

English Program Learning Outcomes Assessment

University of Alaska Southeast - Spring 2025

1. Program Overview	1
2. Program Level Learning Outcomes (PLOs)	2
3. Data Collection Methods for the PLOs	2
4. Data Collected on the PLOs During the Previous Academic Year	4
5. Analysis of Assessment Results	4
6. Conclusions and Plans for Program Improvement	5
Appendix A	6

1. Program Overview

The Bachelor of Arts in English at UAS provides students with a comprehensive foundation in literary studies and writing, both creative and academic. The Program offers three emphasis areas: Literature, Creative Writing, and Literature and the Environment, allowing students to tailor their coursework to their interests and career goals.

Core requirements for all English majors include literature surveys in American and world literature, as well as introductions to film studies and literary theory. The literature emphases provide a broad grounding in the history and diversity of literary production, with electives covering diverse genres, periods, and themes. The Creative Writing emphasis fosters students' growth as writers through workshops in a variety of genres in fiction, poetry, creative nonfiction, and other forms, while also grounding them in the study of literary craft and tradition. The Literature and the Environment emphasis explores the intersections between literature, culture, and the natural world, preparing students to engage with pressing ecological issues.

Regardless of emphasis, all English majors develop advanced skills in critical thinking, textual analysis, research, and written and oral communication. Creative Writing students additionally hone their skills in creative expression, revision, and workshop critique. The Program prepares students for a variety of careers, including creative writing, teaching, editing, publishing, journalism, law, and environmental advocacy.

As part of the English Program's ongoing efforts to assess our programming, 100- and 200-level writing courses (WRTG 110, 111, 211, 212) were selected for this year's focused evaluation, and we used a novel model to assess them. These courses introduce students to college-level writing, research, and textual analysis. The assessment also piloted a new set of rubrics aligned with Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) 1 and 2, which focus on applying theoretical approaches to textual analysis and examining literature from diverse perspectives. This is a departure from our previous practice, owing to new requirements from NWCCU, as well as a new understanding by

the Provost's Office about what those requirements mean in terms of measuring program outcomes in lieu of course outcomes.

2. Program Level Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

The English Program has established the following five Program Level Learning Outcomes:

1. Apply various theoretical approaches and methodologies to the analysis of literature or the craft of writing.
2. Critically analyze or explicate literature and writing from diverse, marginalized perspectives.
3. Demonstrate advanced reading and writing skills specific to their literary or creative disciplines.
4. Reflect on their own writing, demonstrating an awareness of technique, audience, and purpose.
5. Demonstrate professional skills through a capstone experience, internship, or senior thesis.

These PLOs are correctly listed in the UAS Course Catalog (CourseLeaf) and are written as measurable outcomes without the "students will" phrasing. They encompass the key areas of the English Program, including literary analysis, diverse perspectives, advanced disciplinary skills, reflective writing practice, and professional application.

While the Program previously followed a more course-specific assessment approach, as outlined in the 2016 plan, the current PLOs represent a shift towards evaluating student learning at the program level. This aligns with best practices in outcomes-based assessment and allows for a more holistic view of student achievement across the curriculum. The pilot assessment involved collecting a sample of student artifacts from the targeted WRTG courses and having faculty raters score them using the new PLO rubrics. The goal was to test the effectiveness of the rubrics in capturing student performance and to identify areas where the rubrics may need refinement to better align with the types of assignments and student work in these introductory writing courses.

The current pilot assessment cycle focused on PLOs 1 and 2, which address theoretical approaches to textual analysis and the examination of literature from diverse, marginalized perspectives.

3. Data Collection Methods for the PLOs

For the pilot assessment of PLOs 1 and 2 in the first- and second-year writing courses (WRTG 110, 111, 211, 212), the English Program developed a new set of rubrics aligned with these

specific outcomes. The rubrics were designed to evaluate student performance across multiple dimensions related to theoretical analysis, diverse perspectives, and disciplinary writing skills. Going into this, we understood that there would be mismatches between some of the rubric dimensions and the ways the courses are currently being taught. We viewed this as an opportunity to modify and refine our assessment protocol, especially as we are winding down our latest five-year cycle.

The PLO 1 rubric assesses students' ability to apply theoretical approaches and methodologies to textual analysis, with dimensions focusing on analysis, methodological application, research integration, and critical awareness. The PLO 2 rubric evaluates students' capacities to critically analyze literature from diverse, marginalized perspectives, with additional dimensions addressing cultural and historical context, critical frameworks, power and representation, and scholarly engagement.

To collect data using these rubrics, faculty members sampled five student artifacts (final essays, papers, and projects) from each targeted WRTG course. There were 20 artifacts in total and five participating faculty raters. Faculty raters were divided into pairs, with each pair responsible for evaluating their assigned set of artifacts from the assigned specific courses. The single rater existed to break any significant (>2) rating mismatches. Raters collaboratively scored the artifacts using the PLO rubrics, assigning a rating of 0 (NA), 1 (Beginning), 2 (Developing), 3 (Proficient), or 4 (Mastery) for each dimension. Because these are 100- and 200-level courses, raters should have preferred the lower end of the ratings (Beginning and Developing).

Raters were encouraged to provide qualitative comments and notes alongside their scores, particularly in cases where the rubric dimensions did not neatly align with the nature of the student work. This pilot round prioritized gathering formative feedback on the rubrics themselves, recognizing that adjustments might be needed to better capture the range of student performance in these introductory writing courses. Changes are indeed required.

Scores and comments were recorded in a shared Excel spreadsheet, with separate tabs for each rater pair and course. The spreadsheet served as the central repository for the collected assessment data. It's important to note that this pilot assessment deviated from the Program's previous practice of evaluating course-level outcomes, as described in our 2016 assessment plan. The new PLO rubrics represent a first attempt at implementing program-level assessment, and the Program anticipates refining both the rubrics and data collection process based on the insights gained from this initial round. Copies of the rubrics associated with each program learning outcome are included in Appendix A alongside the experimental assessment protocol we used this cycle.

4. Data Collected on the PLOs During the Previous Academic Year

The pilot assessment provided important insights into our data collection process and opportunities for improvement. While we weren't able to conduct the intended quantitative analysis due to variations in how the data was entered in the shared Excel spreadsheet, we learned valuable lessons about implementing program-level assessment.

Our review identified several areas where we can strengthen our data collection approach:

1. We need clearer guidelines for completing the full assessment process
2. We should specify acceptable score formats (whole numbers only)
3. We can improve our data validation to ensure numeric entries
4. We can better standardize scoring criteria across raters

Though we received less qualitative feedback than originally planned, the pilot highlighted the importance of aligning our PLO rubrics more closely with the learning outcomes and activities in beginning writing courses. The feedback and observations from our raters will be instrumental in refining both our rubrics and data collection methods for future assessment cycles. See section 6, below.

5. Analysis of Assessment Results

The data collection challenges revealed several underlying structural issues in our assessment approach:

- Need for rubric refinement: The pilot revealed that our new PLO rubrics, while theoretically sound, faced practical implementation challenges. The rubric dimensions often mismatched the specific types of work being evaluated in introductory writing courses, indicating a gap between our program-level assessment tools and classroom realities.
- Misalignment with course structure: The assessment uncovered fundamental disconnects between program-level outcomes and course-specific learning activities. Our rubrics attempted to measure program-level competencies without adequately accounting for the developmental nature of skills acquisition in foundational writing courses. In essence, we were trying to use English PLOs to assess WRTG courses, which didn't work. We are considering using GELO outcomes for future WRTG course assessment, and also questioning whether we should be assessing our WRTG courses as part of our program assessment work.
- Process design flaws: The emphasis on qualitative feedback, while valuable in theory, may have inadvertently undermined the importance of consistent numeric scoring.

These findings suggest that our assessment challenges stem not from simple procedural issues, but from more fundamental questions about how we measure student learning at the program level while honoring the specific contexts of individual courses, as well as honoring the articulated preferences for Program faculty to engage in more narrative-based assessment practices.

6. Conclusions and Plans for Program Improvement

Based on the evaluation of the pilot assessment, the English Program proposes the following action items and plans for improvement of Program assessment in future years and into the next five-year cycle. We will choose items 1 or 2 and subsequently address items 3-5:

1. **Option 1: Revise PLO rubrics:** A subcommittee of English faculty will review the current PLO rubrics and consider revisions to better align the dimensions and descriptors with the learning outcomes and assignment types in the foundational writing courses. The revised rubrics will be piloted in a future assessment cycle and further refined based on rater feedback and data analysis.
2. **Option 2: Consider using GELO (General Education Learning Outcomes):** They are “programmatic” and could be used to measure WRTG courses at the 100- and 200-levels, separate WRTG assessment from ENGL assessment, use GELO outcomes in WRTG assessment years, and assess ENGL using only the English PLOs.
3. **Integrate quantitative and qualitative data:** Future assessment cycles should prioritize the collection of both quantitative scores and qualitative comments to provide a more comprehensive picture of student performance. The Program will develop guidelines for raters to ensure a balance between numeric ratings and written feedback, and it will use both types of data to inform programmatic decisions.
4. **Align program-level and course-level assessment:** The Program will work to create clearer connections between PLO assessment and existing course-level assessment practices through revision of the curriculum map. We will review whether we want to do benchmark assessment rather than summative assessment as that choice will affect how we approach the revision of the map. The experimental assessment protocol we used this year is included in Appendix C.
5. **Revisit and potentially revise PLOs:** In light of the challenges encountered in the pilot assessment, the Program will consider initiating a review of the current Program Learning Outcomes. We will also establish an assessment cycle, making clear what is being assessed, on what schedule, and with what rubrics. Any proposed revisions to the PLOs will be carefully considered and vetted by the Program before being implemented in future assessment cycles.

Appendix A

Experimental Assessment Protocol

Curriculum Map

Rubrics

English Program Assessment Protocol (inclusive of WRTG)

Program level assessment requires curriculum mapping. A curriculum map is a document that ties the Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) to course-level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). The Provost has asked us to normalize our assessment of the English program, reporting on PLOs rather than SLOs—but, again, the map will make the connections, and we will be able to make inferences about course-level outcomes as part of this review. Because we need to do this tie-up, starting AY 25-26 we'll have to assess courses in potentially unexpected groupings. The Assessment Sequencing portion of this document explains how PLO assessment is distributed over a five-year assessment cycle.

We have five PLOs, one dedicated to our various capstones, and the other four split between literature and writing (the implication is that it's creative writing, not introductory academic writing, that happens in the WRTG sequence, but a note about that later). These are they:

1. Apply various theoretical approaches and methodologies to the analysis of literature or the craft of writing. **[Applicable to ENGL, CRW, and WRTG]**
2. Critically analyze or explicate literature and writing from diverse, marginalized perspectives. **[Applicable to ENGL, CRW, and WRTG]**
3. Demonstrate advanced reading and writing skills specific to their literary or creative disciplines. **[ENGL and CRW only]**
4. Reflect on their own writing, demonstrating an awareness of technique, audience, and purpose. **[WRTG and CRW only]**
5. Demonstrate professional skills through a capstone experience, internship, or senior thesis. **[ENGL and CRW capstones only]**

Our remit is to assess one or two PLOs every year. The advice from the Dean's office is as follows:

1. ***Build Toward the 5-Year Program Review:*** Annual assessments should contribute to the 5-year program review process. Typically, this involves evaluating one or two Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) each year and providing evidence to demonstrate how students are (or are not) meeting the specific PLOs.
2. ***Use Direct and Indirect Evidence:*** The gold standard for demonstrating student achievement of PLOs is direct evidence (e.g., evaluating artifacts of student work, pre/post-tests). However, indirect evidence (e.g., self-reports, surveys) can also be useful, especially as a supplement to direct evidence.
3. ***Include Rubrics or Evaluation Tools:*** When possible, include rubrics or other tools used to assess student work or PLOs in your assessment plan or report. (This allows readers to understand how learning evidence was evaluated.)

4. ***Close the Loop:*** *The most critical—and often overlooked—aspect of assessment is to “close the loop.” Use what you learn from the assessment process to improve your program and enhance student learning.*

According to the Provost’s office, and as described in the assessment template, Annual Program Assessment Reports should be based on program assessment plans; be approximately three to five pages in length; and provide the following:

1. **Brief Program Overview** (250 words max.)
2. **Program Level Learning Outcomes** (PLOs). Note whether the PLOs listed in the UAS Course Catalog (CourseLeaf) are correct and written properly (measurable outcomes, not all starting with “students will”, [sic] etc.). If applicable, list the date corrected in Courseleaf.
3. **How the data is collected** on the PLOs (rubrics, portfolios, etc.)
4. **The data collected** on the PLOs during the previous academic year (assessment period)
5. An **evaluation/analysis** of the data collected
6. Conclusions and **plans for program improvement**.

We obviously value broader discussions. We should provide the requested data and format it as described, but we should also add an appendix. What the provost is asking for relative to the page restrictions they’ve mandated makes reporting difficult—even without the appendix, three-to-five pages is skeletal.

Below is a draft of a possible curriculum map, along with the rubric we might use to evaluate the PLOs. There are four ideal ratings: **B = Beginning:** Initial exposure and practice; **D = Developing:** Increasing independence with skills; **P = Proficient:** Consistent, effective application; **M = Mastery:** Sophisticated, nuanced application. Generally speaking, a student should not have an M for WRTG 110—otherwise they would not be in 110. Likewise, the capstones should not have a B or a D, and the preponderance of ratings **should** be M and P. Again, the ratings within the grid are the ideal ratings; they do not necessarily imply that every student will reach them, nor do they preclude the possibility of higher ratings in lower-level courses. Essentially, with this system, we are evaluating progress as well as output, and this will allow us to develop a narrative for the program report about our students’ trajectories. This system also retains what we said we wanted to keep, and, in fact, may offer better, bird’s-eye views of our classroom practice.

Two courses on this map do not exist: WRTG 311 (formerly ENGL 311, deactivated a couple of years ago) and WRTG 424 (the next number for the upper-division ENGLs, an entirely new standing selected topics course focused on language and literacy). We also have had discussions about adding to the 300-level (history of English, linguistics, moving 215 to 315, for example), but those are not reflected here yet. WRTG 311 and 424 are courses we wanted to add anyway, and their inclusion supports better full-program assessment by

tying our WRTG SLOs to our PLOs, crossing the upper-/lower-division threshold at the same time.

Integrated English Program Curriculum Map (Ideal Ratings)

	PLO 1	PLO 2	PLO 3	PLO 4	PLO 5	Possible Artifacts
Academic Writing						
WRTG S110 Intro to College Writing	B	B	-	B	-	Process essays; basic argumentative essay; portfolios
WRTG S111 Writing Across Contexts	B	B	-	D	-	Rhetorical analysis papers; academic argumentation essay
WRTG S211 Writing and Humanities	D	D	-	D	-	Synthesis essays; comparative analyses
WRTG S212 Writing and Professions	D	D	-	D	-	Professional writing portfolio; memos, emails, instructions, etc.
WRTG 311 Advanced Academic Writing	P	P	-	P	-	Meta-analytical writing; reflections
WRTG 424 Advanced Topics in Language	P	P	-	P	-	Language analysis essays; final projects
Creative Writing						
ENGL S261 Creative Writing	-	-	B	B	-	Portfolio of original work
ENGL S361 Intermediate Creative Writing	-	-	D	D	-	Genre-specific portfolio
ENGL S461 Advanced Creative Writing	-	-	P	P	-	Polished final draft of creative piece
Sophomore Core						
ENGL S200 World Literature	D	D	D	-	-	Analysis essay of cultural contexts
ENGL S215 Intro to Literary Study	D	D	D	-	-	Literary criticism assignments using theory; examinations
ENGL S217 Film Studies	D	D	D	-	-	Film analysis papers; movie reviews
ENGL S226 American Literature	D	D	D	-	-	Critical analysis papers; examinations
Upper Division and Advanced Literature						
ENGL S303 Literature & Environment	D	D	D	-	-	Research-based scholarship; community-integrated activity
ENGL S365 Literatures of Alaska	D	D	D	-	-	Cultural analysis papers or final essay
ENGL S370 Indigenous Literatures	D	D	D	-	-	Literary analysis papers or final essay

ENGL S418 Advanced Themes	P	P	P	-	-	Research project or final essay
ENGL S419 Major Authors	P	P	P	-	-	Author research project or final essay
ENGL S420 Genre Studies	P	P	P	-	-	Genre analysis project or final essay
ENGL S422 Literary Periods	P	P	P	-	-	Period research project
Capstone Experiences						
ENGL S491 Internship	-	-	-	-	M	Professional evaluation
ENGL S499 Thesis	-	-	-	-	M	Thesis defense

Assessment Sequencing

<i>Year 1: Writing Foundations</i>	PLOs Assessed: 1 & 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus: Writing development and instruction in academic writing • Courses: WRTG S110, S111, S211, S212, S311, S424 • Artifacts: Process essays, rhetorical analyses, synthesis essays, professional writing 	
<i>Year 2: Creative Development</i>	PLOs Assessed: 3 & 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus: Disciplinary creative writing skills and technique awareness • Courses: ENGL S261, S361, S461 • Artifacts: Creative portfolios, genre-specific work, reflective pieces 	
<i>Year 3: Core Literary Analysis</i>	PLOs Assessed: 1 & 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus: Introductory theoretical approaches and introductory disciplinary writing • Courses: ENGL S200, S215, S217, S226 • Artifacts: Analysis essays, literary criticism assignments, examinations 	
<i>Year 4: Advanced Analysis</i>	PLOs Assessed: 2 & 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus: Diverse perspectives and advanced literary analysis • Courses: ENGL S303, S365, S370, S418, S419, S420, S422 • Artifacts: Research projects, cultural analyses, literary analyses 	
<i>Year 5: Capstones</i>	PLO Assessed: 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus: Professional competency • Courses: ENGL S491, S499, HUM S499 (?) • Artifacts: Professional evaluations, thesis defenses 	

PLO	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
1	X	-	X	-	-	2
2	X	-	-	X	-	2
3	-	X	X	-	-	2
4	-	X	-	X	-	2
5	-	-	-	-	X	1

15-Year Assessment Cycle Overview (2025-2040)

Cycle 1: 2025-2030			
Year	PLOs	Fall Courses	Spring Courses
2025-26	1 & 2	WRTG 110/111, WRTG 211/212	ENGL 215
2026-27	3 & 4	ENGL 261, 461	ENGL 361
2027-28	1 & 3	ENGL 226, 420	ENGL 217
2028-29	2 & 4	ENGL 418	ENGL 365, 422
2029-30	5	ENGL 491/499	ENGL 491/499
Cycle 2: 2030-2035			
Year	PLOs	Fall Courses	Spring Courses
2030-31	1 & 2	WRTG 110/111, WRTG 211/212	ENGL 215
2031-32	3 & 4	ENGL 261, 461	ENGL 361
2032-33	1 & 3	ENGL 226	ENGL 217, 420
2033-34	2 & 4	ENGL 422	ENGL 365, 418
2034-35	5	ENGL 491/499	ENGL 491/499
Cycle 3: 2035-2040			
Year	PLOs	Fall Courses	Spring Courses
2035-36	1 & 2	WRTG 110/111, WRTG 211/212	ENGL 215
2036-37	3 & 4	ENGL 261, 461	ENGL 361
2037-38	1 & 3	ENGL 420	ENGL 217, 226
2038-39	2 & 4	ENGL 418	ENGL 365, 422
2039-40	5	ENGL 491/499	ENGL 491/499

Some courses, like our writing sequence (WRTG 110/111) and creative writing courses (ENGL 261/361/461), are offered frequently enough that we can assess them at consistent points in each cycle. These provide stable benchmarks for student achievement. Our capstone courses are similar in that they're offered every semester, so we can reliably assess professional skills (PLO 5) in the final year of each cycle.¹

An interesting variation comes with our upper-division literature courses, which rotate through different semesters in their four-year pattern. Because of this rotation, we might assess ENGL 420 (Genre Studies) in fall one cycle and spring the next. This gives us different perspectives on student achievement because we see how students perform at different points in the academic year and in different course combinations.

Over three complete cycles (15 years), this creates a comprehensive picture of our program's effectiveness. We maintain consistent assessment points through our regularly-offered courses while capturing the variety of student experiences through our rotating upper-division offerings. The system is both stable and dynamic, allowing us to track long-term trends while adapting to the natural rhythms of our course offerings.

¹ We will have to be relatively diligent about securing and maintaining artifacts for this PLO because it is only assessed once every five years.

Assessment Instructions

Because we're missing Math and Jessy for this go round, the pairings are a little off. I tried to minimize one's exposure to one's own artifacts. This leaves me as a fifth wheel, but we need someone to perform third reads, when necessary. Assembling, conducting, and reporting are big jobs, so I hope you will let me get away with it this time. These are the assignments:

WRTG 211	Geoff and Emily	WRTG 110	James and Kevin
WRTG 212		WRTG 111	
Third Read	Jay		

1. You'll receive ten anonymized essays, five per assigned class. You can find them by clicking the links in the table, above. Syllabi and assignments sheets are also in these folders. If you're in-person, Jay has paper copies of all materials for you.
2. With your partner, use the rubrics for PLOs 1 and 2 to perform an assessment of the artifacts. [You can find the scoring spreadsheet here \(a single file, but each of you has your own tab; the rubrics are preloaded there\)](#)
 - o You may norm if you choose to, but as you read and rate, it's likely that your discussion will lead you to agreement anyway (see next note).
 - o You should aim to read the essays in the same order. Have a conversation after the first few, then continue with the rest on your own, entering your ratings on the spreadsheet provided in the assessment folder. Enter numbers, not letters (**B/1, D/2, P/3, M/4**).
 - If you need a third reader, let Jay know. Third readers are required when your and your partners' ratings diverge by more than 1 (e.g., B/1 and P/3)
 - o End with a larger conversation in preparation for the narrative report and observations that you'll send to Jay.
 - o What we are measuring is not success within a class, or even whether a class itself is successful; we're measuring program outcomes that manifest themselves within the classes we're pulling artifacts from to determine how our students progress through our curriculum.
3. For ratings, because we're assessing introductory and developmental courses, our benchmarks for the ratings are B/1 for beginning and D/2 for developing, depending on the course.
 - o You can still rate artifacts higher or lower: proficiency might be possible in the 200s, although it's highly unlikely in the 100s. **For students who are behind Beginner, enter 0**, even though the rubric does not go that low.

Zeroes are for serious deficiencies. Don't enter fractional scores. The rubric purposefully leverages four ratings in order to avoid splitting down the middle.

- o If we see a preponderance of Bs and a smattering of Ds (and non-ratings/zeroes), that is fine and expected because when we add upper-level WRTG courses, and as we assess other ENGL courses with writing projects embedded in them, we will be able to make inferences about student improvement across our curriculum.
 - o In other words, if most students receive B/1 and D/2, that means they are hitting the level benchmarks. If (in later assessment sessions where they will be integrated) students continue to receive B/1 and D/2 in the upper-division writing courses, that signals a problem, and that's really what we're tracking.
4. Perform a review of the course syllabi and assignment sheets associated with your assigned courses. Provide any commentary about design, pacing, content, methodology, etc. This doesn't have to be detailed, but you might include your commentary, or its highlights, in the narrative you send to Jay.
 5. Then, we return as a large group to discuss what we saw.
 6. Jay will receive the narratives and write the report, add the rubric scores, and perform quantitative and qualitative analysis. He'll send a draft to everyone before the next program meeting, work on corrections and revision, and then acquire everyone's assent to transmit the report to the Provost.
 - o Jay would also like feedback related to the use of the rubrics—PLO 2's rubric, for example, doesn't quite hit the mark for a writing course. We can alter (a) the rubric or (b) the PLO, or (c) both!

PLO 1: Apply theoretical approaches and methodologies to the analysis of literature or the craft of writing

Dimension	Beginning (1)	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Mastery (4)
Analysis	Identifies surface features and basic elements of texts	Explains relationships between textual elements and contexts	Analyzes how multiple elements and contexts create meaning	Generates sophisticated insights by synthesizing complex textual and contextual relationships
Methodological Application	Uses basic analytical tools with limited understanding	Applies theoretical approaches to support interpretation	Uses theoretical frameworks systematically to develop complex interpretations	Employs and evaluates multiple theoretical frameworks to generate original insights
Research Integration	References primary/secondary sources with basic understanding	Uses scholarly sources to support analytical claims	Synthesizes diverse scholarly sources to develop arguments	Contributes to scholarly discourse through sophisticated research integration
Critical Awareness	Shows basic awareness of methodological choices	Explains rationale for methodological choices	Evaluates effectiveness of different methodological approaches	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of theoretical/methodological implications

1. Analysis

- o How do they engage with textual complexity?
- o How do they address multiple contexts?
- o How do they develop interpretations?
- o How do they generate insights?

2. Methodological Application

- o How do they understand theoretical frameworks?
- o How do they apply methodologies?
- o How do they use multiple approaches?
- o How do they evaluate methodological choices?

3. Research Integration

- o How do they engage with scholarship?
- o How do they use sources?
- o How do they develop arguments?
- o How do they contribute to discussions?

4. Critical Awareness

- o How do they understand their approaches?
- o How do they justify their choices?
- o How do they evaluate methods?
- o How do they show theoretical understanding?

PLO 2: Critically analyze or explicate literature and writing from diverse, marginalized perspectives

Dimension	Beginning (1)	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Mastery (4)
Cultural and Historical Context	Identifies basic cultural or historical elements	Explains specific cultural/historical contexts and their significance	Analyzes complex relationships between texts and their cultural/historical contexts	Generates sophisticated insights about how texts engage with multiple cultural/historical traditions
Critical Frameworks	Uses basic concepts from marginalized perspectives	Applies specific critical frameworks from marginalized perspectives	Analyzes texts using multiple frameworks from marginalized perspectives	Synthesizes diverse critical frameworks to generate new understandings
Power and Representation	Identifies basic issues of representation or power	Explains how texts engage with power structures and representation	Analyzes complex relationships between texts, power, and representation	Evaluates how texts challenge or reinforce systemic power structures
Scholarly Engagement	Shows basic awareness of scholarship from marginalized perspectives	Incorporates scholarship from marginalized perspectives	Engages in meaningful dialogue with scholarship from marginalized perspectives	Contributes to scholarly conversations about marginalized perspectives

1. Cultural and Historical Context

- o How do they understand cultural specificity?
- o How do they address historical contexts?
- o How do they handle cultural complexity?
- o How do they recognize cultural authority?

2. Critical Frameworks

- o How do they employ alternative perspectives?
- o How do they use specific critical approaches?
- o How do they integrate multiple frameworks?
- o How do they develop new insights?

3. Power and Representation

- o How do they recognize power dynamics?
- o How do they analyze representation?
- o How do they address systemic issues?
- o How do they evaluate textual politics?

4. Scholarly Engagement

- o How do they use diverse scholarship?
- o How do they engage with different traditions?
- o How do they contribute to discussions?
- o How do they advance understanding?

PLO 3: Demonstrate advanced reading and writing skills specific to their literary or creative disciplines

Dimension	Beginning (1)	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Mastery (4)
Disciplinary Reading	Identifies basic textual patterns and elements	Analyzes relationships between textual elements using disciplinary approaches	Uses disciplinary approaches to develop complex interpretations	Generates sophisticated readings that contribute to disciplinary understanding
Research & Scholarship	Uses basic research tools and scholarly sources	Selects and incorporates relevant scholarship	Synthesizes diverse scholarly sources to develop arguments	Contributes to scholarly conversations through original research and analysis
Genre/Form Control	Shows basic understanding of disciplinary conventions	Applies conventions effectively to achieve purpose	Uses conventions strategically to enhance effectiveness	Demonstrates mastery while innovating within conventions
Professional Discourse	Uses some discipline-specific terminology	Employs discipline-specific language accurately	Engages fluently with disciplinary discourse	Demonstrates sophisticated command of disciplinary language

1. Disciplinary Reading

- o How do they understand texts in disciplinary contexts?
- o How do they apply disciplinary approaches?
- o How do they develop interpretations?
- o How do they contribute to understanding?

2. Research & Scholarship

- o How do they find and evaluate sources?
- o How do they integrate scholarship?
- o How do they develop arguments?

- o How do they advance knowledge?

3. Genre/Form Control

- o How do they understand conventions?
- o How do they apply formal elements?
- o How do they achieve effects?
- o How do they innovate appropriately?

4. Professional Discourse

- o How do they use disciplinary language?
- o How do they engage with field conversations?
- o How do they demonstrate expertise?
- o How do they contribute to discourse?

PLO 4: Reflect on their own writing, demonstrating an awareness of technique, audience, and purpose

Dimension	Beginning (1)	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Mastery (4)
Process Awareness	Describes basic writing steps or choices	Explains specific writing decisions and their effects	Analyzes effectiveness of writing strategies	Evaluates complex relationships between process choices and outcomes
Audience Awareness	Identifies intended audience	Explains how specific choices address audience needs	Analyzes how different elements work together to engage audience	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of audience relationship throughout work
Technical Control	Identifies basic techniques used in writing	Explains how specific techniques achieve effects	Analyzes relationships between techniques and effectiveness	Demonstrates sophisticated awareness of craft and its implications
Purpose & Context	Describes basic goals for the writing	Explains how choices serve specific purposes	Analyzes effectiveness in achieving complex purposes	Evaluates relationship between choices and broader rhetorical/creative goals

1. Process Awareness

- o How do they understand their process?
- o How do they explain their choices?
- o How do they evaluate strategies?
- o How do they show development?

2. Audience Awareness

- o How do they identify audiences?
- o How do they address audience needs?
- o How do they engage readers?
- o How do they maintain focus?

3. Technical Control

- o How do they understand technique?
- o How do they explain craft choices?
- o How do they achieve effects?
- o How do they demonstrate mastery?

4. Purpose & Context

- o How do they articulate goals?
- o How do they achieve purposes?
- o How do they understand context?
- o How do they meet objectives?

PLO 5: Demonstrate professional skills through a capstone experience, internship, or senior thesis

Professional/Scholarly Conduct

Dimension	Beginning (1)	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Mastery (4)
Project Management	Completes basic assigned tasks	Manages components with guidance	Plans and executes complex projects	Demonstrates sophisticated project design and execution
Professional Responsibility	Meets basic obligations	Fulfills responsibilities consistently	Takes initiative in professional contexts	Shows leadership and professional maturity
Independent Work	Requires regular guidance	Works with occasional support	Functions independently	Demonstrates creative/scholarly autonomy
Field Engagement	Shows basic field awareness	Engages with field conventions	Contributes to field discussions	Advances creative/scholarly discourse

Thesis Project Dimensions

Dimension	Beginning (1)	Developing (2)	Proficient (3)	Mastery (4)
Project Depth	Shows basic engagement with form/subject	Develops ideas/techniques with purpose	Creates sustained, complex work	Produces sophisticated, fully realized work
Technical Achievement	Applies basic techniques/methods	Uses techniques/methods purposefully	Employs advanced approaches effectively	Demonstrates masterful command of form
Critical Awareness	Explains basic creative/scholarly choices	Discusses artistic/scholarly decisions	Articulates complex creative/scholarly vision	Shows sophisticated understanding of project's contribution
Defense/ Discussion	Describes project elements	Explains creative/scholarly choices	Engages in sophisticated dialogue about work	Demonstrates mastery in discussing creative/scholarly choices

For All Capstone Experiences:

- Professional/Scholarly Conduct dimensions apply to all projects (internship + thesis)
- Expected performance at Mastery (4) level

For Thesis Projects:

- Dimensions apply to both creative and scholarly work (do not use this rubric to evaluate internships!)
- Focus on mastery of form and contribution to field