**Unit Assessment Plan**

**Comparative Literature Department**

**Learning Goals andObjectives**

**LO 1 -** Students will develop / continue to develop skills in “reading” (i.e., engaging and interpreting) sustained and sometimes complex imaginative texts (for example: literature, cinema, media productions);

**LO2 –** Students will learn to/further develop proficiency to identify key passages and examples from the texts under examination and deploy those passages or examples as the basis for a critical argument;

**LO3** – Students will develop skills in the varieties of writing that are central to the discipline of comparative literature: writing that is concise, lucid and clear in expression; essays that successfully frame and work through a conceptual problem, in discussions and arguments anchored by clear and relevant examples; writing that communicates in a clear and specific voice.

**Assessment Methods**

Comparative Literature courses at all levels, graduate and undergraduate, include a requirement of an extended final essay or a portfolio composed of substantive shorter pieces of critical writing. While mid-term and final exams are also administered, the essay is the principal medium for gauging a student’s relative mastery of not only the materials in a given course, but the approaches and practices of the discipline of comparative literature (close readings of literary and visual texts, theoretical framing, etc.). The essay also represents an opportunity for a student to truly excel —to demonstrate sustained engagement, originality and a readiness to analyze probingly.

**Assessment Processes**

As a means of assessing whether or not and to what degree stated learning outcomes have been met, we propose to develop dossiers of essays. Examples will be collected from a sampling of courses at each level within the undergraduate curriculum, e.g., 101, 102, 103; 212, 231; 301, 360; 450, 461. Examples included in those portfolios will range across the grading spectrum. In other words, essays judged poor or failing will be included alongside those deemed average, good and outstanding. These samples will include instructor comments indicating the ways in which the essay has succeeded (or not succeeded) in satisfying the criteria of the assignment. The assignment itself will also be included. The names of students will be redacted from the essays for the purposes of privacy.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning Objective** | **AY 16-17** | **AY 17-18** | **AY 18-19** | **AY 19-20** | **AY 20-21** |
| LO1 – Students will develop / continue to develop skills in “reading” (i.e., engaging and interpreting) sustained and sometimes complex imaginative texts (for example: literature, cinema, media productions) | X | X |  |  |  |
| LO2 – Students will learn to/further develop proficiency to identify key passages and examples from the texts under examination and deploy those passages or examples as the basis for a critical argument | X | X |  |  |  |
| LO3 – Students will develop skills in the varieties of writing that are central to the discipline of comparative literature: writing that is concise, lucid and clear in expression; essays that successfully frame and work through a conceptual problem, in discussions and arguments anchored by clear and relevant examples; writing that communicates in a clear and specific voice | x | X | revisit |  |  |

**Status, Outcomes and Results**

At at least one faculty meeting per year, our department will discuss this process and compare notes. Likewise, our Director of Pedagogy will confer with those of our Graduate Employees who serve as IORs.

**Decisions, Plans and Recommendations**

Over AY2018-19 we plan to focus on assembling and reviewing our dossier of 100-level essays. Over AY 2019-2020, we will similarly review our assessment practices at the 200-level. Our plan is to have completed a review assessment in our lower-division, Gen Ed (Core Ed) courses by spring of 2020. By Fall of 2020 we commit to having implemented any changes the faculty deems appropriate, such that our assignments and our practices of assessing student work at the 100- and 200-level support the pedagogy and the learning outcomes set forth in the UO Core Ed requirement approved by the UO faculty Senate in 2017.