There is no significant change in the data over time. I will continue to be very specific in crafting the discussion questions and connecting them directly to the individual projects, and giving students the rubrics.

**B. Final Draft of Individual Project (SLO #1)**
Due: WEEK 16 MAY 4 (NPZ May 6)

Each student will write a thesis-driven paper of a minimum length of fifteen pages, excluding bibliography and title page. The paper will focus on a specific focus or topic that will also inform the student's work in other assignments, including the Bibliography and Review of Literature.

This paper will be a literary/analytical paper, drawing on appropriate secondary scholarship in literary studies (i.e. the MLA database, NOT ERIC). Pedagogical papers will not be accepted; the pedagogical component of the class is covered in the wiki assignment.

You are expected to make *The Hobbit* the primary focus of your paper, but you are also required to use primary material from three of the four assigned types of readings: Anderson, Rateliff, Scull and Hammond, *The Letters*.

You are also required to have at least five peer-reviewed academic articles as secondary evidence (you may have more than five, and you may have Tolkien articles that were not published in refereed journals in addition to the five peer-reviewed).

Learning Criteria:

Argument: A well developed thesis paragraph which makes an original argument and which is placed last in a multi-paragraph introductory section.

Evidence: The comprehensive use of assigned primary and secondary evidence in the body of the paper through the appropriately formatted and attributed use of quotations, paraphrases, and summaries

### B. Final Draft of Individual Project (SLO #1)

#### Assessment of Final Drafts of Individual Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Criteria</th>
<th>EXCEEDS (90-100%)</th>
<th>MEETS (80-89%)</th>
<th>MEETS (70-79%)</th>
<th>FAILS (0-60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Argument 15%</td>
<td>Thesis paragraph which presents clear statement of debatable claim about meaning of primary text, situated in well developed multi-paragraph introduction which includes review of literature and good blueprint statement. Located within first two pages, or top of third (if review of literature precedes thesis paragraph).</td>
<td>A clear thesis statement in a multi-paragraph introduction that presents relevant context and review of literature. Located within first three pages (if review of literature precedes thesis paragraph).</td>
<td>An attempt at a thesis statement that does not quite make a debatable claim about primary text; or is situated halfway or more through paper (far too late), without blueprint statement, or context, but has minimal review of literature.</td>
<td>Fails to give any sense of argument in paper at all. No review of literature. No blueprint statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evidence 10%</td>
<td>Extensive and clearly attributed source</td>
<td>Clearly attributed source materials attempts to</td>
<td>Attributed source materials, tending toward more quotes than summaries and paraphrases. Primary evidence in body, a little</td>
<td>Fails to attribute source materials;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (66%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I consider the results satisfactory if 70% of the students meet or exceed the criteria. That result was met.

Overall, I was happy with the ways in which the earlier discussion assignments led to the strength of the projects: I have encouraged at least three students to consider publication for their work.

However, this class is somewhat unusual in its tight focus (THE HOBBIT). I believe that the fact that the students were all working on the same text, albeit with different approaches and topics, and the fact that they were able to talk to each other about the text, and give each other responses, led to a fairly high success rate.

Most of my courses give students a wider range of project texts to work with. However, seeing how well having the students all working on the same text for their projects were able to move from discussions of their topic to the project in this class does lead me to think that in future courses with a more diverse set of readings, students might benefit from some similar focus, with some limits on their choice of texts for their projects.

**ENG 595 - Research Literature and Techniques:** This course requires an extensive investigation into a topic agreed upon by the student and the advisory committee. Note Graded on a satisfactory (S) or unsatisfactory (U) basis. Required of students who opt for the 36-hour Master's.

**SLO 2**

Students will demonstrate their understanding of the conventions associated with researched writing including bibliographic essays as measured by an evaluation of the students’ final project.

**SLO 2**

At the end of the term, students were asked to submit a bibliographic essay in which they demonstrate their understandings of the conventions associated with researched writing by engaging in the complex and rigorous research required of them according to the signed contract they prepared with their faculty specialist and the support of their English 595 instructor (see SLO#1).

Students were provided with the following information:

A bibliographic essay is a review of the relevant/important scholarship (also known as a literature review) that is available on a particular topic. It is written in essay form; it has a point or an argument. Think of it like this. If you wanted to bring someone up-to-date on what's been published on a particular topic, you would give that person this kind of essay. It provides the arguments various scholars make and the salient points. You can organize it chronologically or topically (and sometimes both). For instance, if you're providing a history of the scholarship on composition studies, you would probably organize it chronologically. If you were discussing a particular area of composition studies--what's been written about audience analysis (see Lisa Ede's bibliographic essay in doc sharing)--then you might organize it by the way different disciplines handle audience analysis. If there is a great deal of material on your topic--Shakespeare, for instance--you would need to refocus so that it is manageable.
The essay will include a thesis statement and a conclusion. The essay will be between 6500-7000 words and will discuss 25-35 sources. You will need to position your own argument within the essay.

I have placed 3 samples in document sharing: one wherein I offer commentary (I also have a video/audio of assigned above), one that offers no commentary, but it's a really obvious example of a bib essay, and one that a student wrote for a different class (thus, the length and number of sources are different).

The results reported were derived from the final draft of bibliographic essays submitted, after extensive negotiated with their faculty specialist and the course instructor (me) through at multiple revisions and genres (i.e., bibliography, annotated bibliography, etc). The bibliographic essay was determined to be successful in meeting this objective if it clearly “demonstrate their understanding of the conventions associated with researched writing” (SLO).

9 out of the 13 students (69%) who completed the assignment exceeded average expectations for effectively identifying a topic that allows for engagement in complex and rigorous research, as indicated by scores in the “Excellent” or “Above Average” range on the rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS/THESIS</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine students (69%) submitted contracts that exceeded average expectations. I consider Student Learning Outcome 1 successful, but with room for improvement.

While the vast majority demonstrated use of the scholarly conventions associated with the bibliographic essay that meet or exceed expectations, I would like to see an even higher percentage the next time I teach the course. This could be achieved through more focused instruction on how to craft a bibliographic essay. I will build additional time into the syllabus to provide for students to submit drafts an additional draft of their bibliographic essay for peer review, and I will provide a rubric for student reviewers to assess the effectiveness of this draft to guide both the reviewers in spotting what separates an effective bibliographic essay from less effective ones.

ENG 599 - Bibliography and Methods of Research: For beginning literature and languages graduate students who have not had an equivalent graduate-level course, this course covers manuscript preparation, format; research techniques for literary, linguistics, and composition/rhetoric studies.

SLO 3
Use secondary scholarship in ways that reflects the conventions associated with researched writing: summaries, paraphrase, quotations, with clear attribution with works cited or bibliography. This outcome will be assessed through the annotated bibliography and bibliographic essay

SLO 3
Use secondary scholarship in ways that reflects the conventions associated with researched writing: summaries, paraphrase, quotations, with clear attribution with works cited or bibliography. This outcome will be assessed through the annotated bibliography and bibliographic essay.

Instrument: Bibliographic Essay (Final Project); instructions listed below

All students quoted material appropriately, wrote useful summaries and paraphrases, and used the citation method appropriate for their discipline
Findings

Students had the most difficulty at the beginning of the semester; most had to revise early papers at least once, but much of that was a result of not following instructions.

The results are excellent with all students being able to complete all of the tasks.

It is likely that the one or two students who dropped the course would not have been able to successfully complete the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student has used different forms of research including but not limited to scholarly journals, monographs, and edited collections</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student understands the appropriate use of different forms of research including but not limited to scholarly journals, monographs, and edited collections</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student has met or exceeded expectations in terms of research, thus demonstrating the ability to identify scholarship appropriate for the topic</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student uses secondary scholarship in ways that reflect the conventions associated with researched writing: summaries</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s summaries and paraphrases are helpful and accurate</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student uses citation form associated with the discipline</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instrument: Bibliographic Essay, which is based on several assignments (instructions for both are included)

Drawing from the proposal, annotated bibliography, and perhaps additional sources, students will write an organized, tightly focused essay reflecting scholarship on their topic. Topics will vary, but choosing African American literature would not be sufficiently focused. Writing on the comic book Icon would, and it would allow you to look to scholarship on African American characters in comics and scholarship regarding graphic narratives or comics, thus providing plenty of sources. The essay will include a thesis statement and a conclusion. The essay will be between 3500-4500 words and will discuss 20-30 sources). You will need to position your own argument within the essay.

Evaluation: This assignment will be evaluated according to students’ ability to identify and analyze research in a way that offers insights into the trends, types of research, argument, and major scholars on the topic. Students will also need to note where the research intersects and diverges. The bibliographic essay will reflect a thorough understanding of the conventions associated with bibliographic essays.

See also the following from the bibliography, which was the basis for the Bib Essay:

- Do not use book reviews (articles summarizing and judging critical texts) or interviews.
- Articles come from journals that are peer-reviewed
- Books are published by acceptable publishers: academic publishers such as Routledge, Taylor & Francis, Sage, MLA, etc., and most university presses (see http://www.aaupnet.org/index.php?option=com_contact&view=category&catid=7&Itemid=18)
- Scholarship demonstrates depth. That is, scholarship is more than an opinion piece, journal introduction, or brief overview. For instance, early issues of some journals have articles that are 2 or 3 pages long. Articles like that generally won’t provide the depth necessary for your projects. You can include such articles, but they should be in addition to the requirements
• Older scholarship is balanced by contemporary scholarship.
• Bibliographic entries accurately reflect the style associated with area of study (MLA, APA, etc.)
• Entries are applicable to the topic
• Your treatment of the entries demonstrates your depth of the topic.

4. ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME #2

70% is the standard for indicating a satisfactory outcome. The data from the SLOs listed below indicate that the majority of faculty assessments of student work resulted in satisfactory, or above, outcomes.

A: Produce a high-quality bibliographic essay and research-based conference-length paper of the student’s own design.

ENG 525:
Faculty assessment of student work shows that 77% of students could produce a high quality research-based conference length paper of the student's own design.

ENG 595:
Student survey: After taking the class, 100% of students say that their ability to write a bibliographic essay increased.

Faculty assessment show that 69% of the students who completed the final project exceeded average expectations for writing a bibliographic essay.

ENG 599:
Faculty assessment of student work shows that 100% of students could produce a high quality bibliographic essay.

B. Produce written work (primarily essays) that demonstrate the ability to use primary texts and secondary scholarship in ways that reflect the conventions associated with research writing: summaries, paraphrase, quotations, with clear attribution with works cited or bibliography

ENG 509:
Faculty assessment of student work showed that 100% of students who did the written paper assignment demonstrated the ability to use primary texts and secondary scholarship; in contrast, among the students who chose the electronic option, 85% demonstrated that ability.

ENG 525:
Faculty assessment of Discussion Results: In two out of the three discussions, 78%-88% of students' postings were deemed satisfactory; in the third, only 55% of students postings were deemed satisfactory.

Faculty assessment of individual projects showed that 77% of students produced projects that demonstrated their ability to use primary texts and secondary scholarship appropriately.

ENG 599:
Faculty assessment of student work shows that 100% of students could demonstrate the ability to use primary and secondary scholarship in ways that reflect the conventions of academic research.
C. Produce essays demonstrating they know the conventions of writing for an academic audience. The conventions include: a well-developed thesis paragraph which makes an original argument and which is placed last in a multi-paragraph introductory section; the comprehensive use of primary and secondary evidence in the body of the paper through the appropriately formatted and attributed use of quotations, paraphrases, and summaries; and clear textual attribution plus the Works Cited page in MLA style.

ENG 509:
Faculty assessment of student work showed that 100% of students who did the written paper and 100% of the students who did the electronic option demonstrated they knew the conventions of writing for an academic audience.

ENG 525:
Faculty assessment of individual projects showed that they knew the conventions of writing for an academic audience (thesis, evidence, formatting, attribution).

ENG 595:
Student Survey: As measured by a survey given at the start of the class, all the students came into the course with some knowledge of and experience with (proposal writing and annotated bibliographies), but only half had any experience with writing bibliographic essays. The post-class survey showed improvement in all areas: 100% of the students who completed the assignments reported a greater understanding of how to write proposals, annotated bibliographies, and bibliographic essays for an academic audience.

ENG 599:
Faculty assessment of student work shows that 100% of students demonstrated they knew the conventions of writing for an academic audience.

CONCLUSION:

70% is the standard for indicating a satisfactory outcome. In regard to all the criteria listed above, the SLORs from four courses show that from 69-100% of students produced work demonstrating a satisfactory outcome in regard to the outcomes. The Student Learning Outcome Reports show that in most cases, student work is meeting the standard for a satisfactory outcome in this area.

However, implementing a Graduation Portfolio assessment as a culminating experience would provide additional data from a wider range of faculty.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Department of Literature and Languages should carry-over this area to the next cycle and supplement the data with a Graduation Portfolio and a MA student survey in order to gather a range of data and more robust evidence regarding learning outcomes.
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME # 3 CRITICAL THINKING & ANALYSIS

A comprehensive list of the English MA/MS program goals is included in Appendix A. The process of developing the goals included faculty input during department meetings and the collection and incorporation of all student learning outcomes on English class syllabi during the 2011 calendar year. The top three (Reading, Writing, Critical Analysis) were selected for the 2011-2012 assessment cycle.

SLO #3: READING: ANALYSIS Students will:

A. produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) demonstrating the ability to synthesize ideas.

B. produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) demonstrating the ability to identify, contemplate, weigh, and acknowledge multiple perspectives and multiple subject positions based on personal experience and scholarship that explores perspectives that differ from their own.

C. produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) demonstrating the ability to understand the basic theoretical concepts underlying contemporary approaches to textual analysis and the major differences between them.

D. produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) demonstrating the ability to use the key forms and terminology of textual analysis (whether or written or visual texts).

2. LINKS TO CURRICULUM & PROGRAM FACULTY

ENG 599 - Bibliography and Methods of Research
ENG 677 - Theory and Practice of Argumentative Discourse
ENG 518 - Thesis
ENG 595 - Research Literature and Techniques
ENG 510 - Introduction to Film Studies
ENG 530 - History of Narrative Film
ENG 610 - Studies in Film Genres
ENG 620 - Adaptation: Film, Literature, and other Influences
ENG 710 - Film Theory and Criticism
ENG 720 - Special Topics in Film Study
ENG 505 - The Invention of Children’s Literature and Childhood
ENG 506 - Problems in Adolescent Literature
ENG 507 - Narrative Transformations in Literature of Children and Adolescents
ENG 508 - Constructing Reality and Reconstructing History in Children's and Adolescent Literature
ENG 509 - Literary Genres
ENG 516 - Early American Literature
ENG 519 - American Literature in Transition: From Civil to World Wars
ENG 520 - Approaches to Critical Theory
ENG 521 - American Modernities
ENG 522 - Major Figures in American Literature
ENG 525 - Contemporary Literature
ENG 526 - Studies in Shakespeare
ENG 527 - Antebellum American Literature
ENG 531 - Major Figures and Movements in British Literature
ENG 534 - Medieval and Renaissance British Literature
ENG 536 - The Age of Reason
ENG 537 - Modern Transformations: British and Irish Literature
ENG 540 - Development of the British Novel
ENG 579 - Style and Stylistics
ENG 780 - Texts and Genders
ENG 781 - Major Figures in World Literature

NOTE: Not all the above courses are taught every semester or even every year. Most graduate students, after meeting a few specific requirements, work with the program advisor(s) to develop a program best suited to their professional needs and scholarship interests. See Appendix B for the program requirements for an English MA/MS.

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT: An Assessment Committee consisting of two English and one Spanish faculty member worked on assessment procedures during 2011-12. In future, the committee has recommended that both an English Assessment and a Spanish Assessment Committee be formed to work with the Department head on assessment.

The Department of Literature and Languages (DLL) scheduled agenda items dealing with program assessment at all monthly meetings during the long terms for 2011-2012 academic year. During department meetings, faculty went into break-out groups relating to specific programs to set goals, content, and learning outcomes for these courses. The results of these meetings were compiled by the Assessment Chair and distributed to the faculty as a whole, with input being solicited at later meetings.

3. STRATEGIES/METHODS FOR OBSERVING STUDENT LEARNING

A. Student Learning Outcome Reports Collected: Every semester, selected Student Learning Outcome Reports generated by faculty for their courses are collected for use in program assessment. The full text of the SLORs used in this report are in Appendix C. Depending on the program assessment outcome, different parts of SLORs will be used in the program assessment for the 2011-12 cycle. The SLORs used in this section are: English 509, English 525, English 595, and English 599.

Since there is only one strategy for collecting data, using the SLORs, for all learning outcomes in this section, this report will give selected information from the SLORs (full text in Appendix C), then aggregate the results in a checklist.

ENG 509 - Literary Genres: An examination of one or more literary genres. Topics and approaches may vary, but might include a focus on a particular historical period, theme, or critical approach to selected poetry, drama, non-fiction prose, fiction, or film.

Student Learning Outcome from Syllabus:
• Students will demonstrate their ability to synthesize ideas pertaining to the course as measured by a review of selected weekly responses from the students and by assessment of each student’s final project.

Assessment criteria
Format Options:
Research Paper:
• Must include appropriate critical and theoretical texts relevant to the course
• Cannot be only a lengthy explication of primary text(s)
• Contain potential for a significant, original contribution to scholarly inquiry [published article, conference presentation] or to enlarge the audience’s awareness and understanding of psychogeography in some other fashion

Online Blog or Other Electronic Project:
• Must include appropriate critical and theoretical texts relevant to the course
• Contain potential for a significant, original contribution to scholarly inquiry [published article, conference presentation] or to enlarge the audience’s awareness and understanding of psychogeography in some other fashion

6. Results:
Final Paper
Note: Five (5) students submitted a paper for the final project. The percentages in the chart below are for those students, not a percentage of the entire class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent (90-100%)</th>
<th>Above Average (80-89%)</th>
<th>Average (70-79%)</th>
<th>Fail (0-60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus</td>
<td>4 80%</td>
<td>1 20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development</td>
<td>4 80%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 20%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organization</td>
<td>5 100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Style</td>
<td>5 100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conventions</td>
<td>5 100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students’ performance here is unsurprising. Because the students who wrote research papers for their final projects tend to be effective writers who wish to eventually publish or to present their work at a conference, these papers are of good quality. However, in the future I will adapt my rubric more explicitly for the assignment.

Electronic Project
Note: Seven (7) students submitted an electronic presentation for their project. The percentages in the chart below are for those students, not a percentage of the entire class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent (90-100%)</th>
<th>Above Average (80-89%)</th>
<th>Average (70-79%)</th>
<th>Fail (0-60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus</td>
<td>4 57%</td>
<td>1 14%</td>
<td>1 14%</td>
<td>1 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development</td>
<td>2 29%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 43%</td>
<td>2 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organization</td>
<td>5 71%</td>
<td>2 29%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Style</td>
<td>5 71%</td>
<td>1 14%</td>
<td>1 14%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that because I have attempted to round off the percentages some categories slightly exceed 100% while another falls just under 100%.
Overwhelmingly, the students who opted for the electronic project had more difficulties incorporating the critical and theoretical material into their projects and addressing audience concerns (category #2). I see now that I need to provide even advanced graduate students with more explicit written instructions on ways to include such information.

**ENG 525 - Contemporary Literature:** A study of post-1945 and recent literature in the United States and/or the United Kingdom and Ireland. Special emphasis will be placed on the ways in which national and international phenomena, both social as well as aesthetic, have informed an increasingly diverse understanding of literary texts. Topics for analysis could include late Modernism and its links to postmodern thought, Cold War writing, literatures of nationhood, post colonialism, the institutionalization of theory, multiculturalism and its literary impact, and the ever-growing emphasis placed on generic hybridity, especially as it concerns visual and electronic media.

**Faculty Assessment English 525 (full SLOR in Appendix C)**

Student Learning Outcome from Syllabus:

1. Learners will demonstrate that they understand the varying types of scholarship that have been published on Tolkien's novel over the decades, are able to identify peer-reviewed work, and can analyze where their work fits into the scholarly dialogue. This outcome will be assessed by evaluation of work on the Hobbit Bibliography and Review of Literature and by the final draft of the 15 page paper.

Two Instruments:

A. Hobbit Bibliography & Review of Literature (SLO #1)
B. Final Draft of Individual Project (SLO #1)

A. Hobbit Bibliography & Review of Literature (SLO #1)

Your discussion posts go in the Ongoing Hobbit Bibliography discussion.

**INDIVIDUAL DISCUSSION PROMPTS OF ASSESSED DISCUSSIONS**

**DISCUSSION 1:**

**WEEK TWO: JAN 23-27 (NPZ 29)**

**Read:** "Criteria for Identifying a Refereed Journal" by Miller and Servan (pdf is uploaded to the discussion and in Doc.Sharing)

**Post:** A comment in The Hobbit Bibliography Discussion

Your comment should be 400-600 words long, and formatted in two paragraphs. Be sure you answer all the questions below, and be as specific as you can (what you tell me and the class here will help me help you on your individual project as well as with this assignment).

First, tell the class about your experience with bibliographic work in the past: have you done Annotated Bibliographies for your past courses (graduate or undergraduate)? Have you written Bibliographic essays or Reviews of Literature in your past courses (graduate or undergraduate)?

Have you taken English 599 or 595 (or their equivalent classes in research methods in your major department)? How much do you know about academic publications (journals, monographs, etc.)? How often have the faculty in your classes talked about academic publication? What topic (of the various approaches to The Hobbit that I give in the Project handout) are you thinking of focusing on? What sort of papers in past graduate seminars (if any) have you done that might connect in some way with this project (i.e. medieval topics, children's literature topics, poetry topics, etc.)? (200-300 words)

Second, what have you learned from reading Miller and Servan? What seems to be the most important points that are relevant to you and your understanding of the assignments in this class? What was most surprising to you in the article? What seemed familiar to you? (200-300 words)
DISCUSSION 3  
WEEK FOUR   FEB 6-10

Read:  The Chronological Hobbit Bibliography and the Peer-Reviewed Hobbit Bibliography to find material relating to your focus (as determined in your Topic Statement). These two Bibliographies are uploaded to the Bibliography discussion and in Doc.Sharing.

Post:  A comment in The Hobbit Bibliography Discussion

Length:   1000 words  
REQUIRED:  Subject Line Listing

List the three scholars' names and the three journals you're researching in your SUBJECT heading so others know not to replicate your work. You may, if you wish, post the names early in the week and add the post later on (you can edit posts).

You must find five peer-reviewed academic articles for your individual project (you may have more, and you may use some of the general articles in addition to the required minimum): remember that not everything published in a peer-reviewed journal is in fact a peer-reviewed article (there are more informal essays, book reviews).

MLA is not always accurate in identifying peer-reviewed journals (and some journals which are peer-reviewed today, were not in the past; plus, as Miller and Servan note, there are a range of criteria held to be self-identified peer-reviewed/refereed journals).

For this post, you should focus on your chosen (and approved by me) topic. You will go through the two bibliographies I prepared before class started and find all the articles (peer-reviewed and general) that relate to your topic--make a separate list for yourself by cutting/pasting from the ones I prepared.

You will be looking at more than five articles to see what is out there, and to select the five best articles (peer-reviewed) for your project.

Then analyze the patterns you see in the scholarship on your topic. I intend that this material do double-duty for your "Working Bibliography and Review of Literature" which is due Week 8 (and by double-duty, I mean, consider this group assignment to be a rough draft of that Project assignment!).

By analyze the patterns: I do not mean read all the articles (though you will eventually be reading the articles you choose for your project, and you can look at the PDFs I have uploaded if you wish.)

I mean, review the list you created, looking for key words in the titles that indicate the focus of articles (are medieval texts mentioned, such as Beowulf or Norse mythology; are genres mentioned, such as fairy tale, epic, myth, children's literature, etc.; are theorists mentioned, such as Jung or Plato; are specific elements of Tolkien's work mentioned (such as poetry, imagery, or Elvish languages); are themes mentioned (such as heroism, determinism, etc.); are languages, linguistics, or translation issues mentioned (I don't expect anybody to read the scholarship in other languages, but you need to know that Tolkien scholarship exists in a number of languages); are your articles mostly structural (focusing on elements of the text), source studies drawing on medieval elements, or using contemporary critical theories? What about dates of publication?

You can learn a lot from just critically reading titles although of course that does not replace reading the articles: it is simply a first step in the process of researching secondary scholarship.

After doing the work above, research THREE authors and THREE JOURNALS and Google them to see what you can find out about them (if there is NOTHING on your chosen author or journal, choose a replacement). (For an example of what to do, see my Sample Evaluation of Two Articles Handout.)

Your work in this discussion is a start at writing a collaborative Review of Literature.

DISCUSSION 5:  
WEEK SEVEN   FEB 27-MAR 2 (NPZ 4)

Read:  The Four Full-Text essays on The Hobbit (in pdf form in the Discussion and uploaded to Doc.Sharing). NOTE: These well full-text ones I downloaded from the databases; I order others via ILL, but I did not assign them since it's not always possible to get the assignments. But those I did get, I have uploaded, and you may substitute one of those for one in the list below IF the substitution is closer to your topic.

Bibliographic citations given below:

Post: A Comment in The Hobbit Bibliography

Number the separate parts of your post:

1. Write an evaluation of the article you think is most relevant to your topic (i.e. this is where you can substitute one of the others I found; if you have another that you think is the most important, you can substitute it but you MUST send me a pdf of it). The questions your evaluation should answer are taken from MLA 7th Ed page 38, 1.6.4: "Who is the author? What are the author's credentials for writing and publishing this work? When judged against previous reading and your understanding of the topic, is information furnished by author correct? Is the argument presented logically and without bias? Are the author's sources clearly and adequately indicated, so they can be verified. Are the author's sources current (TO THE TIME OF PUBLICATION!), or are they outdated? Who is the publisher, or what is the sponsoring organization of the work? Is the work peer-reviewed—that is, has it been read and recommended for publication by experts.” Remember, I've uploaded a model/sample evaluation of two Articles for you to see.

2. Write two summaries and one paraphrase of the article you disagree with most. Your summaries and paraphrase should give a reader who has not read the essay the following information without in any way indicating your disagreement (that's what the rest of essays are for)?

Provide: A one-sentence summary of the article (including name of author and title!) (focus on the claims/arguments, not the evidence).

A one-paragraph summary of the article (including name of author and title!) (focus on the arguments, not the evidence).

A one-paragraph paraphrase of a "chunk" of the article (focusing on the evidence and explaining how it supports the claims in the above paragraphs).

Your summaries should convey the following information (in different levels of detail):

What is the main argument of the essay? Are any other scholars identified as making opposing arguments? What type of evidence is presented to support the argument (historical? Biographical? Textual/close reading? Structural elements (plot, character, symbolism, etc)? Stylistic evidence? Other scholarship? Something else?) What sorts of critical methods/theories are used (the theories/methods are related to the types of evidence).

3. Working with either article you used above, choose 1-3 selected quotes from the article and prepare a "quote sandwich" for each. The majority of use of secondary work in academic articles is via summary and paraphrase; one indicator of an inexperienced academic writer is the data dump of exact quotes without introduction or analysis. Pick quotes that you think are so stunning and brilliant that they deserve to be quoted directly.

Resources on how to do the quote sandwich, summarize, and paraphrase:
http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/563/1/
http://www.csun.edu/~hfrbc006/quote.html
http://www.delmar.edu/engl/instruct/bcraig/help/quotsand.html
http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/619/01/
http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/563/03/
http://www.utoronto.ca/ucwriting/paraphrase.html

Learning Criteria

Keep in mind the Bibliographic discussion is held in a threaded discussion for ease of collaborative work, but it's not a "discussion" in the same way the Hobbit or Wiki discussions are. Instead, it's a space to post your individual contributions. The criteria are somewhat different than the others which is why a different criteria and rubric are give here. To earn full credit in your online discussions, you need to meet the following criteria:
11. You post the assigned number of posts.

12. You post on time (by the No Penalty Zone is "on time").

13. Your posts meet the required format and assigned length requirements.

14. Your posts address the question(s) that I've asked and references the assigned readings.

15. Your original post is written to an informed audience (me and your classmates); writing to that audience (which is the default audience in academic essays, and you are able to summarize, analyze, paraphrase, identify issues in response to prompt questions, and has specific evidence.

RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT: RUBRIC AND DATA

A. Hobbit Bibliography & Review of Literature (SLO #1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number</td>
<td>Has posted assigned number of posts</td>
<td>Has only done half the assigned work (i.e. not full number of posts, or skimpy posts, not meeting length and assignment requirements), or both.</td>
<td>No postings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 1</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 3</td>
<td>7 (55%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 5</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Timeliness</td>
<td>Is on time (NPZ)</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Not on time/ not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 1</td>
<td>8 (88%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 3</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 5</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Length</td>
<td>Posts meet the required format and length requirements.</td>
<td>Posts are half or less the assigned length, do not follow format requirements.</td>
<td>Minimal or missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 1</td>
<td>8 (88%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 3</td>
<td>5 (55%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 5</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Topic</td>
<td>Posts repeats key words from question prompt and references all assigned readings.</td>
<td>Posts might mention a key term, references some of the assigned readings.</td>
<td>No clear relation to question or readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 1</td>
<td>8 (88%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 3</td>
<td>5 (55%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion 5</th>
<th>7 (78%)</th>
<th>2(22%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Audience 20%

| 7 (78%) | 2(22%) |

If 70% meet or exceed expectations, then I consider the learning outcome successful.

In this case, the expectation was met in most of the discussions (the middle discussion's numbers reflect a midterm crunch; the final one, one student's taking an Incomplete in the class).

Conclusions: I was aware from the start that this particular group of students was doing an excellent job in the online discussions: I attribute this in part to chance, i.e. a very good group of students; but in part to my designing very specific questions that were tied directly to the readings and the later work in the course (and giving them the rubrics).

There is no significant change in the data over time.

I will continue to be very specific in crafting the discussion questions and connecting them directly to the individual projects, and giving students the rubrics.

B. Final Draft of Individual Project (SLO #1)

Due: WEEK 16 MAY 4 (NPZ May 6)

Each student will write a thesis-driven paper of a minimum length of fifteen pages, excluding bibliography and title page. The paper will focus on a specific focus or topic that will also inform the student's work in other assignments, including the Bibliography and Review of Literature.

This paper will be a literary/analytical paper, drawing on appropriate secondary scholarship in literary studies (i.e. the MLA database, NOT ERIC). Pedagogical papers will not be accepted; the pedagogical component of the class is covered in the wiki assignment.

You are expected to make The Hobbit the primary focus of your paper, but you are also required to use primary material from three of the four assigned types of readings: Anderson, Rateliff, Scull and Hammond, The Letters.

You are also required to have at least five peer-reviewed academic articles as secondary evidence (you may have more than five, and you may have Tolkien articles that were not published in refereed journals in addition to the five peer-reviewed).

Learning Criteria:

Argument: A well developed thesis paragraph which makes an original argument and which is placed last in a multi-paragraph introductory section.

Evidence: The comprehensive use of assigned primary and secondary evidence in the body of the paper through the appropriately formatted and attributed use of quotations, paraphrases, and summaries

B. Final Draft of Individual Project (SLO #1)

Assessment of Final Drafts of Individual Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Criteria</th>
<th>EXCEEDS (90-100%)</th>
<th>MEETS (80-89%)</th>
<th>MEETS (70-79%)</th>
<th>FAILS (0-60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

38
### Argument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thesis paragraph which presents clear statement of debatable claim about meaning of primary text, situated in well developed multi-paragraph introduction which includes review of literature and good blueprint statement. Located within first two pages, or top of third (if review of literature precedes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>An attempt at a thesis statement that does not quite make a debatable claim about primary text; or is situated halfway or more through paper (far too late), without blueprint statement, or context, but has minimal review of literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fails to give any sense of argument in paper at all. No review of literature. No blueprint statement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clearly attributed source materials attempts to present summaries, paraphrases, and quotes. Extensive use of assigned primary and selected secondary evidence in body. Evidence is directly related to argument, and connection is made clear in topic sentences of body paragraphs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attributed source materials, tending toward more quotes than summaries and paraphrases. Primary evidence in body, a little secondary. Little attempt made to connect evidence to argument by means of analytical topic sentences; topic sentences tend to start with summary rather than argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fails to attribute source materials; cannot summarize or paraphrase and relies heavily on quotes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I consider the results satisfactory if 70% of the students meet or exceed the criteria. That result was met.

Overall, I was happy with the ways in which the earlier discussion assignments led to the strength of the projects: I have encouraged at least three students to consider publication for their work.

However, this class is somewhat unusual in its tight focus (THE HOBBIT). I believe that the fact that the students were all working on the same text, albeit with different approaches and topics, and the fact that they were able to talk to each other about the text, and give each other responses, led to a fairly high success rate.

Most of my courses give students a wider range of project texts to work with. However, seeing how well having the students all working on the same text for their projects were able to move from discussions of their topic to the project in this class does lead me to think that in future courses with a more diverse set of readings, students might benefit from some similar focus, with some limits on their choice of texts for their projects.
ENG 595 - Research Literature and Techniques: This course requires an extensive investigation into a topic agreed upon by the student and the advisory committee. Note Graded on a satisfactory (S) or unsatisfactory (U) basis. Required of students who opt for the 36-hour Master’s.

SLO 2
Students will demonstrate their understanding of the conventions associated with researched writing including bibliographic essays as measured by an evaluation of the students’ final project.

SLO 2
At the end of the term, students were asked to submit a bibliographic essay in which they demonstrate their understandings of the conventions associated with researched writing by engaging in the complex and rigorous research required of them according to the signed contract they prepared with their faculty specialist and the support of their English 595 instructor (see SLO#1).

Students were provided with the following information:
A bibliographic essay is a review of the relevant/important scholarship (also known as a literature review) that is available on a particular topic. It is written in essay form; it has a point or an argument. Think of it like this. If you wanted to bring someone up-to-date on what's been published on a particular topic, you would give that person this kind of essay. It provides the arguments various scholars make and the salient points. You can organize it chronologically or topically (and sometimes both). For instance, if you're providing a history of the scholarship on composition studies, you would probably organize it chronologically. If you were discussing a particular area of composition studies--what's been written about audience analysis (see Lisa Ede's bibliographic essay in doc sharing)--then you might organize it by the way different disciplines handle audience analysis. If there is a great deal of material on your topic--Shakespeare, for instance--you would need to refocus so that it is manageable.

The essay will include a thesis statement and a conclusion. The essay will be between 6500-7000 words and will discuss 25-35 sources. You will need to position your own argument within the essay.

I have placed 3 samples in document sharing: one wherein I offer commentary (I also have a video/audio of assigned above), one that offers no commentary, but it's a really obvious example of a bib essay, and one that a student wrote for a different class (thus, the length and number of sources are different).

The results reported were derived from the final draft of bibliographic essays submitted, after extensive negotiated with their faculty specialist and the course instructor (me) through at multiple revisions and genres (i.e., bibliography, annotated bibliography, etc). The bibliographic essay was determined to be successful in meeting this objective if it clearly “demonstrate their understanding of the conventions associated with researched writing” (SLO #2).

9 out of the 13 students (69%) who completed the assignment exceeded average expectations for effectively identifying a topic that allows for engagement in complex and rigorous research, as indicated by scores in the “Excellent” or “Above Average” range on the rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS/THESIS</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine students (69%) submitted contracts that exceeded average expectations. I consider Student Learning Outcome 1 successful, but with room for improvement.
While the vast majority demonstrated use of the scholarly conventions associated with the bibliographic essay that meet or exceed expectations, I would like to see an even higher percentage the next time I teach the course. This could be achieved through more focused instruction on how to craft a bibliographic essay. I will build additional time into the syllabus to provide for students to submit drafts an additional draft of their bibliographic essay for peer review, and I will provide a rubric for student reviewers to assess the effectiveness of this draft to guide both the reviewers in spotting what separates an effective bibliographic essay from less effective ones.

**ENG 599 - Bibliography and Methods of Research:** For beginning literature and languages graduate students who have not had an equivalent graduate-level course, this course covers manuscript preparation, format; research techniques for literary, linguistics, and composition/rhetoric studies.

**SLO 3**
Use secondary scholarship in ways that reflects the conventions associated with researched writing: summaries, paraphrase, quotations, with clear attribution with works cited or bibliography. This outcome will be assessed through the annotated bibliography and bibliographic essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students had the most difficulty at the beginning of the semester; most had to revise early papers at least once, but much of that was a result of not following instructions.</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The results are excellent with all students being able to complete all of the tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is likely that the one or two students who dropped the course would not have been able to successfully complete the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student has used different forms of research including but not limited to scholarly journals, monographs, and edited collections</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>12 (100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student understands the appropriate use of different forms of research including but not limited to scholarly journals, monographs, and edited collections</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student has met or exceeded expectations in terms of research, thus demonstrating the ability to identify scholarship appropriate for the topic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student uses secondary scholarship in ways that reflect the conventions associated with researched writing: summaries</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s summaries and paraphrases are helpful and accurate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student uses citation form associated with the</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discipline: Bibliographic Essay, which is based on several assignments (instructions for both are included)

Drawing from the proposal, annotated bibliography, and perhaps additional sources, students will write an organized, tightly focused essay reflecting scholarship on their topic. Topics will vary, but choosing African American literature would not be sufficiently focused. Writing on the comic book Icon would, and it would allow you to look to scholarship on African American characters in comics and scholarship regarding graphic narratives or comics, thus providing plenty of sources. The essay will include a thesis statement and a conclusion. The essay will be between 3500-4500 words and will discuss 20-30 sources). You will need to position your own argument within the essay.

Evaluation: This assignment will be evaluated according to students’ ability to identify and analyze research in a way that offers insights into the trends, types of research, argument, and major scholars on the topic. Students will also need to note where the research intersects and diverges. The bibliographic essay will reflect a thorough understanding of the conventions associated with bibliographic essays.

See also the following from the bibliography, which was the basis for the Bib Essay:

- Do not use book reviews (articles summarizing and judging critical texts) or interviews.
- Articles come from journals that are peer-reviewed
- Books are published by acceptable publishers: academic publishers such as Routledge, Taylor & Francis, Sage, MLA, etc., and most university presses (see http://www.aaupnet.org/index.php?option=com_contact&view=category&catid=7&Itemid=18)
- Scholarship demonstrates depth. That is, scholarship is more than an opinion piece, journal introduction, or brief overview. For instance, early issues of some journals have articles that are 2 or 3 pages long. Articles like that generally won’t provide the depth necessary for your projects. You can include such articles, but they should be in addition to the requirements
- Older scholarship is balanced by contemporary scholarship.
- Bibliographic entries accurately reflect the style associated with area of study (MLA, APA, etc.)
- Entries are applicable to the topic
- Your treatment of the entries demonstrates your depth of the topic.

4. ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME #3.A: Students will produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) demonstrating the ability to synthesize ideas.

English 509:
Paper Option: 100% of students' papers were assessed as meeting the standard for demonstrating the ability to synthesize ideas for a satisfactory outcome (70% or above).

Electronic Option: 85% of students' papers were assessed as meeting the standard for demonstrating the ability to synthesize ideas for a satisfactory outcome (70% or above).

ENG 525:
Faculty assessment of student work shows that 77% of students could produce a paper that meets the standard for demonstrating the ability to synthesize ideas for a satisfactory outcome (70% or above).

ENG 595:
Student survey: After taking the class, 100% of students say that their ability to synthesize ideas for a bibliographic essay improved.
Faculty assessment show that 69% of the students who completed the final project exceeded average expectations for synthesizing ideas in a bibliographic essay.

**ENG 599:**
Faculty assessment of student work shows that 100% of students could produce a high quality bibliographic essay which synthesized ideas.

**ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME #3.B:** Students will produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) demonstrating the ability to identify, contemplate, weigh, and acknowledge multiple perspectives and multiple subject positions based on personal experience and scholarship that explores perspectives that differ from their own.

There is no clear connection between the language, and specifics, of this learning outcome and any of the Student Learning Outcomes Reports turned in.

**RECOMMENDATION:** English faculty discuss editing or removal of this learning outcome.

**ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME #3.C:** Students will produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) demonstrating the ability to understand the basic theoretical concepts underlying contemporary approaches to textual analysis and the major differences between them.

**English 509:**
Paper Option: 100% of students' papers were assessed as demonstrating the ability to understand the basic theoretical concepts which meet the standard for a satisfactory outcome (70% or above).

Electronic Option: 85% of students' papers were assessed as demonstrating the ability to understand the basic theoretical concepts which meet the standard for a satisfactory outcome (70% or above).

**ENG 525:**
Faculty assessment of student work shows that 77% of students could produce a high quality work demonstrating the ability to understand the basic theoretical concepts which meet the standard for a satisfactory outcome (70% or above)

**ENG 595:**
Student survey: After taking the class, 100% of students say that their ability to write a bibliographic essay showing different theoretical approaches increased.

Faculty assessment show that 69% of the students who demonstrating the ability to understand the basic theoretical concepts which meet the standard for a satisfactory outcome demonstrating the ability to understand the basic theoretical concepts which meet the standard for a satisfactory outcome.

**ENG 599:**
Faculty assessment of student work shows that 100% of students could produce a high quality bibliographic essay. demonstrating the ability to understand the basic theoretical concepts.
ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME #3.D: Students will produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) demonstrating the ability to use the key forms and terminology of textual analysis (whether or written or visual texts).

ENG 509:
Faculty assessment of student work showed that 100% of students who did the written paper assignment demonstrated the ability to use literary terminology; in contrast, among the students who chose the electronic option, 85% demonstrated that ability.

ENG 525:
Faculty assessment of individual projects showed that 77% of students produced projects that demonstrated their ability to use literary terminology appropriately.

CONCLUSION:
70% is the standard for indicating a satisfactory outcome. In regard to all the criteria listed above, the SLORs from four courses show that from 69-100% of students produced work demonstrating a satisfactory outcome in each area.

The Student Learning Outcome Reports show that in most cases, student work is meeting the standard for a satisfactory outcome in this area.

However, implementing a Graduation Portfolio assessment as a culminating experience would provide additional data from a wider range of faculty.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Department of Literature and Languages should carry-over this area to the next cycle and supplement the data with a Graduation Portfolio and a MA student survey in order to gather a range of data and more robust evidence regarding learning outcomes.
5. **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RESULTS:**

These are the three program outcomes assessed for the 2011-12 cycle.

**SLO #1: READING: MEANING** Students will:

D. produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) showing they understand written and visual texts from a variety of national traditions and historical periods.

E. produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) showing they understand the writings of scholars and critics about written and visual texts.

F. produce research/argument essays of substantive length (15-35 pages) showing they can integrate peer-reviewed scholarship with their analysis of written or visual texts in order to develop their own contribution to the scholarly dialogue.

**SLO #2 WRITING**

A. Produce a high-quality bibliographic essay and research-based conference-length paper of the student’s own design.

B. Produce written work (primarily essays) that demonstrate the ability to use primary texts and secondary scholarship in ways that reflect the conventions associated with researched writing: summaries, paraphrase, quotations, with clear attribution with works cited or bibliography.

C. Produce essays demonstrating they know the conventions of writing for an academic audience. The conventions include: a well developed thesis paragraph which makes an original argument and which is placed last in a multi-paragraph introductory section; the comprehensive use of primary and secondary evidence in the body of the paper through the appropriately formatted and attributed use of quotations, paraphrases, and summaries; and clear textual attribution plus the Works Cited page in MLA style.

**SLO #3: READING: ANALYSIS** Students will:

A. produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) demonstrating the ability to synthesize ideas.

B. produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) demonstrating the ability to identify, contemplate, weigh, and acknowledge multiple perspectives and multiple subject positions based on personal experience and scholarship that explores perspectives that differ from their own.

C. produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) demonstrating the ability to understand the basic theoretical concepts underlying contemporary approaches to textual analysis and the major differences between them.

D. produce written works (position papers, response papers, analytical essays, research/argument essays) demonstrating the ability to use the key forms and terminology of textual analysis (whether or written or visual texts).

These are the methods/strategies used to gather data:

**A. Student Learning Outcome Reports Collected:** Every semester, selected Student Learning Outcome Reports generated by faculty for their courses are collected for use in program assessment. The full text of the SLORs used in this report are in Appendix E. Depending on the program assessment outcome, different parts of SLORs will be used in the program assessment for the 2011-12 cycle. The SLORs used in this cycle's program assessment are: English 509, English 525, English 595, and English 599.
ENG 509 - Literary Genres: An examination of one or more literary genres. Topics and approaches may vary, but might include a focus on a particular historical period, theme, or critical approach to selected poetry, drama, non-fiction prose, fiction, or film.

ENG 525 - Contemporary Literature: A study of post-1945 and recent literature in the United States and/or the United Kingdom and Ireland. Special emphasis will be placed on the ways in which national and international phenomena, both social as well as aesthetic, have informed an increasingly diverse understanding of literary texts. Topics for analysis could include late Modernism and its links to postmodern thought, Cold War writing, literatures of nationhood, post colonialism, the institutionalization of theory, multiculturalism and its literary impact, and the ever-growing emphasis placed on generic hybridity, especially as it concerns visual and electronic media.

ENG 595 - Research Literature and Techniques: This course requires an extensive investigation into a topic agreed upon by the student and the advisory committee. Note Graded on a satisfactory (S) or unsatisfactory (U) basis. Required of students who opt for the 36-hour Master’s.

ENG 599 - Bibliography and Methods of Research: For beginning literature and languages graduate students who have not had an equivalent graduate-level course, this course covers manuscript preparation, format; research techniques for literary, linguistics, and composition/rhetoric studies.

This table reports the summary of information from all the assessment areas,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES*</th>
<th>STUDENT PERCEPTION % Satisfactory</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>FACULTY ASSESSMENT % Satisfactory</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: READING: MEANING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Not assessed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not assessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>509 Paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>509 Electronic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>525 Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>525 Paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Not assessed</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55-88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>509 Paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>509 Electronic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>525 Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>525 Paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Not assessed</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>509 Paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>509 Electronic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>525 Paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### #2: WRITING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not assessed</td>
<td>Not assessed</td>
<td>Not assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>77% 100% 69% 100%</td>
<td>100% 85% 55-88% 77% 100%</td>
<td>100% 85% 77% 100% 69% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### #3: READING: ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not assessed</td>
<td>Not assessed</td>
<td>Not assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100% 85% 77% 100%</td>
<td>100% 85% 77% 100%</td>
<td>100% 85% 77% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES
The data generated by faculty Student Learning Outcomes Reports (SLORs) in two literature and two research and methods courses show that students have generally learned the skills relating to each areas of the outcomes at a satisfactory level.

However there were some potential problem areas in the areas, relating to online student discussions and electronic productions.

Additionally, there were two areas where the SLORs did not address the criteria in any way, showing gaps in the assessment process.

Therefore, the chair of the assessment committee recommends that the DLL, starting in Summer 2012, develop two methods for assessing learning outcomes as culminating experiences in this program (see Appendix D for details). The two methods are:

1. **Graduate Portfolio**: Faculty teaching all graduate courses turn in copies of the major projects from their graduate English classes to be assembled in a Portfolio which will be assessed by the English Assessment Committee when the student graduates. This process will be modeled on the English BA Senior Portfolio which was piloted Spring 2012.

2. **518/595 Assessment**: The English 595 class has two faculty working with students; the teacher of record and the content specialist. The faculty communicate with each other, and the student, throughout the term. They could easily work together to complete a rubric assessing the learning outcomes based on the final project which would also be turned in as part of the Graduate Portfolio.

English 518 sections are still taught on the independent study model: the advisor works with the student, and a committee of at least two other faculty. At the final defense, the committee, as well as signing the graduate school form, can also discuss and complete a single rubric assessing the completed thesis.

The Department needs to develop a common rubric which would be used for all 595s, and another for the 518s.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Department of Literature and Languages should carry-over the three learning outcomes this year to the next cycle in order to supplement assessment with additional data from a Graduation Portfolio and a MA student survey in order to gain more robust evidence regarding learning outcomes.

Additional Recommendations can be found in Appendix D.

Because the amount of data was limited this cycle, and the results are not strongly indicative of satisfactory or failing results, the Department of Literature and Languages should carry over the program outcomes for assessment in the next cycle (2012-13).

The department faculty should review the recommendations, including the revised materials in Appendix E, and meet in August to plan the data-gathering schedule and procedures. See specific recommendations in Appendix D.

**6. PROGRAM ENHANCEMENT**
The Department of Literature and Languages changed English 595 from independent studies to an organized course to facilitate both the quality of student work and the time to graduation. The course has been taught twice in this cycle, and our assessment will continue to examine the success of this change.
APPENDIX A:

This list is the COMPREHENSIVE list of goals that the department has developed.

MA MS ENGLISH The program has set the following goals (outcomes):

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Critical Thinking & Analysis
4. Language Use
5. Language Structure
6. Understanding & appreciation of texts (any genre/media) as art form
7. Understanding & appreciation of texts (any genre/media) as socio-cultural productions
8. Understand social and cultural differences
9. Timely completion of: exam
10. Timely completion of 595 or thesis (Beginning F 2011, 595 will be offered as an organized course each long semester; thesis hours -- 518-- are done with thesis committee).
11. Content knowledge and skills to enter doctoral program in English
12. Content knowledge and skills to enter chosen professions (gov, non-profit, corporation)
APPENDIX B: ENGLISH MA/MS PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Thesis Option</th>
<th>Non-Thesis Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Work (Major Dept.)</td>
<td>30 sh, at least 18 sh in English, including ENG 599</td>
<td>36 sh, at least 24 sh in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>12 of the 30 sh may be outside of English</td>
<td>12 of the 36 sh may be outside of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final project</td>
<td>6 sh of ENG 518 Thesis (included in total 30 sh)</td>
<td>3 sh of ENG 595 Paper (included in total 36 sh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations</td>
<td>Written and oral proposal of Thesis and final defense</td>
<td>Written and oral proposal of ENG 595 paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language*</td>
<td>a. 12 sh of appropriate undergraduate-level classes, or</td>
<td>a. 12 sh of appropriate undergraduate-level classes, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. 6 sh of graduate-level French for Reading, or</td>
<td>b. 6 sh of graduate-level French for Reading, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Dept. FLPE</td>
<td>c. Dept. FLPE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Students who do not satisfy the foreign language requirement will receive an MS degree rather than an MA.

Please note that the Departmental Foreign Language Proficiency Exam (FLPE) will be the final exam for the second course in the French for Reading sequence.

**Course required for all Graduate Teaching Assistants: ENG 675 Colloquium: Teaching College Reading and Writing can be used toward Master’s degree in English.
APPENDIX C: FACULTY STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES REPORTS

Literary Genres
ENG 509.001
Spring 2012

- Fifteen (15) students were enrolled in class (12th day)

- Three [3] students eventually withdrew from the course, leaving twelve (12) students still enrolled by final class meeting

- Fifteen (15) students completed the entrance survey given during class on 19 January 2012.

- Ten (10) students completed the exit survey given during class on 3 May 2012

- Twelve students completed their final project.

- Of the fifteen students enrolled on the 12th day, three students did not submit final projects.

Final Projects fall into two categories:

- Essay (5 students)

- Electronic Presentation (7 students)

Although three students dropped the course after the census date, each of the remaining students submitted a final project for the class and completed all assignments. The withdrawal rate seems typical, and it might even be low given the course’s concentration on psychogeography, an emerging area in literary studies.

Student Learning Outcome from Syllabus:

- Students will demonstrate their ability to identify key figures, groups and issues pertaining to this course as measured through pre- and post-test assessments.

- Students will demonstrate their ability to synthesize ideas pertaining to the course as measured by a review of selected weekly responses from the students and by assessment of each student’s final project.

Assessment Criteria Given Students

Students will have the choice of composing an original research paper for the course or by composing and maintaining a blog pertaining to psychogeography for their final project. The project should be well researched using appropriate critical and theoretical texts; it should not be simply a lengthy explication of your primary text(s). An important goal is for you to develop a project that has the potential to make a significant, original contribution to scholarly inquiry or to enlarge the audience’s awareness and understanding of psychogeography in some other fashion. (30% of total course grade)

Two Instruments Used:

1). Student Self Assessment:

The following survey quiz was given to students on January 19th and May 3rd.

Assessment Quiz
Instructions: Answer each question by circling the letter corresponding to be what you think is the most appropriate response.

1. I [the student] have a good understanding of “psychogeography.”
   A) Strongly agree  B) Agree  C) No opinion  D) Disagree  E) Strongly Disagree

2. Guy Debord and the Situationists are important to the development of psychogeography.
   A) Strongly agree  B) Agree  C) No opinion  D) Disagree  E) Strongly Disagree

3. Peter Ackroyd, Stewart Home, Iain Sinclair and Will Self have been identified as “psychogeographers.”
   A) Strongly agree  B) Agree  C) No opinion  D) Disagree  E) Strongly Disagree

4. I [the student] am familiar with each of the people named above.
   A) Strongly agree  B) Agree  C) No opinion  D) Disagree  E) Strongly Disagree

5. Contemporary British modes of psychogeography seldom involve issues such as social class and ethnicity.
   A) Strongly agree  B) Agree  C) No opinion  D) Disagree  E) Strongly Disagree

2) Review of Final Project

Final Project: (30%)

Due Date: 3 May 2012

Assessment criteria

Format Options:

**Research Paper:**

- Must include appropriate critical and theoretical texts relevant to the course
- Cannot be only a lengthy explication of primary text(s)
- Contain potential for a significant, original contribution to scholarly inquiry [published article, conference presentation] or to enlarge the audience’s awareness and understanding of psychogeography in some other fashion

**Online Blog or Other Electronic Project:**

- Must include appropriate critical and theoretical texts relevant to the course
• Contain potential for a significant, original contribution to scholarly inquiry [published article, conference presentation] or to enlarge the audience’s awareness and understanding of psychogeography in some other fashion

6. Results: Student Learning Outcomes Entrance Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results: Student Learning Outcomes Exit Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I designed the questions on the survey quizzes to address a few of the fundamental issues with psychogeography that connected the reading assignments and discussions for the class. Because the topic was unfamiliar to many students at first, the differences between the two sets of responses are in line with my expectations.

For questions #2 and #3, which involve the key individuals and groups involved with the course focus, a definite majority were able to recognize these figures and their respective roles in psychogeography: 100% (#2) and 90% (#3). Although I am surprised that a total of 40% of the students taking the exit exam selected “strongly agree,” “agree” or “no opinion” for Question 5, this fact does indicate that should I draw additional attention to the issues of social class and ethnic communities in the future.

This Student Learning Outcome was successful.

6. Rubric for Project/Paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent (90-100%)</th>
<th>Above Average (80-89%)</th>
<th>Average (70-79%)</th>
<th>Fail (0-60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Focus         | • demonstrates an excellent understanding and synthesis of relevant concepts  
                   • clearly stated  
                   • offers significant insight  
                   • consistently supported throughout paper  
                   • demonstrates an effective understanding and synthesis of relevant concepts  
                   • clearly stated  
                   • offers insight  
                   • consistently supported throughout paper  
                   • demonstrates an understanding and synthesis of relevant concepts  
                   • somewhat clearly stated  
                   • offers adequate insight  
                   • supported throughout paper with some exceptions  
                   • does not demonstrate an understanding and synthesis of relevant concepts  
                   • unclearly stated  
                   • lacks insight  
                   • not cohesively supported |
| 2. Development   | • excellent awareness of audience  
                   • addresses rhetorical  
                   • solid awareness of audience  
                   • addresses rhetorical  
                   • sufficient audience awareness  
                   • addresses rhetorical  
                   • lack of audience awareness |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• cohesively and clearly organized</td>
<td>• style appropriate for intended audience</td>
<td>• presented in appropriate format</td>
<td>6. Rubric for Electronic Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• sophisticated structure reflects rhetorical aim</td>
<td>• varied, sophisticated sentence structure</td>
<td>• uses correct documentation format</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• demonstrates logical progression of thought</td>
<td>• precise, creative and powerful word choice</td>
<td>• free of mechanical, grammatical and typographical errors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• effectively organized</td>
<td>• style appropriate for intended audience</td>
<td>• presented in appropriate format</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• reflects rhetorical aim</td>
<td>• varied sentence structure</td>
<td>• uses correct documentation format</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• demonstrates logical progression of thought</td>
<td>• precise, creative word choice</td>
<td>• relatively free of mechanical, grammatical and typographical errors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• adequately organized</td>
<td>• style inappropriate for intended audience</td>
<td>• adequately reflects appropriate format</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• generally reflects rhetorical aim</td>
<td>• lack of control over sentence structure</td>
<td>• inadequate use of correct documentation format</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• sufficiently logical progression of thought</td>
<td>• uninspiring word choice</td>
<td>• contains some free of mechanical, grammatical and typographical errors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• not clearly organized</td>
<td>• does not reflect rhetorical aim</td>
<td>• consistent and varied grammatical and typographical errors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• illogical development of thought</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rubric for Electronic Project

- **Aim with Clarity**
  - Convincing supporting information
  - Concrete examples and descriptions

- **Aim with Sophistication**
  - Convincing, creative supporting information
  - Concrete examples and descriptions

- **Aim**
  - Convincing supporting information
  - Concrete examples and descriptions

- **Organization**
  - Effectively organized
  - Reflects rhetorical aim
  - Demonstrates logical progression of thought

- **Style**
  - Style appropriate for intended audience
  - Varied, sophisticated sentence structure
  - Precise, creative and powerful word choice

- **Conventions**
  - Presented in appropriate format
  - Uses correct documentation format
  - Free of mechanical, grammatical and typographical errors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent (90-100%)</th>
<th>Above Average (80-89%)</th>
<th>Average (70-79%)</th>
<th>Fail (0-60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Focus         | • demonstrates an excellent understanding and synthesis of relevant concepts  
                  • clearly stated  
                  • offers significant insight  
|                  | • demonstrates an effective understanding and synthesis of relevant concepts  
                  • clearly stated  
                  • offers insight  
|                  | • demonstrates an understanding and synthesis of relevant concepts  
                  • somewhat clearly stated  
                  • offers adequate insight  
|                  | • does not demonstrate an understanding and synthesis of relevant concepts  
                  • unclearly stated  
                  • lacks insight  
| 2. Development   | • excellent awareness of audience  
                  • excellent inclusion of theoretical material  
|                  | • solid awareness of audience  
                  • effective inclusion of theoretical material  
|                  | • sufficient audience awareness  
                  • adequate effective inclusion of theoretical material  
|                  | • lack of audience awareness  
                  • does not include theoretical material  
| 3. Organization  | • cohesively and clearly organized  
                  • sophisticated structure reflects rhetorical aim  
                  • demonstrates logical progression of thought  
|                  | • effectively organized  
                  • reflects rhetorical aim  
                  • demonstrates logical progression of thought  
|                  | • adequately organized  
                  • generally reflects rhetorical aim  
                  • sufficiently logical progression of thought  
|                  | • not clearly organized  
                  • does not reflect rhetorical aim  
                  • illogical development of thought  
| 4. Style         | • style appropriate for and engages audience  
                  • highly creative presentation of information  
|                  | • style appropriate for intended audience  
                  • creative presentation of information  
|                  | • adequate style for intended audience  
                  • some creativity in presentation of information  
|                  | • style inappropriate for intended audience  
                  • lack of creativity in presentation  

6. Results:
Final Paper

Note: Five (5) students submitted a paper for the final project. The percentages in the chart below are for those students, not a percentage of the entire class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent (90-100%)</th>
<th>Above Average (80-89%)</th>
<th>Average (70-79%)</th>
<th>Fail (0-60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Style</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conventions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students’ performance here is unsurprising. Because the students who wrote research papers for their final projects tend to be effective writers who wish to eventually publish or to present their work at a conference, these papers are of good quality. However, in the future I will adapt my rubric more explicitly for the assignment.

Electronic Project

Note: Seven (7) students submitted an electronic presentation for their project. The percentages in the chart below are for those students, not a percentage of the entire class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent (90-100%)</th>
<th>Above Average (80-89%)</th>
<th>Average (70-79%)</th>
<th>Fail (0-60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Please note that because I have attempted to round off the percentages some categories slightly exceed 100% while another falls just under 100%.

Overwhelmingly, the students who opted for the electronic project had more difficulties incorporating the critical and theoretical material into their projects and addressing audience concerns (category #2). I see now that I need to provide even advanced graduate students with more explicit written instructions on ways to include such information.

7. CLOSING THE LOOP

In a future version of this course or a course with similar content and assignments I plan to provide more detailed written instructions in separate and redundant handouts in order to ensure that students understand how to tailor electronic and written projects for particular academic and advanced-interest audiences. Although the Student Learning Outcome for identifying key individuals and groups was successful, I plan to establish new ways of having students demonstrate this understanding: most likely, this will come through incorporation on an assigned short writing topic.
Contemporary Literature
English 525.01W
Spring 2012

12 students were enrolled in class (12th day)
7 (58%) of the students completed the assignments that were chosen for assessment this term
3 students dropped the class
1 student failed to turn in any work and failed the class
1 student took Incomplete grades due to family problems

Student Learning Outcome from Syllabus:

1. Learners will demonstrate that they understand the varying types of scholarship that have been published on Tolkien's novel over the decades, are able to identify peer-reviewed work, and can analyze where their work fits into the scholarly dialogue. This outcome will be assessed by evaluation of work on the Hobbit Bibliography and Review of Literature and by the final draft of the 15 page paper.
2. Learners will demonstrate an understanding of the curricular resources available on the internet on teaching Tolkien's Hobbit. This outcome will be assessed by evaluation of the wiki assignments on teaching Tolkien.

Three Instruments:

A. Hobbit Bibliography & Review of Literature (SLO #1)
B. Final Draft of Individual Project (SLO #1)
C. Wiki Assignment (SLO #2)

A. Hobbit Bibliography & Review of Literature (SLO #1)

English 525.01W
Spring 2012
Contemporary Literature: The Hobbit

Hobbit Bibliography and Review of Literature Assignment
DISCUSSION ASSIGNMENTS
15 points/100

NOTE: You will not be posting your discussions here: there is no Dropbox.

Your discussion posts go in the Ongoing Hobbit Bibliography discussion.

That threaded discussion has four topic threads: you must post in a different thread for each assignment. The threads are: WEEK TWO; WEEK FOUR; WEEK SIX; WEEK SEVEN.

Unlike the other discussions, you are not assigned to respond regularly: only once, during WEEK THREE, are you assigned to respond to classmates. You can respond more often, of course, but prioritize the graded responses first!

Since the 'discussions' are working toward a collaborative Review of Literature that will be posted in the Fantastic Wiki (by me!), I thought it might be useful for you to have a master list of the discussion questions to review as a single unit.
**INDIVIDUAL DISCUSSION PROMPTS**

**WEEK TWO: JAN 23-27 (NPZ 29)**

**Read:** "Criteria for Identifying a Refereed Journal" by Miller and Serzan (pdf is uploaded to the discussion and in Doc.Sharing)

**Post:** A comment in The Hobbit Bibliography Discussion

Your comment should be 400-600 words long, and formatted in two paragraphs. Be sure you answer all the questions below, and be as specific as you can (what you tell me and the class here will help me help you on your individual project as well as with this assignment).

First, tell the class about your experience with bibliographic work in the past: have you done Annotated Bibliographies for your past courses (graduate or undergraduate)? Have you written Bibliographic essays or Reviews of Literature in your past courses (graduate or undergraduate)?

Have you taken English 599 or 595 (or their equivalent classes in research methods in your major department)? How much do you know about academic publications (journals, monographs, etc.)? How often have the faculty in your classes talked about academic publication? What topic (of the various approaches to The Hobbit that I give in the Project handout) are you thinking of focusing on? What sort of papers in past graduate seminars (if any) have you done that might connect in some way with this project (i.e. medieval topics, children's literature topics, poetry topics, etc.)? (200-300 words)

Second, what have you learned from reading Miller and Servan? What seems to be the most important points that are relevant to you and your understanding of the assignments in this class? What was most surprising to you in the article? What seemed familiar to you? (200-300 words)

**WEEK THREE: POST RESPONSE TO CLASSMATES IN WEEK THREE**

**JAN 30-FEB 3 (NPZ 5)**

**Post:** Three responses to classmates in The Hobbit Bibliography Discussion

These will be the only assigned responses to classmates (you can have informal discussions if you wish, but these are the only ones which will count as your grade). These responses should be 100-200 words. Engage with the major points that each classmate makes about their bibliographic background, their reading of Miller and Servan.

**WEEK FOUR FEB 6-10**

**Read:** The Chronological Hobbit Bibliography and the Peer-Reviewed Hobbit Bibliography to find material relating to your focus (as determined in your Topic Statement). These two Bibliographies are uploaded to the Bibliography discussion and in Doc.Sharing.

**Post:** A comment in The Hobbit Bibliography Discussion

**Length:** 1000 words

**REQUIRED:** Subject Line Listing
List the three scholars' names and the three journals you're researching in your SUBJECT heading so others know not to replicate your work. You may, if you wish, post the names early in the week and add the post later on (you can edit posts).

You must find five peer-reviewed academic articles for your individual project (you may have more, and you may use some of the general articles in addition to the required minimum): remember that not everything published in a peer-reviewed journal is in fact a peer-reviewed article (there are more informal essays, book reviews).

MLA is not always accurate in identifying peer-reviewed journals (and some journals which are peer-reviewed today, were not in the past; plus, as Miller and Servan note, there are a range of criteria held to be self-identified peer-reviewed/refereed journals).

For this post, you should focus on your chosen (and approved by me) topic. You will go through the two bibliographies I prepared before class started and find all the articles (peer-reviewed and general) that relate to your topic--make a separate list for yourself by cutting/pasting from the ones I prepared.

You will be looking at more than five articles to see what is out there, and to select the five best articles (peer-reviewed) for your project.

Then analyze the patterns you see in the scholarship on your topic. I intend that this material do double-duty for your "Working Bibliography and Review of Literature" which is due Week 8 (and by double-duty, I mean, consider this group assignment to be a rough draft of that Project assignment!).

By analyze the patterns: I do not mean read all the articles (though you will eventually be reading the articles you choose for your project, and you can look at the PDFs I have uploaded if you wish.)

I mean, review the list you created, looking for key words in the titles that indicate the focus of articles (are medieval texts mentioned, such as Beowulf or Norse mythology; are genres mentioned, such as fairy tale, epic, myth, children's literature, etc.; are theorists mentioned, such as Jung or Plato; are specific elements of Tolkien's work mentioned (such as poetry, imagery, or Elvish languages); are themes mentioned (such as heroism, determinism, etc.); are languages, linguistics, or translation issues mentioned (I don't expect anybody to read the scholarship in other languages, but you need to know that Tolkien scholarship exists in a number of languages); are your articles mostly structural (focusing on elements of the text), source studies drawing on medieval elements, or using contemporary critical theories? What about dates of publication?

You can learn a lot from just critically reading titles although of course that does not replace reading the articles: it is simply a first step in the process of researching secondary scholarship.

After doing the work above, research THREE authors and THREE JOURNALS and Google them to see what you can find out about them (if there is NOTHING on your chosen author or journal, choose a replacement). (For an example of what to do, see my Sample Evaluation of Two Articles Handout.)

Your work in this discussion is a start at writing a collaborative Review of Literature.

WEEK SIX FEB 20-24 (NPZ 26)

Read: "Tom Shippey's J. R. R. Tolkien Author of the Century and a Look Back at Tolkien Criticism since 1982" by Michael D. C. Drout and Hilary Wynne.
Post: A comment in The Hobbit Bibliography

Length: 500 words

Write a summary of what you think the most important arguments being made about Tolkien Criticism since 1982 by Drout and Wynne (200 words).

Then, look back at the posts in Week Four's discussion and write a 300 word comparison/contrast between what Drout and Wynne say, and what the class has noted in their reviews of literature. What similar ideas are expressed? What conflicting ideas are expressed? What did you learn by doing the last assignment and then reading Drout and Wynne for this week's assignment?

WEEK SEVEN FEB 27-MAR 2 (NPZ 4)

Read: The Four Full-Text essays on The Hobbit (in pdf form in the Discussion and uploaded to Doc.Sharing). NOTE: These well full-text ones I downloaded from the databases; I order others via ILL, but I did not assign them since it's not always possible to get the assignments. But those I did get, I have uploaded, and you may substitute one of those for one in the list below IF the substitution is closer to your topic.

Bibliographic citations given below:


Post: A Comment in The Hobbit Bibliography

Number the separate parts of your post:

1. Write an evaluation of the article you think is most relevant to your topic (i.e. this is where you can substitute one of the others I found; if you have another that you think is the most important, you can substitute it but you MUST send me a pdf of it). The questions your evaluation should answer are taken from MLA 7th Ed page 38, 1.6.4: "Who is the author? What are the author's credentials for writing and publishing this work? When judged against previous reading and your understanding of the topic, is information furnished by author correct? Is the argument presented logically and without bias? Are the author's sources clearly and adequately indicated, so they can be verified. Are the author's sources current (TO THE TIME OF PUBLICATION!), or are they outdated? Who is the publisher, or what is the sponsoring organization of the work? Is the work peer-reviewed--that is, has it been read and recommended for publication by experts." Remember, I've uploaded a model/sample evaluation of two Articles for you to see.
2. Write two summaries and one paraphrase of the article you disagree with most. Your summaries and paraphrase should give a reader who has not read the essay the following information without in any way indicating your disagreement (that's what the rest of essays are for)?

Provide: A one-sentence summary of the article (including name of author and title!) (focus on the claims/arguments, not the evidence).

A one-paragraph summary of the article (including name of author and title!) (focus on the arguments, not the evidence).

A one-paragraph paraphrase of a "chunk" of the article (focusing on the evidence and explaining how it supports the claims in the above paragraphs).

Your summaries should convey the following information (in different levels of detail):

What is the main argument of the essay? Are any other scholars identified as making opposing arguments? What type of evidence is presented to support the argument (historical? Biographical? Textual/close reading? Structural elements (plot, character, symbolism, etc)? Stylistic evidence? Other scholarship? Something else?) What sorts of critical methods/theories are used (the theories/methods are related to the types of evidence).

3. Working with either article you used above, choose 1-3 selected quotes from the article and prepare a "quote sandwich" for each. The majority of use of secondary work in academic articles is via summary and paraphrase; one indicator of an inexperienced academic writer is the data dump of exact quotes without introduction or analysis. Pick quotes that you think are so stunning and brilliant that they deserve to be quoted directly.

Resources on how to do the quote sandwich, summarize, and paraphrase:

http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/563/1/
http://www.csun.edu/~hflrc006/quote.html
http://www.delmar.edu/engl/instruct/bcraig/help/quotsand.html
http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/619/01/
http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/563/03/
http://www.utoronto.ca/ucwriting/paraphrase.html

Grading Criteria

Keep in mind the Bibliographic discussion is held in a threaded discussion for ease of collaborative work, but it's not a "discussion" in the same way the Hobbit or Wiki discussions are. Instead, it's a space to post your individual contributions. The criteria are somewhat different than the others which is why a different criteria and rubric are give here. To earn full credit in your online discussions, you need to meet the following criteria:

16. You post the assigned number of posts.
17. You post on time (by the No Penalty Zone is "on time").
18. Your posts meet the required format and assigned length requirements.
19. Your posts address the question(s) that I've asked and references the assigned readings.
20. Your original post is written to an informed audience (me and your classmates); writing to that audience (which is the default audience in academic essays, and you are able to summarize, analyze, paraphrase, identify issues in response to prompt questions, and has specific evidence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Number</strong></td>
<td>Has posted assigned number of posts</td>
<td>Has only done half the assigned work (i.e. not full number of posts, or skimpy posts, not meeting length and assignment requirements), or both.</td>
<td>No postings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Timeliness</strong></td>
<td>Is on time (NPZ)</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Not on time/ not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Length</strong></td>
<td>Posts meet the required format and length requirements.</td>
<td>Posts are half or less the assigned length, do not follow format requirements.</td>
<td>Minimal of missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Topic</strong></td>
<td>Posts repeats key words from question prompt and references all assigned readings.</td>
<td>Posts might mention a key term, references some of the assigned readings.</td>
<td>No clear relation to question or readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Audience</strong></td>
<td>Able to summarize, analyze, paraphrase, identify issues in response to prompt questions, and has specific evidence.</td>
<td>Responds to question and has some evidence; analysis is implicit rather than explicitly stated.</td>
<td>Is not able to respond to questions, or does so in such a way as to be unreadable. OR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Final Draft of Individual Project (SLO #1)

INDIVIDUAL PROJECT
FINAL DRAFT ASSIGNMENT (20%)

Due: WEEK 16 MAY 4 (NPZ May 6)

Each student will write a thesis-driven paper of a minimum length of fifteen pages, excluding bibliography and title page. The paper will focus on a specific focus or topic that will also inform the student's work in other assignments, including the Bibliography and Review of Literature.

This paper will be a literary/analytical paper, drawing on appropriate secondary scholarship in literary studies (i.e. the MLA database, NOT ERIC). Pedagogical papers will not be accepted; the pedagogical component of the class is covered in the wiki assignment.

You are expected to make *The Hobbit* the primary focus of your paper, but you are also required to use primary material from three of the four assigned types of readings: Anderson, Rateliff, Scull and Hammond, *The Letters*.

You are also required to have at least five peer-reviewed academic articles as secondary evidence (you may have more than five, and you may have Tolkien articles that were not published in refereed journals in addition to the five peer-reviewed).

**Grading Criteria:**

1. **Length (minimum):** 15 pages, not counting cover sheet and bibliography. May be longer; should not be appreciably shorter.
2. **Audience:** an academic audience (familiar with primary source, but not with secondary sources).
3. **Argument:** A well developed thesis paragraph which makes an original argument and which is placed last in a multi-paragraph introductory section.
4. **Evidence:** The comprehensive use of assigned primary and secondary evidence in the body of the paper through the appropriately formatted and attributed use of quotations, paraphrases, and summaries.
5. **Attribution:** Clear textual attribution in the body of the paper (NOT simply parenthetical) PLUS the Works Cited page (MLA).

MLA Criteria from most recent Handbook (copies in Writing Center if you do not own one; if you are in English graduate program, you should own one).

**CHAPTER 1: Research and Writing**
1.9 Writing Drafts The First Draft & Subsequent Draft page 46-47
1.10 Language and Style page 49-50

**CHAPTER 4: The Format of the Research Paper**
All information in 4.1-4.7. You do not need to worry about binding, and while you are submitting electronically, you need to follow all the formatting rules above.

**CHAPTER 5: Documentation: Preparing the List of Works Cited**
As needed. I expect your List of Works Cited to follow the MLA Style...
CHAPTER 6: Documentation: Citing Sources in the Text page 214-220
6.1 Parenthetical Documentation and the List of Works Cited page 214
6.2 Information Required in Parenthetical Documentation
6.3 Readability

RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Criteria</th>
<th>EXCEEDS (90-100%)</th>
<th>MEETS (80-89%)</th>
<th>MEETS (70-79%)</th>
<th>FAILS (0-60%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Length 5%</td>
<td>15+ pages</td>
<td>14-15 pages</td>
<td>15 pages total</td>
<td>0-12 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>excluding Works Cited, Cover Page</td>
<td>excluding Works Cited, Cover Page</td>
<td>which may include Cover Page and Works Cited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 2. Audience 10% | Uses correct literary terminology easily and accurately. Essay follows MLA guidelines for academic papers, blending primary and secondary materials. | Uses correct terminology mostly; tries to follow MLA guidelines. Has both primary and secondary materials. | Tries to use correct terminology occasionally but spends unnecessary time defining it; tries to follow MLA guidelines. Has mostly primary materials, with secondary materials only in quotes. | Fails to use any literary terminology; fails to have any clear structure. Tends to summarize plot. |
|                 | Uses correct terminology mostly; tries to follow MLA guidelines. Has both primary and secondary materials. | Tries to use correct terminology occasionally but spends unnecessary time defining it; tries to follow MLA guidelines. Has mostly primary materials, with secondary materials only in quotes. | Fails to use any literary terminology; fails to have any clear structure. Tends to summarize plot. |
| 3. Argument 15% | Thesis paragraph which presents clear statement of debatable claim about meaning of primary text, situated in well developed multi-paragraph introduction which includes review of literature and good blueprint statement. Located within first two pages, or top of third (if review of literature precedes thesis paragraph). | A clear thesis statement in a multi-paragraph introduction that presents relevant context and review of literature. Located within first three pages (if review of literature precedes thesis paragraph). | An attempt at a thesis statement that does not quite make a debatable claim about primary text; or is situated halfway or more through paper (far too late), without blueprint statement, or context, but has minimal review of literature. | Fails to give any sense of argument in paper at all. No review of literature. No blueprint statement. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Evidence</th>
<th>Extensive and clearly attributed source materials; skilled use of summaries, paraphrases, quotes. Extensive use of assigned primary and selected secondary evidence in body. Evidence is directly related to argument, and connection is made clear in topic sentences of body paragraphs.</th>
<th>Clearly attributed source materials attempts to present summaries, paraphrases, and quotes. Mostly primary in body, some use of secondary. Evidence is related to argument, and connection is mostly made clear in topic sentences.</th>
<th>Attributed source materials, tending toward more quotes than summaries and paraphrases. Primary evidence in body, a little secondary. Little attempt made to connect evidence to argument by means of analytical topic sentences; topic sentences tend to start with summary rather than argument.</th>
<th>Fails to attribute source materials; cannot summarize or paraphrase and relies heavily on quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Attribution</td>
<td>Follows correct MLA style for Works Cited Page; Textual attribution for summaries and parenthetical for quotes. Introduction of source materials.</td>
<td>Attempts to follow correct MLA style for Works Cited Page; has some textual attribution but relies more on parenthetical. Attempts to introduce source materials.</td>
<td>Attributes most primary and second evidence correctly most of the time, but fails to introduce source materials.</td>
<td>No Works Cited page or fails to follow MLA Style. Unclear or missing attribution in essay. No identification of source materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Wiki Assignment (SLO #2)
English 525.01W
Spring 2012
Contemporary Literature: The Hobbit

**TEACHING TOLKIEN WIKI ASSIGNMENT**
15 points/100
Tolkien and Teaching Resources on the Class Wiki

Your individual project must be a literary/cultural study, not a pedagogical paper; however, I am incorporating a pedagogical element in the course through a collaborative exercise where you will all find, share, and evaluate teaching resources on Tolkien (primarily *The Hobbit*, but you can branch out to the Legendarium in general) on a class wiki: this wiki is on our university server and is only for use by my students or colleagues who ask to be logged on by their CWID and authorized as users:


If you've never worked with a wiki before, I have two things to say:
1. Don't worry! I have tutorials in various formats and school kids are doing wiki entries; and,

2. You are way behind the times: wikis have been used in everything from grade school to graduate school for years now. What a great chance for you to get up to speed on an innovative way to teach!

A wiki allows for collaborative effort to take place asynchronously, making it perfect for online courses. You will be able to focus your individual efforts on the teaching levels and topics that most interest you as a professional, and work with like-minded students on those entries.

I have made the basic wiki categories, so your primary task will be editing them. Work on the entry that is most relevant to your future professional goals, and do not assume that the only venue for teaching Tolkien's work is a literature class.

Kristine Larsen is a professor of physics, and uses Tolkien's work in a number of her introductory astronomy and physics courses: http://www.physics.ccsu.edu/larsen/

Here is a page from the Tolkien Society on using his work to teach music: http://www.tolkiensociety.org/ed/ks1_2_music.html

Given that interdisciplinary and collaborative teaching is often encouraged these days, you can also look for resources for that type of teaching: Dr. Judy Ann Ford, History, and I have team-taught Tolkien's work, often including *The Hobbit* and *The Silmarillion* as well as *The Lord of the Rings*, and the film, on both the graduate and undergraduate level, and we've published articles about our courses.

So be imaginative and branch out (like "Leaf by Niggle"!).

I also have an entry for "Other" to incorporate teaching outside educational institutions, such as a church group, or a book discussion group, etc.

**The Fantastic Wiki Categories For This Assignment:**

The Hobbit: grades 1-7

The Hobbit: grades 7-12

The Hobbit: university undergraduate
http://wiki.tamu-commerce.edu/TheFantasticWiki/index.php?title=The_Hobbit:_University_Undergraduate

The Hobbit: university graduate

The Hobbit: other!
http://wiki.tamu-commerce.edu/TheFantasticWiki/index.php?title=The_Hobbit:_Teaching_in_other_situations%21
Each student will be responsible for finding 3-5 unique (not duplicated by other students) online resources and writing a 200-word paragraph about each source.

I assume you will evaluate the sites you find and choose 3-5 that are good/useful (i.e. if they're not good, don't choose them!), so your paragraph will be more summary/descriptive.

Cover who created the web page, what resources are there for teachers, and how up to date the site is.

You will also read sources collected by other students and do some collaborative work on writing the introduction to the entry, organizing the material into coherent sub-groups (in other words, don't just line up a bunch of links and paragraphs with no clear structural grouping), and do the brief introductions for each section.

**Criteria:**

1. Collect assigned number of sites.
2. Collected sites are unique (not duplicated by other students or assignment handout)
3. Collected sites are correctly linked to and formatted on wiki page.
4. Summary/description is 200 words long.
5. Summary/description provides clear, correct, and sufficient information about the site for wiki readers not familiar with the site.
6. Participate in organizing sites in coherent meaningful groups.
7. Participate in writing introductory materials (to entry, to groups).

**RUBRIC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>EXCELS 90-100</th>
<th>MEETS 70-89</th>
<th>FAILS 0-69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unique</td>
<td>All unique</td>
<td>Most unique</td>
<td>Most not unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Links</td>
<td>Correct link Format on Wiki</td>
<td>Correct Link</td>
<td>Non working link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Summary length</td>
<td>200 words, well written</td>
<td>150-200 words, correctly written</td>
<td>0-100 words problems with grammar and syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Summary info</td>
<td>Clear, correct, sufficient info for general audience</td>
<td>Correct information for general audience</td>
<td>Unclear, incorrect information, not useful for general audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organization</td>
<td>Much evidence of organizing info shown in wiki and wiki</td>
<td>Some evidence of work done in wiki and</td>
<td>Work not done in wiki or in discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>discussion</th>
<th>discussion</th>
<th>little evidence of activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Introductions 2.5</td>
<td>Much evidence of writing and editing introductory materials</td>
<td>Some evidence of work done in wiki and discussion</td>
<td>Work not done in wiki or discussion; little evidence of activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT:**

A. Hobbit Bibliography & Review of Literature (SLO #1)

Bibliography and Review of Literature: Assessment of three of the five assigned discussions, organized chronologically

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number</td>
<td>Has posted assigned number of posts</td>
<td>Has only done half the assigned work (i.e. not full number of posts, or skimpy posts, not meeting length and assignment requirements), or both.</td>
<td>No postings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Discussion 1</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 3</td>
<td>7 (55%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 5</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Timeliness</th>
<th>Is on time (NPZ)</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
<th>Not on time/ not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20% Discussion 1</td>
<td>8 (88%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1(11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 3</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2(22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion 5</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2(22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3. Length | Posts meet the required format and length requirements. | Posts are half or less the assigned length, do not follow format requirements. | Minimal or missing. |
| 20% | | | |
| Discussion 1 | 8 (88%) | | 1(11%) |
| Discussion 3 | 5 (55 %) | 2(22%) | 2 (22%) |
| Discussion 5 | 7 (78%) | 2 (22%) | 2 (22%) |

| 4. Topic | Posts repeats key words from question prompt and references all assigned readings. | Posts might mention a key term, references some of the assigned readings. | No clear relation to question or readings |
| 20% | | | |
| Discussion 1 | 8 (88%) | | 1(11%) |
If 70% meet or exceed expectations, then I consider the learning outcome successful.

In this case, the expectation was met in most of the discussions (the middle discussion's numbers reflect a midterm crunch; the final one, one student's taking an Incomplete in the class).

**Conclusions:** I was aware from the start that this particular group of students was doing an excellent job in the online discussions: I attribute this in part to chance, i.e. a very good group of students; but in part to my designing very specific questions that were tied directly to the readings and the later work in the course (and giving them the rubrics). There is no significant change in the data over time.

I will continue to be very specific in crafting the discussion questions and connecting them directly to the individual projects, and giving students the rubrics.

**B. Final Draft of Individual Project (SLO #1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of Final Drafts of Individual Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grading Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Length</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ pages excluding Works Cited, Cover Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Audience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses correct literary terminology easily and accurately. Essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% following MLA guidelines for academic papers, blending primary and secondary materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (66%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3. Argument | Thesis paragraph which presents clear statement of debatable claim about meaning of primary text, situated in well developed multi-paragraph introduction which includes review of literature and good blueprint statement. Located within first two pages, or top of third (if review of literature precedes thesis paragraph). | A clear thesis statement in a multi-paragraph introduction that presents relevant context and review of literature. Located within first three pages (if review of literature precedes thesis paragraph). | An attempt at a thesis statement that does not quite make a debatable claim about primary text; or is situated halfway or more through paper (far too late), without blueprint statement, or context, but has minimal review of literature. | Fails to give any sense of argument in paper at all. No review of literature. No blueprint statement. |
| 6 (66%) | 1 (11%) | 2 (22%) |

| 4. Evidence | Extensive and clearly attributed source materials; skilled use of summaries, paraphrases, quotes. Extensive use of assigned primary and selected secondary | Clearly attributed source materials attempts to present summaries, paraphrases, and quotes. Mostly primary in | Attributed source materials, tending toward more quotes than summaries and paraphrases. Primary evidence in body, a little secondary. Little attempt made to connect evidence to argument by means of analytical topic | Fails to attribute source materials; cannot summarize or paraphrase and |
| 10% | | | | |
I consider the results satisfactory if 70% of the students meet or exceed the criteria. That result was met.

**Conclusions:** In the case of this class, the percentages results are on the borderline: however, the student who had a family tragedy was earning good grades until she had to leave the state; I anticipate that her work, when completed this summer, will be in the high range and will shift the results slightly. And one student never handed in any work.

Overall, I was happy with the ways in which the earlier discussion assignments led to the strength of the projects: I have encouraged at least three students to consider publication for their work.

However, this class is somewhat unusual in its tight focus (THE HOBBIT). I believe that the fact that the students were all working on the same text, albeit with different approaches and topics, and the fact that they were able to talk to each other about the text, and give each other responses, led to a fairly high success rate.

Most of my courses give students a wider range of project texts to work with. However, seeing how well having the students all working on the same text for their projects were able to move from discussions of their topic to the project in this class does lead me to think that in future courses with a more diverse set of readings, students might benefit from some similar focus, with some limits on their choice of texts for their projects.

C. Wiki Assignment (SLO #2)
Wiki Assessment Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>SUCCESSES</th>
<th>ATTEMPTS</th>
<th>FAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follows correct MLA style for Works Cited Page; Textual attribution for summaries and parenthetical for quotes.</td>
<td>6 (66%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts to follow correct MLA style for Works Cited Page; has some textual attribution but relies more on parenthetical. Attempts to introduce source materials.</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Number of Links</strong></td>
<td>Five</td>
<td>Three-Four</td>
<td>Zero-Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2. Unique</strong></th>
<th>All unique</th>
<th>Most unique</th>
<th>Most not unique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td>5 (55%)</td>
<td>22 (22%)</td>
<td>22 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3. Links</strong></th>
<th>Correct link Format on Wiki</th>
<th>Correct Link</th>
<th>Non working link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>4. Summary length</strong></th>
<th>200 words, well written</th>
<th>150-200 words, correctly written</th>
<th>0-100 words problems with grammar and syntax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td>4(44%)</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>5. Summary info</strong></th>
<th>Clear, correct, sufficient info for general audience</th>
<th>Correct information for general audience</th>
<th>Unclear, incorrect information, not useful for general audience.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td>5 (55%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6. Organization</strong></th>
<th>Much evidence of organizing info shown in wiki and wiki discussion</th>
<th>Some evidence of work done in wiki and discussion</th>
<th>Work not done in wiki or in discussion; little evidence of activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>7. Introductions</strong></th>
<th>Much evidence of writing and editing introductory materials</th>
<th>Some evidence of work done in wiki and discussion</th>
<th>Work not done in wiki or discussion; little evidence of activity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td>5 (55%)</td>
<td>22 (22%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If 70% meet or exceed expectations, then I consider the learning outcome successful. The assessment shows that the criteria was not met in any area (except one, the ability to make a correct link in a wiki!)

**Conclusions:** The results (well under 70%)show that improvement in I still struggle with effective ways to work with wikis in my online courses.
I use wiki assignments in selected courses (undergraduate and graduate). Because of past class results, I have refined the instructions for doing wiki entries: the only critique I received from students was lack of information on how to post images. The change I need to make for the next wiki assignments I give is building in more time for my feedback and required revision, as well as having students give feedback to each other. I have tried to use wikis for group assignments, and in most cases that does not work (for this course, I had a loose group affiliations based on areas of teaching interest, and the students did interact fairly well).
Closing the Loop
SLO #1
Learners will demonstrate that they understand the varying types of scholarship that have been published on Tolkien's novel over the decades, are able to identify peer-reviewed work, and can analyze where their work fits into the scholarly dialogue. This outcome will be assessed by evaluation of work on the Hobbit Bibliography and Review of Literature and by the final draft of the 15 page paper.

Successful: I consider the assessment results of the Bibliography and Review of Literature Assignment and the Final Project to show that students do understand the varying types of scholarship, how to identify peer-reviewed work, and analyze where their work fits into that dialogue. I will be using modifications of this assignment in future courses where this outcome is important.

SLO #2
Learners will demonstrate an understanding of the curricular resources available on the internet on teaching Tolkien's *Hobbit*. This outcome will be assessed by evaluation of the wiki assignments on teaching Tolkien.

Unsuccessful: For the next iteration of this course (or any course with a wiki component), I will start the assignment earlier in the term, assign a higher grade to it, tie the component more directly to individual project assignments and the discussions, and provide time for feedback from me and from classmates on the earlier drafts of wiki entries.
## Student Learning Outcomes Report

### English 595

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE INFORMATION</th>
<th>Research Lit/Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Shannon Carter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE STATISTICS</th>
<th>15 students enrolled in the class (12th day census)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 students (94%) completed the post-test designed to measure SLO 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 students (73%) completed the assignment designed to measure SLO 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES FROM SYLLABUS

#### SLO 1

Students will demonstrate their ability to identify a topic that allows for engagement in complex and rigorous research as measured by an evaluation of each student’s contract with her or his faculty specialist.

#### SLO 2

Students will demonstrate their understanding of the conventions associated with researched writing including bibliographic essays as measured by an evaluation of the students’ final project.

#### SLO 3

Students will demonstrate an increased understanding of the conventions associated with researched writing as measured by select responses to entrance and exit survey questions.¹

### ASSESSMENT CRITERIA GIVEN TO STUDENTS

#### SLO 1

At the beginning of the term, students were asked to complete a contract in which they identify the project focus (250-300 words) and offer a bibliography consisting of 7-10 scholarly texts that could use to pursue that topic. Along with a sample contract, students were invited to participate in an online forum in which they discussed potential topic ideas and their viability for the major course.
projects. Criteria provided included the major assignments function as a literature review and appropriate selection of source material (scholarly articles, not periodicals; scholarly books, not book reviews; recent articles as often as available).

**SLO 2**

At the end of the term, students were asked to submit a bibliographic essay in which they demonstrate their understandings of the conventions associated with researched writing by engaging in the complex and rigorous research required of them according to the signed contract they prepared with their faculty specialist and the support of their English 595 instructor (see SLO#1).

Students were provided with the following information:

A bibliographic essay is a review of the relevant/important scholarship (also known as a literature review) that is available on a particular topic. It is written in essay form; it has a point or an argument. Think of it like this. If you wanted to bring someone up-to-date on what's been published on a particular topic, you would give that person this kind of essay. It provides the arguments various scholars make and the salient points. You can organize it chronologically or topically (and sometimes both). For instance, if you're providing a history of the scholarship on composition studies, you would probably organize it chronologically. If you were discussing a particular area of composition studies--what's been written about audience analysis (see Lisa Ede's bibliographic essay in doc sharing)--then you might organize it by the way different disciplines handle audience analysis. If there is a great deal of material on your topic--Shakespeare, for instance--you would need to refocus so that it is manageable.

The essay will include a thesis statement and a conclusion. The essay will be between 6500-7000 words and will discuss 25-35 sources. You will need to position your own argument within the essay.

I have placed 3 samples in document sharing: one wherein I offer commentary (I also have a video/audio of assigned above), one that offers no commentary, but it's a really obvious example of a bib essay, and one that a student wrote for a different class (thus, the length and number of sources are different).
At the beginning of the term, students were given a ten-question survey. At the end of the term, students were given the similar questions as an exit survey, and a comparison of results was made. The survey questions and statement determining their use is included on the attached document. Explanation regarding the specific ways in which the comparisons were made is offered in the following section.

### SLO 1

The results reported were derived from the final draft of contracts submitted, after extensive negotiated with their faculty specialist and the course instructor (me) through at least one revision. The contract was determined to be successful if it clearly “identified a topic that allowed for engagement in complex and rigorous research” (SLO1).

### SLO 2

The results reported were derived from the final draft of bibliographic essays submitted, after extensive negotiated with their faculty specialist and the course instructor (me) through at least one revision. The bibliographic essay was determined to be successful in meeting this objective if it clearly “demonstrate their understanding of the conventions associated with researched writing” (SLO2).

### SLO 3

The results reported were determined by comparing entrance and exit survey results, where possible. Among relevant items in the Exit Survey where a comparable question was not asked in the Entrance Survey, results were compiled as a general indicator of student’s overall self assessment of their improvement with respect to SLO3. Because the items on the surveys did not always ask exactly the same question, I compared only those questions which seemed most comparable

In other words,

Entrance Survey: “I have written a bibliographic essay in the past” (T/F)

Exit Survey: “After taking this class, I feel my ability to write a bibliographic essay has increased” (T/F)
My goal was to determine: (a) from the entrance survey, how many students reported previous experience with the key genres assigned in the course, (b) from the exit survey, how many students reported increased understanding with respect to the key genres assigned in the course.

The exit/entrance survey questions compared were the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entrance Survey</th>
<th>Exit Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Before coming to this class, I knew how to write a bibliographic essay</td>
<td>1. After taking this class, I feel my ability to write a bibliographic essay has increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Before attending this class, I knew what an annotated bibliography was.</td>
<td>2. After taking this class, I feel my ability to compile an annotated bibliography has increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Before enrolling in this class, I knew how to write a paper proposal or conference proposal</td>
<td>3. After taking this class, I feel I am better prepared to write a proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. After taking this class, I feel I am better able to demonstrate my ability to identify secondary sources appropriate to academic writing. Appropriate sources include peer-reviewed and sustentative journal articles as well as monographs and anthologies published by academic presses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This course has helped me engage in complex and rigorous research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This course has helped me be able to write an annotated bibliography that reflects a solid understanding of the scholarship associated with my topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. This course has helped me be able to write a bibliographic essay that reflects a solid understanding of the scholarship associated with my topic.

8. This course has helped me use secondary scholarship in a way that reflects the conventions associated with researched writing including summaries, paraphrases, quotations with clear attribution with works cited or bibliography.

RESULT

SLO 1

11 out of the 14 students (79%) who completed the assignment exceeded average expectations for effectively identifying a topic that allows for engagement in complex and rigorous research, as indicated by scores in the “Excellent” or “Above Average” range on the rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS/THESIS</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eleven students (79%) submitted contracts that exceeded average expectations. I consider Student Learning Outcome 1 successful, but with room for improvement.

SLO 2

9 out of the 13 students (69%) who completed the assignment exceeded average expectations for effectively identifying a topic that allows for engagement in complex and rigorous research, as indicated by scores in the “Excellent” or “Above Average” range on the rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS/THESIS</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nine students (69%) submitted contracts that exceeded average expectations. I consider Student Learning Outcome 1 successful, but with room for improvement.

**SLO3**

At the beginning of the term, 12 of the 15 registered students (80%) took a ten-question survey (see “Entrance Survey” attached), which I used to assess students’ familiarity with the different elements of the course’s research and writing requirements. I used a similar instrument at the end of course (see “Exit Survey” attached), which 13/15 students took (87%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Entrance Survey</th>
<th>Exit Survey</th>
<th>Students with positive response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic essay</td>
<td>Q1: 6 (Y) 6 (N)</td>
<td>Q1: 13 (Agree/Highly Agree)</td>
<td>Entrance: Q1-6 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2: 7 (Y) 5 (N)</td>
<td>Q7: 13 (Agree/Highly Agree)</td>
<td>Q2-7 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annotated Bibliography</td>
<td>Q3: 12 (Y) 0 (N)</td>
<td>Q2: 13 (Agree/Highly Agree)</td>
<td>Exit: Q1–13 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q7-13 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I consider this SLO a clear success. In all reflecting on each of the three genres assigned in this course (bibliographic essay, annotated bibliography, and proposal), students reported much improvement (100%). All the students came into the course with some knowledge of and experience with two of the three genres (proposal: 83% and 92%; annotated bibliography: 100%). Only half had any experience with the bibliographic essay (50%), though some students without experience writing these genres reported an understanding of how to go about writing a bibliographic essay (58%).

**CLOSING THE LOOP**

**SLO 1**

Because so many students demonstrated an ability to select a viable topic, I plan to continue the way I teach the course with respect to this objective.

**SLO 2**

While the vast majority demonstrated use of the scholarly conventions associated with the bibliographic essay that meet or exceed expectations, I would like to see
an even higher percentage the next time I teach the course. This could be achieved through more focused instruction on how to craft a bibliographic essay. I will build additional time into the syllabus to provide for students to submit drafts an additional draft of their bibliographic essay for peer review, and I will provide a rubric for student reviewers to assess the effectiveness of this draft to guide both the reviewers in spotting what separates an effective bibliographic essay from less effective ones.

**SLO 3**

Because so many students reported a marked improvement in their understanding of several of the key genres required in a graduate program like ours (proposal, annotated bibliography, and bibliographic essay), I plan to continue the way I teach the course, with an emphasis on the bibliographic essay given the previous experiences our students report coming into the course.
ENTRANCE SURVEY
Please take the following entrance survey. There are no points involved; I'm required to measure your attainment of the goals I've set in this class. Don't worry if you don't know the answers or you don't know how to do some of the things I've identified; you will be the end of the semester!

It shouldn't take you more than 10 minutes. No trick questions. :)

EXIT SURVEY
Instructors are now required to measure student learning but can't use grades to do so. Many of us have started using surveys like the one I have developed below. Normally, I'd figure out a different way to give this to you, but you have absolutely nothing to lose, for I'm not the one who determines whether or not you graduate; your specialist does. That means you get to be frank. Please do so.

Congratulations to those of you who now have enough hours to graduate! And those of you who still have to take a little more coursework, well, you're on the downhill side. It will all be over soon!

At the beginning of the term, students were given a ten-question survey, which included the following statement: Please take the following entrance survey. There are no points involved; I'm required to measure your attainment of the goals I've set in this class. Don't worry if you don't know the answers or you don't know how to do some of the things I've identified; you will be the end of the semester!

It shouldn't take you more than 10 minutes. No trick questions. :)

At the end of the term, students were given the similar questions as an exit survey, and a comparison of results was made.
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- Dr. Susan Stewart

### COURSE STATISTICS

- 14 students enrolled in the class (12<sup>th</sup> day census)
- 12 students (86%) completed the course

### STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES FROM SYLLABUS

#### SLO 1

**FINDINGS**

Demonstrate an understanding of different forms of research and when/how to use them. This outcome will be assessed through research expeditions and assignments.

**Instrument:** Bibliographic Essay (Final Project); instructions listed below

- 100% of the 12 students who completed the course identified different forms of research including scholarship from academic journals, monographs, and edited collections.
- No students used book reviews in place of the above.
- 100% of the 12 students understood the difference between primary and secondary texts and used them appropriately.

#### SLO 2

**FINDINGS**

Demonstrate strong research problem-solving skills. This outcome will be assessed through research expeditions and assignments.

**Instrument:** Bibliographic Essay (Final Project); instructions listed below
All students were able to complete the bibliographic essay with sufficient research materials by using a variety of methods including but not limited to different databases, print materials, and bibliographies from other texts.

**SLO 3**

Use secondary scholarship in ways that reflects the conventions associated with researched writing: summaries, paraphrase, quotations, with clear attribution with works cited or bibliography. This outcome will be assessed through the annotated bibliography and bibliographic essay.

**Instrument: Bibliographic Essay (Final Project); instructions listed below**

All students quoted material appropriately, wrote useful summaries and paraphrases, and used the citation method appropriate for their discipline.

**Findings**

Students had the most difficulty at the beginning of the semester; most had to revise early papers at least once, but much of that was a result of not following instructions.

The results are excellent with all students being able to complete all of the tasks.

It is likely that the one or two students who dropped the course would not have been able to successfully complete the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student has used different forms of research including but not limited to scholarly journals, monographs, and edited collections</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student understands the appropriate use of different forms of research including but not limited to scholarly journals, monographs, and edited collections</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student has met or exceeded expectations in terms of research, thus demonstrating the ability to identify scholarship appropriate for the topic | 12 (100%)  
---|---
Student uses secondary scholarship in ways that reflect the conventions associated with researched writing: summaries | 12 (100%)  
---|---
Student’s summaries and paraphrases are helpful and accurate | 12 (100%)  
---|---
Student uses citation form associated with the discipline | 12 (100%)  
---|---

**Instrument: Bibliographic Essay, which is based on several assignments (instructions for both are included)**

Drawing from the proposal, annotated bibliography, and perhaps additional sources, students will write an organized, tightly focused essay reflecting scholarship on their topic. Topics will vary, but choosing African American literature would not be sufficiently focused. Writing on the comic book Icon would, and it would allow you to look to scholarship on African American characters in comics and scholarship regarding graphic narratives or comics, thus providing plenty of sources. The essay will include a thesis statement and a conclusion. The essay will be between 3500-4500 words and will discuss 20-30 sources). You will need to position your own argument within the essay.

**Evaluation:** This assignment will be evaluated according to students’ ability to identify and analyze research in a way that offers insights into the trends, types of research, argument, and major scholars on the topic. Students will also need to note where the research intersects and diverges. The bibliographic essay will reflect a thorough understanding of the conventions associated with bibliographic essays.

See also the following from the bibliography, which was the basis for the Bib Essay:

- Do not use book reviews (articles summarizing and judging critical texts) or interviews.
- Articles come from journals that are peer-reviewed
- Books are published by acceptable publishers: academic publishers such as Routledge, Taylor & Francis, Sage, MLA, etc., and most university presses (see http://www.aaupnet.org/index.php?option=com_contact&view=category&catid=7&Itemid=18)
- Scholarship demonstrates depth. That is, scholarship is more than an opinion piece, journal introduction, or brief overview. For instance, early issues of some journals have articles that are 2 or 3 pages long. Articles like that generally won’t provide the depth necessary for your projects. You can include such articles, but they should be in addition to the requirements
- Older scholarship is balanced by contemporary scholarship.
- Bibliographic entries accurately reflect the style associated with area of study (MLA, APA, etc.)
- Entries are applicable to the topic
- Your treatment of the entries demonstrates your depth of the topic.
APPENDIX D: MATERIALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Draft rubric for graduation Portfolio Assessment (created for the English BA, can be modified for MA MS program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES*</th>
<th>SUCCEEDS</th>
<th>ATTEMPTS</th>
<th>FAILS</th>
<th>NO ASSIGNMENT APPLIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: READING: MEANING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to understand written texts in a variety of genres (poetry, fiction, short stories, drama)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to understand written texts from a variety of national traditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to understand written texts from a variety of historical periods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to understand the writings of scholars and critics about literary texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: WRITING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to write summaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to write explications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to write close readings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to write original arguments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: READING: ANALYSIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to understand key forms and terminology of literary criticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to understand basic theoretical concepts underlying contemporary approaches to literature and the major differences between them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to understand the aims of literary criticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: The three program outcomes are the ones chosen for assessment for 2011-12; they may be changed for later cycles, depending on the final conclusions of earlier assessments. At that point, the specific outcomes must also be revised.
1. Draft of MA/MS English Survey from model of BA English Survey

One goal for the use of this survey is to be able to break out MA/MS and PHD students' responses for separate analysis.

This draft is a rough suggestion only: the faculty who teach the graduate courses in the various tracks would need to prepare specific questions relating to their area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate English Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status: Completes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. What is your class level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MA/MS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is your concentration

| Composition/Rhetoric | |
| Linguistics | |
| Literature | |
| Other (BLANK TO FILL IN) | |

5. Have you already taken English 599?

| No | |
| Yes | |
| Not required | |

6. If yes, during what semester?

<p>| Fall 1996 | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently taking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this point in my graduate program, I can:

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

- Find and use the Modern Language Association's International Bibliography (MLA)
- Do a variety of types of searches in the MLA
- Distinguish sources published in peer-reviewed scholarly journals from sources published in general periodicals.
- Identify and evaluate secondary scholarship in relationship to my chosen topic.
- Identify the major arguments and the theories and methodologies used.
- Prepare an annotated bibliography on a subject assigned in a graduate course.
- Do a close reading on a variety of texts (poetry, fiction, non-fiction, scholarly) in order to write a paper in an upper-level English class.
- Write a summary or paraphrase of an essay or article for and upper-level English class.
- Distinguish between an article's arguments and the evidence presented to support the argument.
- Correctly present and attribute quotes, paraphrases,
| and summaries.                                                                 |
| Use literary terminology in papers for my literature courses.               |
| Believe I am prepared to write formal research-based analytical papers on literary topics. |
| Understand and identify the important features of an essay including, voice and supporting evidence. |
| Read peer's draft and give constructive help during various phases of the writing process. |
| Analyze a writing situation, including audience, choose among rhetorical modes for the best to use, and engage in a process of writing and revising in response to instructor and peer feedback. |
| 11. What is your CWID? (Please note that CWID's are strictly used to issue Extra Credit, your answers will remain anonymous to your instructor) |
3. Draft of common rubric for revision process

ENGLISH 333 COMMON RUBRIC: REVISION PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Succeeded</th>
<th>Attempted</th>
<th>Did Not Do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised surface level features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected stylistic infelicities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Revision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deleted irrelevant text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produced new text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response to Critiques</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responded to peer response by classmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responded to instructor suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student learning outcomes this rubric measures:

1. Students will demonstrate they can edit and revise their texts.
2. Students will demonstrate they can change texts in response to feedback from classmates and instructor.
RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Student Learning Outcomes Reports Procedures

1. Selection of specific courses at the start of each term:

The facts are that we have a fairly lengthy list of program outcomes, and that faculty have a number of course outcomes from which they choose 2-4 student learning outcomes to assess.

The Syllabus 2011 Study showed that all course outcomes relate to our complete list of program outcomes, but not every class or student learning outcome will relate directly to the three program outcomes chosen for assessment.

In this cycle, two of the specific outcomes could not be assessed by means of the SLORs that were turned in.

Here is a future procedure and timeline for department consideration:

1. The recommendation of the Assessment Chair is to retain this year's goals for assessment, gathering more data, in the next cycle. Editing of specific language in the goals can be done. The department will have to vote on that in August. Then certain courses need to be selected to be used in the program assessment: those courses need to be selected as early as possible in the Fall and Spring terms.

2. As part of the process of selection, faculty have to identify specific assignments that can be assessed for specific learning outcomes related to program outcomes. Ideally at least three faculty will agree to make sure one or more of the learning outcomes from their courses relate directly to the program assessment outcome.

3. Not *all* outcomes assessed in an individual faculty's SLORs need to be a program outcome, but the department head needs to have a list of faculty who commit to producing data for the program assessment as well as their individual assessment reports. Note that courses are identified with specific outcomes for ease of identification.

4. Fall SLORs have to come in before the spring semester starts, so program assessment can begin.

2. Content and formatting information:

A great deal of time was spend copying/pasting from a variety of differently formatted documents (including landscape vs. portrait page layout, etc.). This meant that formatting was jumbled, and much editing had to be done. The faculty who volunteers their course SLORs need to follow some basic content and formatting guidelines:

1. Report raw data, not just averages. If the only assessment is 80% of students did well, that's a grade. Numbers and percentages in the raw data columns are good. The 2011-12 final draft can be used as a model.

2. Tables are absolutely necessary for data in most cases, but tables alone do not make sense of the data. We may need a workshop on how to use tables appropriately, how to introduce them, and now to format them.
3. A common rubric or table format would be useful for faculty teaching some courses relating to the same program assessment (see, the English 333 Rubric as an example for writing classes). Faculty could generate common rubrics in a group if they wish; note, that having a common rubric does not dictate teaching the same assignment!

4. If a five point scale is used in student surveys, we need keep to a standard format: the one we're using in the BA English survey should be the standard.


I would recommend that the MA/MS English Survey might be reviewed by faculty who might choose 2-3 items to administer to their courses, relating to one of the program outcomes, so that additional survey data could be generated. Those faculty could use that data in their individual outcomes reports as well.

5. A three, or four, or five point column rubric for evaluating student work would make assembling data from disparate SLORs easier. This scale would be used in assessing learning outcomes and need not (in fact should not) have to be used in grading.

One option, currently in the newly revised Portfolio Rubric, is: Succeeds/Attempts/Fail/Not Applicable.

6. Faculty need to set the standard for what they consider "satisfactory" results: that is, not just report what percentages are over average, without saying "if X% of students meet or exceed this criteria, it's satisfactory.

Secondarily, the department should decide whether 70% is a reasonable standard for 'satisfactory' for the next cycle's report.

Once a standard is set, if their expectations for success are fully met, they have to decide and report whether they will raise standard or choose another outcome for the next time they teach the class. Assessment only works if it's extended from class to the next class, and so on, and from program to program.

7. Faculty need to clearly distinguish between the INSTRUMENT (the assignment) and the ASSESSMENT CRITERIA (how student learning is assessed). Many assignments have assessment criteria in them--but some are fairly vague (i.e. the assessment criteria really should incorporate material from the rubrics that define what excellent is, etc.).

8. The department needs to assemble best Student Learning Outcomes Reports (SLORS) from Spring 2012 for reference in later terms. It would be best to have examples from different areas and using different instruments: i.e. people using student surveys PLUS some other instrument, people using essays; people using portfolios, etc. We need a common core, but reporting does differ depending on instrument.
B. GRADUATE ENGLISH SURVEY

If the DLL decides to use a Graduate Survey, we will need to work with someone who can analyze the survey results in order to compare the responses of students who have taken required courses (for example, 599). Others may be identified.

C. GRADUATION PORTFOLIO EVALUATION

1. Faculty will begin to hand in copies of at least one major assignment for every graduate course in every semester classes are taught.

2. The DLL will shift to a revised portfolio rubric (draft proposed to department is in Appendix D). The revision moves away from YES/NO assessment to SUCCEEDS/ATTEMPTS/FAILS and includes a "No Assignment Available" to allow for more nuanced assessment and to incorporate awareness of the lack of materials relating to the outcome rather than the failure to produce satisfactory materials relating to the outcome.

English 518 and 595s will be assessed by the committee (518) and the teacher of record and content specialist (595).