

## 2016-2017 Annual Assessment Report Template

For instructions and guidelines visit our [website](#)  
or [contact us](#) for more help.

Please begin by selecting your program name in the drop down. If the program name is not listed, please enter it below:

BA Humanities Religious Concentration

OR

### Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

#### Q1.1.

Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs), and emboldened Graduate Learning Goals (GLGs) did you assess? [Check all that apply]

- 1. **Critical Thinking**
- 2. **Information Literacy**
- 3. **Written Communication**
- 4. **Oral Communication**
- 5. Quantitative Literacy
- 6. **Inquiry and Analysis**
- 7. Creative Thinking
- 8. Reading
- 9. Team Work
- 10. Problem Solving
- 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- 12. **Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives**
- 13. Ethical Reasoning
- 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**
- 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**
- 19. **Professionalism**
- 20. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a. Humanities B.A. PLO 1.1

b.

c.

#### Q1.2.

Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information including how your specific PLOs are **explicitly** linked to the Sac State **BLGs/GLGs**:

The Humanities BA with Religious Studies Concentration PLG 2 aligns closely with University BLG "Intellectual and Practical Skills," although the latter does not specifically mention reading, which is the subject of our PLO 2.1 and one of the PLOs assessed this academic year. PLO 2.1 aligns with the AAC&U category Reading and the accompanying VALUE Rubric.

The Humanities BA with Religious Studies Concentration program has two PLGs that fit fairly well with the University PLO "Intercultural Knowledge and Competence" (AAC&U rubric), which emphasizes acquisition of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts. Our PLG 1, "Knowledge of Human Cultures," which is similar to elements of the University BLG "Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World," aligns quite well with "Intercultural Knowledge and Competence." Our PLG 3, "Lifelong Learning," which connects well with the University BLG "Personal and Social Responsibility," fits nicely with "Intercultural Knowledge and Competence." Especially well aligned are our PLOs 3.4 and 3.5, which encourage reflection on "the diversity of communities and cultures" and the cultivation of an empathy that allows one to understand and adapt to the perspectives of others.

The program has two PLOs that align with the University PLO "Global Learning" (AAC&U rubric), which encourages students to become informed and open-minded people who understand and know how to act responsibly in the world's many diverse cultural settings. Our PLG 1, "Knowledge of Human Cultures," is clearly related to "Global Learning." The same can be said of our PLG 3, "Lifelong Learning," and especially PLOs 3.4 and 3.5, which are clearly linked to the "Cultural Diversity" and "Perspective Taking" descriptors for "Global Learning."

For this academic year, in addition to PLO 2.1 (Reading), we have assessed PLO 1.1: "Explain the distinguishing values and prominent forms of literary and artistic expression of the major eras of Western and Asian cultures." In order to assess this PLO effectively, we have created a rubric (appended at Q8) drawing on some aspects of the AAC&U Rubrics for "Global Learning" and "Intercultural Knowledge."

**Q1.2.1.**

Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

1. Yes, for all PLOs
2. Yes, but for some PLOs
3. No rubrics for PLOs
4. N/A
5. Other, specify:

**Q1.3.**

Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

**Q1.4.**

Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?

1. Yes
2. No (skip to Q1.5)
3. Don't know (skip to Q1.5)

**Q1.4.1.**

If the answer to Q1.4 is **yes**, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

**Q1.5.**

Did your program use the *Degree Qualification Profile* ("DQP", see <http://degreeprofile.org>) to develop your PLO(s)?

1. Yes
2. No, but I know what the DQP is
3. No, I don't know what the DQP is
4. Don't know

**Q1.6.**

Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

## Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO

**Q2.1.**

Select **OR** type in **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the correct box* for this PLO in Q1.1):

Reading

If your PLO is **not listed**, please enter it here:

**Q2.1.1.**

Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

Humanities BA with Religious Studies Concentration PLO 2.1: (Reading) Demonstrate ability simultaneously to extract and construct meaning when reading diverse texts.

This PLO is one of four "skills" PLOs (along with Critical Thinking, Written Communication, and Information Literacy) of PLG2: Intellectual and Communication Skills: Students majoring in Humanities & Religious Studies should be able to demonstrate analytical reading skills, critical thinking skills, written communication skills, and information literacy in order to facilitate clear understanding and articulation of subject matter in academic and professional pursuits.

**Q2.2.**

Has the program developed or adopted **explicit** standards of performance for this PLO?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. N/A

**Q2.3.**

Please **provide the rubric(s)** and **standards of performance** that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix.

Standard of Performance for graduating seniors: 90% should achieve 2.0 or better (of 4.0), 30% 3.0 or better. (Note: HRS 190M is intended for juniors and seniors, not only for graduating seniors; our capstone HRS 198 was not offered during the 2016-2017 academic year.)

(See appended AAC&U Reading VALUE Rubric)



VALUE Rubric\_Reading.pdf  
90.27 KB



No file attached

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdrd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the <b>PLO</b> , the <b>standard</b> of performance, and the <b>rubric</b> that was used to measure the PLO:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. In <b>SOME</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. In <b>ALL</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. In the university catalogue
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10. Other, specify: <input type="text"/>

### Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

**Q3.1.**

Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to Q6)
- 3. Don't know (skip to Q6)
- 4. N/A (skip to Q6)

**Q3.1.1.**

How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO?

**Q3.2.**

Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to Q6)
- 3. Don't know (skip to Q6)
- 4. N/A (skip to Q6)

**Q3.2.1.**

Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected:

The HRS Assessment Committee collected final essays from HRS 190M (all students are required to take one section of HRS 190, Topics in Humanities and Religious Studies).

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

### Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

**Q3.3.**

Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?

1. Yes
2. No (skip to Q3.7)
3. Don't know (skip to Q3.7)

**Q3.3.1.**

Which of the following direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) were used?

[Check all that apply]

1. Capstone project (e.g. theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
2. Key assignments from required classes in the program
3. Key assignments from elective classes
4. Classroom based performance assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques
5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects
6. E-Portfolios
7. Other Portfolios
8. Other, specify:

**Q3.3.2.**

Please **provide** the direct measure (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) you used to collect data, THEN **explain** how it assesses the PLO:

The direct measure is a 6- to 8-page essay in which students craft an argument about one or two primary sources and enrich that argument with a thoughtful engagement with at least one of our secondary sources. These sources are from among the assigned readings for the course. They must have a compelling motive, an original thesis, and ample supporting textual evidence (from both primary and secondary sources).

It was a straightforward task for the HRS Assessment Committee to apply the AAC&U Reading Rubric to this assignment—our issues with alignment, as explained below in 5.1.1, notwithstanding.

 No file attached

 No file attached

**Q3.4.**

What tool was used to evaluate the data?

1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to Q3.4.4.)
2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to Q3.4.2.)

3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to Q3.4.2.)
4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to Q3.4.2.)
5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to Q3.4.2.)
6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to Q3.4.2.)
7. Used other means (Answer Q3.4.1.)

**Q3.4.1.**

If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [Check all that apply]

1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to Q3.4.4.)
2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to Q3.4.4.)
3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to Q3.4.4.)
4. Other, specify:  (skip to Q3.4.4.)

**Q3.4.2.**

Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. N/A

**Q3.4.3.**

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the rubric**?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. N/A

**Q3.4.4.**

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. N/A

**Q3.5.**

How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

3

**Q3.5.1.**

How many faculty members participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

2

**Q3.5.2.**

If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?

1. Yes  
 2. No  
 3. Don't know  
 4. N/A

**Q3.6.**

How did you **select** the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?

5 of the students in HRS 190M (a required seminar for all majors) were in the Religious Studies concentration. We chose to evaluate all five of their term papers.

**Q3.6.1.**

How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

We assessed all available term papers.

**Q3.6.2.**

How many students were in the class or program?

5

**Q3.6.3.**

How many samples of student work did you evaluated?

5

**Q3.6.4.**

Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?

1. Yes  
 2. No  
 3. Don't know

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

**Q3.7.**

Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

1. Yes

2. No (skip to Q3.8)  
 3. Don't Know (skip to Q3.8)


**Q3.7.1.**


Which of the following indirect measures were used? [Check all that apply]

1. National student surveys (e.g. NSSE)  
 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)  
 3. College/department/program student surveys or focus groups  
 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews  
 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews  
 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews  
 7. Other, specify:

**Q3.7.1.1.**

Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:

 No file attached

 No file attached

**Q3.7.2.**

If surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?

**Q3.7.3.**

If surveys were used, how did you **select** your sample:

**Q3.7.4.**

If surveys were used, what was the response rate?



### Question 3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)

**Q3.8.**

Were external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?

1. Yes
2. No (skip to **Q3.8.2**)
3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

**Q3.8.1.**

Which of the following measures was used? [Check all that apply]

1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.)
3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.)
4. Other, specify:

**Q3.8.2.**

Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

1. Yes
2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)
3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

**Q3.8.3.**

If other measures were used, please specify:

 No file attached

 No file attached

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

### Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

**Q4.1.**

Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO in **Q2.1**:



Humanities BA with RS Concentration PLO 2-1 Data Set.pdf  
18.16 KB



Longitudinal Study PLO 2-1.pdf  
14.34 KB

**Q4.2.**

Are students doing well and meeting the program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

80% (4 of 5) students scored 2.0 or above, which does not quite meet our standard of performance for graduating seniors (90%); and no students scored above 3.0 (standard of performance calls for 30% at 3.0 or above). Even though HRS 190M is open to juniors as well as seniors, these data indicate need for improvement. We are convinced that our students need more opportunities to observe and practice textual analysis in their HRS class sessions.

In 2010-2011, as part of a multipronged assessment of reading, we focused on the Analysis category of the AAC&U Reading Rubric, scoring all six reading response papers for all 27 students in HRS 108, Approaches to Religious Studies, which at that time was a required course for all HRS BA students in their junior or senior years. As noted in the "Longitudinal Study" document (appended at Q4.1), the average score for Analysis was 1.8. This correlates closely with the average score of 1.7 attained during this 2016-2017 assessment cycle.



No file attached



No file attached

**Q4.3.**

For the selected PLO, the student performance:

- 1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard
- 2. **Met** expectation/standard
- 3. **Partially** met expectation/standard
- 4. Did not meet expectation/standard
- 5. No expectation/standard has been specified
- 6. Don't know

## Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

**Q4.4.**

Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Q4.5.**

Were **all** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

### Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

**Q5.1.**

As a result of the assessment effort and based on prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate *making any changes* for your program (e.g. course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to Q5.2)
- 3. Don't know (skip to Q5.2)

**Q5.1.1.**

Please describe *what changes* you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes.

The AAC&U Value Reading Rubric did not align well with the direct measure used. The category "Reader's Voice," for example, would seem to demand a portfolio of student work rather than just one assignment, and it fact seems to depend on assessment being done by the instructor of the class. In general, we recognize the need to enhance alignment between direct measures and rubric the next time we assess reading skills.

**Q5.1.2.**

Do you have a plan to assess the *impact of the changes* that you anticipate making?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Q5.2.**

Since your last assessment report, **how have the assessment data from then been used** so far?

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Improving specific courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Modifying curriculum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Improving advising and mentoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Annual assessment reports	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Program review	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Prospective student and family information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
10. Alumni communication	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Program accreditation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
13. External accountability reporting requirement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
15. Strategic planning	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Institutional benchmarking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
17. Academic policy development or modifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
18. Institutional improvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
20. New faculty hiring	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
22. Recruitment of new students	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

23. Other, specify:

**Q5.2.1.**

Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above:

Data for the PLO "intercultural Knowledge and Competence" show that students are exceeding departmental expectations. All five students scored 2.0 or above, with two of the five scoring 3.0 or above. (We also assessed the PLO "Global Learning"; students achieved similarly high scores). In order to maintain this level of quality and to build on it, we have formulated and submitted to our dean a hiring plan that should ensure continued faculty strength in these areas. Our first priority is to hire a person with expertise in East Asian cultures and religions, given that our current faculty person in this area is on the verge of retirement. Our second priority is to enhance our offerings in American humanities by hiring a person with expertise in Latin America.

**Q5.3.**

To what extent did you apply **last year's feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in the following areas?

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Program Learning Outcomes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Standards of Performance	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Measures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Rubrics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Alignment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Data Collection	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Data Analysis and Presentation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Use of Assessment Data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Other, please specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q5.3.1.**

Please share with us an example of how you applied **last year's feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in any of the areas above:


We utilized all available student papers (although with only five students, we were not able to increase from last year's sample size); unforeseen cancellation of HRS 198 limited options for direct measure. As part of our revised Assessment Plan, we have established standards of performance. As noted above with regard to the AAC&U Reading Rubric, we have recognized the advantages to be gained by transitioning to a portfolio rather than a single assignment. The HRS Department has established Four-Year Plans for both BA programs that are correlative to our curricular maps.


(Remember: **Save your progress**)

## Additional Assessment Activities

### Q6.

Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspect of their program *that are not related to the PLOs* (i.e. impacts of an advising center, etc.). **If** your program/academic unit has collected data on program *elements*, please briefly report your results here:

 No file attached

 No file attached

### Q7.

What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? **[Check all that apply]**

- 1. **Critical Thinking**
- 2. **Information Literacy**
- 3. **Written Communication**
- 4. **Oral Communication**
- 5. Quantitative Literacy
- 6. **Inquiry and Analysis**
- 7. Creative Thinking
- 8. Reading
- 9. Team Work
- 10. Problem Solving
- 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- 12. **Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives**
- 13. Ethical Reasoning
- 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**
- 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**
- 19. **Professionalism**
- 20. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:

a.

b.

c.

**Q8.** Please attach any additional files here:



PLO 1-1 Rubric.docx  
25.68 KB



Humanities BA with RS Concentration Assessment Plan.docx  
159.87 KB



Humanities BA with RS Concentration Curricular Map.docx  
80.9 KB



No file attached

**Q8.1.**

Have you attached any files to this form? If yes, please list every attached file here:

AAC&U Value Reading Rubric

Humanities B.A. with Religious Studies Concentration PLO 2.1 Data Set

Longitudinal Study PLO 2.1

PLO 1.1 Rubric

Humanities B.A. with Religious Studies Concentration Assessment Plan

Humanities B.A. with Religious Studies Concentration Curricular Map

## Program Information (**Required**)

**Program:**

(If you typed your program name at the beginning, please skip to Q10)

**Q9.**

Program/Concentration Name: [skip if program name appears above]

BA Humanities Religious Concentration

**Q10.**

Report Author(s):

Jeffrey Brodd and Brad Nystrom

**Q10.1.**

Department Chair/Program Director:

Brad Nystrom

**Q10.2.**

Assessment Coordinator:

Harvey Stark

**Q11.**

Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit

Humanities & Religious Studies

**Q12.**

College:

College of Arts & Letters

**Q13.**

Total enrollment for Academic Unit during assessment semester (see Departmental Fact Book):

The latest OIR data show that there were 12 students in the

**Q14.**

Program Type:

1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
2. Credential
3. Master's Degree
4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)
5. Other, specify:

**Q15.** Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?2 **Q15.1.** List all the names:

Humanities B.A.

Humanities B.A. with concentration in Religious Studies

**Q15.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?1 **Q16.** Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?1 **Q16.1.** List all the names:

M.A. Humanities

**Q16.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?0 **Q17.** Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?0 **Q17.1.** List all the names:

**Q18.** Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?


0

**Q18.1.** List all the names:

When was your <b>assessment plan...</b>	1. Before 2011-12	2. 2012-13	3. 2013-14	4. 2014-15	5. 2015-16	6. 2016-17	7. No Plan	8. Don't know
<b>Q19.</b> developed?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Q19.1.</b> last updated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q19.2. (REQUIRED)**

Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **assessment plan**:

 No file attached

**Q20.**

Has your program developed a **curriculum map**?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Q20.1.**

Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **curriculum map**:

 No file attached

**Q21.**

Has your program indicated in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Q22.**

Does your program have a capstone class?



1. Yes, indicate:
2. No
3. Don't know

**Q22.1.**

Does your program have **any** capstone project?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

ver. 5.15/17

**Department of Humanities & Religious Studies**  
**Humanities BA with RS Concentration**  
**Assessment Plan (REV 11/4/16)**

**Learning Goals and Outcomes**

1. Knowledge of Human Cultures: Students majoring in Humanities & Religious Studies should be able to demonstrate knowledge of human cultures, their values and forms of expression in ways that prepare them to understand, adapt, and succeed in increasingly diverse and complex contexts.
  - 1.1. Explain the distinguishing values and prominent forms of literary and artistic expression of the major eras of Western and Asian cultures.
  - 1.2. Analyze cultural transformations through time, recognizing both persistent aspects and innovations, and proposing well reasoned explanations for such.
  - 1.3. Compare two or more cultures, identifying common themes or issues along with those that are distinctive.
  
2. Intellectual and Communication Skills: Students majoring in Humanities & Religious Studies should be able to demonstrate analytical reading skills, critical thinking skills, written communication skills, and information literacy in order to facilitate clear understanding and articulation of subject matter in academic and professional pursuits.
  - 2.1. (Reading) Demonstrate ability simultaneously to extract and construct meaning when reading diverse texts.
  - 2.2. (Critical Thinking) Demonstrate comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.
  - 2.3. (Written Communication) Use appropriate structure, development, usage, and reference sources to write clear, purposeful, analytical prose. [These are adapted from the English Dept. Writing Assessment Scoring Rubric]
  - 2.4. (Information Literacy) Demonstrate ability to identify, locate, evaluate, and apply information.
  
3. Lifelong Learning: Students majoring in Humanities & Religious Studies should be able to acquire foundations and skills for lifelong learning for purposes of enhancing personal enrichment, intercultural awareness, and active engagement with the challenges and opportunities of the modern world.
  - 3.1. Explore a topic in depth, yielding insight and information indicating special interest in the subject.
  - 3.2. Make explicit references to previous learning and apply in an innovative (new and creative) way that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.
  - 3.3. Review prior learning (past experiences inside and outside of the classroom) in depth to reveal significantly changed perspectives about educational and life experiences, which provide foundation for expanded knowledge, growth, and maturity over time.
  - 3.4. Demonstrate evidence of self-reflection on perspectives because of working within and learning from diversity of communities and cultures.
  - 3.5. Express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.

4. Integrative Learning: Students majoring in Humanities & Religious Studies should be able to demonstrate ability to synthesize and undertake cross- disciplinary study and learning in order to understand holistically the place and relevance of these fields and their subject matter.
  - 4.1. Apply learning acquired in Humanities & Religious Studies as context for studying (within and/or outside of HRS) from relevant disciplinary perspectives such as history, English, philosophy, and art history.
  - 4.2. Select and develop examples of life experiences, drawn from a variety of contexts (e.g., family life, artistic participation, civic involvement, work experience), to illuminate concepts/theories/frameworks of fields of study.
  - 4.3. Create wholes out of multiple parts (synthesize) or draw conclusions by combining examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.
  - 4.4. Adapt and apply skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations to solve problems or explore issues.
  
5. Competence in the Disciplines (Religious Studies): Students majoring in Humanities with Religious Studies Concentration should be able to demonstrate knowledge and skills of theoretical and methodological approaches appropriate to the field in order to achieve advanced levels of interpretation and analysis of various manifestations of religion in a variety of cultures.
  - 5.1. Explain the historical development of the field of Religious Studies, identifying major thinkers and describing significant theoretical approaches.
  - 5.2. Demonstrate familiarity with the ways “religion” is conceptualized and categorized in academic study, and demonstrate ability to distinguish academic study of religion from personal perspectives (e.g., “faith” perspective).
  - 5.3. Applying appropriate academic approaches, explain characteristic beliefs, practices, and institutions of more than one religion and describe the place of these religions within their historical and cultural contexts.

**Summary Plan for Program Review Cycle (2016/17 through 2020/21)**

**BA Humanities with Religious Studies Concentration**

Overarching Program Learning Goals	Corresponding Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs). (Each must directly relate to one or more Program Goals)	In which course(s) will the PLO(s) be assessed?	In which year will the PLO(s) be assessed and how often?	What types of assessment activities <sup>1</sup> will be used to collect the data?	What types of tools <sup>2</sup> will be used to score/evaluate the activity?  Who will develop/modify the tool and/or evaluate the activities?	How will the data be collected? By whom?	How will the data be reported <sup>3</sup> (both aggregated and disaggregated), and by whom? What will be the standard of performance?	Who will analyze the data?	How will the data be used? By whom?
I. Knowledge of Human Cultures: Students majoring in Humanities & Religious Studies	1. Explain the distinguishing values and prominent forms of literary and artistic expression of the major eras of Western and Asian cultures.	190	16/17	Research paper	Rubrics, developed by Assessment Committee	Coordinated by Assessment Committee	Data will be reported by Assessment Committee. 90% should achieve 2.0 or better (of 4.0), 30%	Assessment Committee and instructor	Faculty will use data for enhancing course design and

should be able to demonstrate knowledge of human cultures, their values and forms of expression in ways that prepare them to understand, adapt, and succeed in increasingly diverse and complex contexts.							3.0 or better		delivery
	2. Analyze cultural transformations through time, recognizing both persistent aspects and innovations, and proposing well reasoned explanations for such.								
	3. Compare two or more cultures, identifying common themes or issues along with those that are distinctive.	190	16/17	Research paper	Rubrics, developed by Assessment Committee	Coordinated by Assessment Committee	Data will be reported by Assessment Committee. 90% should achieve 2.0 or better (of 4.0), 30% 3.0 or better	Assessment Committee and instructor	Faculty will use data for enhancing course design and delivery
II. Intellectual and Communication Skills: Students majoring in Humanities & Religious Studies should be able to demonstrate analytical reading skills, critical thinking skills, written communication skills, and information literacy in order to facilitate clear understanding and articulation of subject matter in academic and professional pursuits.	1. (Reading) Demonstrate ability simultaneously to extract and construct meaning when reading diverse texts.	108, 190, or 198	16/17	Reading response papers	Rubrics, developed by Assessment Committee	Coordinated by Assessment Committee	Data will be reported by Assessment Committee. 90% should achieve 2.0 or better (of 4.0), 30% 3.0 or better	Assessment Committee and instructor	Faculty will use data for enhancing course design and delivery
	2. (Critical Thinking) Demonstrate comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.	190 or 198	18/19	Research paper	Rubrics, developed by Assessment Committee	Coordinated by Assessment Committee	Data will be reported by Assessment Committee. 90% should achieve 2.0 or better (of 4.0), 30% 3.0 or better	Assessment Committee and instructor	Faculty will use data for enhancing course design and delivery
	3. (Written Communication) Use appropriate structure, development, usage, and reference sources to write clear, purposeful, analytical prose.	190 or 198	17/18	Research paper	Rubrics, developed by Assessment Committee	Coordinated by Assessment Committee	Data will be reported by Assessment Committee. 90% should achieve 2.0 or better (of 4.0), 30% 3.0 or better	Assessment Committee and instructor	Faculty will use data for enhancing course design and delivery
	4. (Information Literacy) Demonstrate ability to identify, locate, evaluate, and apply information.	190 or 198	19/20	Research paper	Rubrics, developed by Assessment Committee	Coordinated by Assessment Committee	Data will be reported by Assessment Committee. 90% should achieve 2.0 or better (of 4.0), 30% 3.0 or better	Assessment Committee and instructor	Faculty will use data for enhancing course design and delivery

<p>III. Lifelong Learning: Students majoring in Humanities &amp; Religious Studies should be able to acquire foundations and skills for lifelong learning for purposes of enhancing personal enrichment, intercultural awareness, and active engagement with the challenges and opportunities of the modern world.</p>	<p>1. Explore a topic in depth, yielding insight and information indicating special interest in the subject.</p>								
	<p>2. Make explicit references to previous learning and apply in an innovative (new and creative) way that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.</p>								
	<p>3. Review prior learning (past experiences inside and outside of the classroom) in depth to reveal significantly changed perspectives about educational and life experiences, which provide foundation for expanded knowledge, growth, and maturity over time.</p>								
	<p>4. Demonstrate evidence of self-reflection on perspectives because of working within and learning from diversity of communities and cultures.</p>	190 or 198	17/18	Research paper	Rubrics, developed by Assessment Committee	Coordinated by Assessment Committee	Data will be reported by Assessment Committee. 90% should achieve 2.0 or better (of 4.0), 30% 3.0 or better	Assessment Committee and instructor	Faculty will use data for enhancing course design and delivery
	<p>5. Express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.</p>	190 or 198	17/18	Research paper	Rubrics, developed by Assessment Committee	Coordinated by Assessment Committee	Data will be reported by Assessment Committee. 90% should achieve 2.0 or better (of 4.0), 30% 3.0 or better	Assessment Committee and instructor	Faculty will use data for enhancing course design and delivery
<p>IV. Integrative Learning: Students majoring in Humanities &amp; Religious Studies should be able to demonstrate ability to synthesize and undertake cross-disciplinary study and learning in</p>	<p>1. Apply learning acquired in Humanities &amp; Religious Studies as context for studying (within and/or outside of HRS) from relevant disciplinary perspectives such as history, English, philosophy, and art history.</p>								
	<p>2. Select and develop examples of life experiences, drawn from a variety of contexts (e.g., family life, artistic participation, civic involvement, work experience), to illuminate</p>								

order to understand holistically the place and relevance of these fields and their subject matter.	concepts/theories/frame works of fields of study.								
	3. Create wholes out of multiple parts (synthesize) or draw conclusions by combining examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.								
	4. Adapt and apply skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations to solve problems or explore issues.	190 or 198	18/19	Research paper	Rubrics, developed by Assessment Committee	Coordinated by Assessment Committee	Data will be reported by Assessment Committee. 90% should achieve 2.0 or better (of 4.0), 30% 3.0 or better	Assessment Committee and instructor	Faculty will use data for enhancing course design and delivery
V. Competence in the Disciplines (Religious Studies): Students majoring in Humanities with Religious Studies Concentration should be able to demonstrate knowledge and skills of theoretical and methodological approaches appropriate to the field in order to achieve advanced levels of interpretation and analysis of various manifestations of religion in a variety of cultures.	1. Explain the historical development of the field of Religious Studies, identifying major thinkers and describing significant theoretical approaches.								
	2. Demonstrate familiarity with the ways "religion" is conceptualized and categorized in academic study, and demonstrate ability to distinguish academic study of religion from personal perspectives (e.g., "faith" perspective).	108 or 198	19/20	Research paper	Rubrics, developed by Assessment Committee	Coordinated by Assessment Committee	Data will be reported by Assessment Committee. 90% should achieve 2.0 or better (of 4.0), 30% 3.0 or better	Assessment Committee and instructor	Faculty will use data for enhancing course and curriculum design and delivery
	3. Applying appropriate academic approaches, explain characteristic beliefs, practices, and institutions of more than one religion and describe the place of these religions within their historical and cultural contexts.	108 or 198	20/21	Research paper	Rubrics, developed by Assessment Committee	Coordinated by Assessment Committee	Data will be reported by Assessment Committee. 90% should achieve 2.0 or better (of 4.0), 30% 3.0 or better	Assessment Committee and instructor	Faculty will use data for enhancing course and curriculum design and delivery

### Curricular Map: BA in Humanities with Religious Studies Concentration

PLOs Courses	1.1	1.2	1.3	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	5.1	5.2	5.3
	Required Courses																		
HRS 10	I	I	I	I	I	I	I				I	I	I		I				
HRS 11	I	I	I	I	I	I	I				I	I	I		I				
HRS 70	I	I	I	I	I	I	I				I	I	I		I				
HRS 71	I	I	I	I	I	I	I				I	I	I		I				
HRS 108				D	D	D	D		I		D	D	D		D	D	M	M	
HRS 140	D	D	D	D	D	D	I											I	I
HRS 190	M	M	M	D	D	D	D	D	D		D	D	D		D	D			
HRS 198				M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M		M	M	M	M	M

## HRS PLO 1.1 RUBRIC

**HRS Learning Goal 1:** Knowledge of Human Cultures: Students majoring in Humanities & Religious Studies should be able to demonstrate knowledge of human cultures, their values and forms of expression in ways that prepare them to understand, adapt, and succeed in increasingly diverse and complex contexts.

**HRS PLO 1.1:** Explain the distinguishing values and prominent forms of literary and artistic expression of the major eras of Western and Asian cultures.

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

	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
<b>Worldview Analysis</b>	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the worldview/s (beliefs, values, ideals, etc.) of one or more cultures.	Demonstrates good understanding of the worldview/s (beliefs, values, ideals, etc.) of one or more cultures.	Demonstrates partial understanding of the worldview/s (beliefs, values, ideals, etc.) of one or more cultures.	Demonstrates superficial understanding of the worldview/s (beliefs, values, ideals, etc.) of one or more cultures.
<b>Expression</b>	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of forms of cultural expression (artistic, literary, etc.).	Demonstrates good understanding of forms of cultural expression (artistic, literary, etc.).	Demonstrates partial understanding of forms of cultural expression (artistic, literary, etc.).	Demonstrates superficial understanding of forms of cultural expression (artistic, literary, etc.).
<b>Historical Awareness</b>	Demonstrate thorough awareness of the identifying characteristics of eras, periods, or movements in cultural history.	Demonstrate considerable awareness of the identifying characteristics of eras, periods, or movements in cultural history.	Demonstrate partial awareness of the identifying characteristics of eras, periods, or movements in cultural history.	Demonstrate limited awareness of the identifying characteristics of eras, periods, or movements in cultural history.
<b>Multidisciplinary Approach</b>	Applies multidisciplinary approach to the study of culture in a highly effective manner.	Applies multidisciplinary approach to the study of culture in an effective manner.	Applies multidisciplinary approach to the study of culture only somewhat effectively, or applies only a partially multidisciplinary approach (e.g., shows proficiency in only two or three disciplines) in an effective manner.	Applies only a partially multidisciplinary approach in only a somewhat effective manner.
<b>Empathy</b>	Consistently demonstrates impressive capacity for seeing the world and human experience from the perspectives of others.	Consistently demonstrates sufficient capacity for seeing the world and human experience from the perspectives of others.	Consistently demonstrates basic capacity for seeing the world and human experience from the perspectives of others, or occasionally demonstrates sufficient capacity for seeing the world and human experience from the perspectives of others.	Demonstrates evidence of developing basic capacity for seeing the world and human experience from the perspectives of others.



## Department of Humanities & Religious Studies Humanities BA with RS Concentration

### Curricular Map: BA in Humanities with Religious Studies Concentration

PLOs Courses	1.1	1.2	1.3	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	5.1	5.2	5.3
<b>Required Courses</b>																			
HRS 10	I	I	I	I	I	I	I				I	I	I		I				
HRS 11	I	I	I	I	I	I	I				I	I	I		I				
HRS 70	I	I	I	I	I	I	I				I	I	I		I				
HRS 71	I	I	I	I	I	I	I				I	I	I		I				
HRS 108				D	D	D	D		I		D	D	D		D	D	M	M	
HRS 140	D	D	D	D	D	D	I											I	I
HRS 190	M	M	M	D	D	D	D	D	D		D	D	D		D	D			
HRS 198				M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M		M	M	M	M	M

**PLO 2.1 (Reading) (HRS 190M, Spring 2017, Final Essays)**

	<b>#1</b>	<b>#2</b>	<b>#3</b>	<b>#4</b>	<b>#5</b>	<b>Average</b>
<b>Compreh.</b>	2.0	3.5	3.0	2.0	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
<b>Genres</b>	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.5	<b>1.3</b>
<b>Rel. to Text</b>	2.5	3.5	3.0	1.5	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
<b>Analysis</b>	2.0	2.5	2.5	1.5	3.3	<b>2.4</b>
<b>Interpret.</b>	2.0	2.5	2.5	1.5	2.5	<b>2.2</b>
<b>Voice</b>	2.3	3.5	3.0	1.3	3.0	<b>2.6</b>
<b>Average</b>	2.0	2.6	2.6	1.4	2.7	<b>2.2</b>

Scores 2.0 and above: 80.0% (Standard of Performance is 90%)

Scores 3.0 and above: 0.0% (Standard of Performance is 30%)

**PLO 2.1 (Reading) (HRS 195, Spring 2017, Response Paper #9)**

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	Average
<b>Analysis</b>	2.0	1.8	1.3	1.0	1.5	1.3	1.8	3.3	<b>1.7</b>

**PLO 2.1 (Reading) (HRS 190M, Spring 2017, Final Essays)**

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	Ave.
<b>Analysis</b>	2.0	2.5	2.5	1.5	3.3	<b>2.4</b>

**PLO 2.1 (Reading): Analysis, HRS 108, Spring 2011**

	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	Ave.
<b>Analysis</b>	1.5	1.7	1.5	2.0	2.3	1.5	<b>1.8</b>

# READING VALUE RUBRIC

*for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)*



The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

## Definition

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

## Framing Language

To paraphrase Phaedrus, texts do not explain, nor answer questions about, themselves. They must be located, approached, decoded, comprehended, analyzed, interpreted, and discussed, especially complex academic texts used in college and university classrooms for purposes of learning. Historically, college professors have not considered the teaching of reading necessary other than as a "basic skill" in which students may require "remediation." They have assumed that students come with the ability to read and have placed responsibility for its absence on teachers in elementary and secondary schools.

This absence of reading instruction in higher education must, can, and will change, and this rubric marks a direction for this change. Why the change? Even the strongest, most experienced readers making the transition from high school to college have not learned what they need to know and do to make sense of texts in the context of professional and academic scholarship—to say nothing about readers who are either not as strong or as experienced. Also, readers mature and develop their repertoire of reading performances naturally during the undergraduate years and beyond as a consequence of meeting textual challenges. This rubric provides some initial steps toward finding ways to measure undergraduate students' progress along the continuum. Our intention in creating this rubric is to support and promote the teaching of undergraduates as readers to take on increasingly higher levels of concerns with texts and to read as one of "those who comprehend."

Readers, as they move beyond their undergraduate experiences, should be motivated to approach texts and respond to them with a reflective level of curiosity and the ability to apply aspects of the texts they approach to a variety of aspects in their lives. This rubric provides the framework for evaluating both students' developing relationship to texts and their relative success with the range of texts their coursework introduces them to. It is likely that users of this rubric will detect that the cell boundaries are permeable, and the criteria of the rubric are, to a degree, interrelated.

## Glossary

*The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.*

- **Analysis:** The process of recognizing and using features of a text to build a more advanced understanding of the meaning of a text. (Might include evaluation of genre, language, tone, stated purpose, explicit or implicit logic (including flaws of reasoning), and historical context as they contribute to the meaning of a text.)
- **Comprehension:** The extent to which a reader "gets" the text, both literally and figuratively. Accomplished and sophisticated readers will have moved from being able to "get" the meaning that the language of the text provides to being able to "get" the implications of the text, the questions it raises, and the counterarguments one might suggest in response to it. A helpful and accessible discussion of 'comprehension' is found in Chapter 2 of the RAND report, Reading for Understanding: [www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\\_reports/MR1465/MR1465.ch2.pdf](http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1465/MR1465.ch2.pdf).
- **Epistemological lens:** The knowledge framework a reader develops in a specific discipline as s/he moves through an academic major (e.g., essays, textbook chapters, literary works, journal articles, lab reports, grant proposals, lectures, blogs, webpages, or literature reviews, for example). The depth and breadth of this knowledge provides the foundation for independent and self-regulated responses to the range of texts in any discipline or field that students will encounter.
- **Genre:** A particular kind of "text" defined by a set of disciplinary conventions or agreements learned through participation in academic discourse. Genre governs what texts can be about, how they are structured, what to expect from them, what can be done with them, how to use them
- **Interpretation:** Determining or construing the meaning of a text or part of a text in a particular way based on textual and contextual information.
- **Interpretive Strategies:** Purposeful approaches from different perspectives, which include, for example, asking clarifying questions, building knowledge of the context in which a text was written, visualizing and considering counterfactuals (asking questions that challenge the assumptions or claims of the text, e.g., What might our country be like if the Civil War had not happened? How would Hamlet be different if Hamlet had simply killed the King?).
- **Multiple Perspectives:** Consideration of how text-based meanings might differ depending on point of view.
- **Parts:** Titles, headings, meaning of vocabulary from context, structure of the text, important ideas and relationships among those ideas.
- **Relationship to text:** The set of expectations and intentions a reader brings to a particular text or set of texts.
- **Searches intentionally for relationships:** An active and highly-aware quality of thinking closely related to inquiry and research.
- **Takes texts apart:** Discerns the level of importance or abstraction of textual elements and sees big and small pieces as parts of the whole meaning (compare to Analysis above).
- **Metacognition:** This is not a word that appears explicitly anywhere in the rubric, but it is implicit in a number of the descriptors, and is certainly a term that we find frequently in discussions of successful and rich learning. Metacognition, (a term typically attributed to the cognitive psychologist J.H. Flavell) applied to reading refers to the awareness, deliberateness, and reflexivity defining the activities and strategies that readers must control in order to work their ways effectively through different sorts of texts, from lab reports to sonnets, from math texts to historical narratives, or from grant applications to graphic novels, for example. Metacognition refers here as well to an accomplished reader's ability to consider the ethos reflected in any such text; to know that one is present and should be considered in any use of, or response to a text.

# READING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)



## Definition

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

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

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