|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NSC Logo- CMYK Vert | **Nevada State College**  **Core Curriculum Essential Learning Outcome Proposal Form** | | | | |
| Complete this form to add Essential Learning Outcomes to an existing class in the Core Curriculum. Once approved, these outcomes must be a part of all sections of this course. | | | | | |
| **Course Prefix & Number (e.g., PSY 422)** | | | **Course Title** | **Number of Credits** | **Catalog Year Effective (e.g., 2021-2022)** |
| ENG 131 | | | **Introduction to Literature** | 3 | **2022** |
| **Course Catalog Description (please include the text below):**  An introduction to the study of fiction, poetry, and creative non-fiction. | | | | | |
| **Contact Information for Faculty Lead Submitting this Proposal** | | | | | |
| Contact Person: | | School/Department: | | Phone: | E-mail Address: |
| Emily Hoover | | Humanities | | 702-992-2635 | Emily.Hoover@nsc.edu |
| **Course Information** | | | | | |
| Which general subject area of the Core Curriculum does this course currently fulfill?  English Composition  Study and Technology Skills  Mathematics  Natural Sciences  Social Sciences  Fine Arts  Humanities  Constitution  Cultural Diversity | | | | | |
| Identify the two Essential Learning Outcomes (ELOs) this course will meaningfully address. For each ELO you add, there must be a key assessment that shows student understanding of the ELO. Each class in the Core Curriculum should have one ELO from the “Community Engagement” category and one outcome from either Critical Thinking OR Communication.  Critical Thinking  Inquiry and Analysis  Information Literacy  Lifelong Learning  Quantitative Reasoning  Communication  Written Communication  Oral/Interpersonal Communication  Co-Creative Problem Solving  Creative Expression and Aesthetics  Community Engagement  Civic Knowledge and Engagement  Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion  Critical Literacy  Ethical Reasoning | | | | | |
| If your proposal does not include one ELO from the “Community Engagement” category or it does not have one outcome from either Critical Thinking OR Communication category, please provide a rationale here.  N/A. Proposal includes assessments that speak to both “Critical Thinking” and “Community Engagement” ELOs. | | | | | |
| Plan for student artifact assessment: For the first ELO you selected, describe the key assessment you will use. A key assessment directly addresses the ELO and may be evaluated by review committees. Every section of the course must use this key assessment or an equivalent.  To satisfy the ELO of “Inquiry and Analysis,” within the “Critical Thinking” category, students enrolled in ENG 131: Writing about Literature will practice close-reading a poem by an author in the Southwestern US who has been marginalized by the literary canon. Instructors will be encouraged to decolonize their syllabi or compare canonical texts to non-canonical choices as they select readings for the course. Instructors will scaffold intersectional identity experiences prior to this activity. On the day of the activity, instructors will model annotation practices designed to encourage students to read actively and take apart the poem—examining the parts in order to come up with a theme, or collection of connected themes, that can be supported by concrete textual evidence. This close reading activity will assist students in building directed questioning skills, so they can conduct later research about the author, the text, or the moment in history in which the text is positioned.  After the instructor models close reading, students will practice what was modeled with a different poem, maybe by the same author, or by someone else (who fits the instructor’s course theme; for example, mine is Southwestern writers). This low-stakes, close-reading assignment shows students the value of engaging with literary texts using pens, pencils, and highlighters as well as annotation marks—or, in an online format, through collaborative annotation tools like GoogleDocs and Jamboard or Perusall as well as verbal discussion software like VoiceThread or FlipGrid.  Once students engage actively with the poem and begin to interpret its poetics, they will have gathered enough information to draw logical conclusions about the poem and make inferences about how these conclusions relate to the poem’s rhetorical situation (author/positionality, target audience, purpose/themes, and moment in history) as well as articulate how the poem adds to the conversation surrounding diversity and inclusion (the second ELO addressed below). Once these connections are made, students can begin synthesizing information and asking questions about the poem’s further implications in society—whether it’s discussing how the world is, how it should be, or how it should not be—and work towards answering these direct, investigative questions in literary analysis essays coming up later in the course. Close reading is a key part of the writing process because it helps students brainstorm, practice analysis, and integrate concrete information from literary texts into their essays.  This activity will then be replicated with short fiction in order to expose students to rhetorical situation and genre differences. Both close readings—of poems and short fictions— alongside the essays that are built from close reading experiences may be assessed by Core Curriculum Committees in a portfolio format. | | | | | |
| For the first ELO, explain how the current ELO rubric aligns with the key assessment. List the dimensions on the rubric, the degree of alignment, and the level that we can reasonably expect from a student in this class.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Dimension | Alignment  (2=good alignment, 1=some alignment, 0=no alignment) | **Level (1-4)** | | Directed Questioning | 1 | 2 - Poses a question that partially addresses potentially significant aspects of the topic. | | Information Gathering | 2 | 3 – Frequently communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources to achieve intended purpose. | | Investigative Process | 2 | 3 - Frequently justifies the process by which the collected information will be assessed, interpreted, and synthesized | | Recognition and Discussion of Components | 2 | 4 - Almost always breaks the topic into components which are discussed and analyzed in depth. | | Inference | 2 | 3 - Frequently assesses the relationships between the components and the properties that emerge from their interactions, and integrates those observations into a logical conclusion. | | Further Implications and Next Steps | 2 | 3 - Frequently addresses implications beyond the immediate subject for further inquiry and practice | |  |  |  | | | | | | |
| Plan for student artifact assessment: For the second ELO you selected, describe the key assessment you will use. A key assessment directly addresses the ELO and may be evaluated by review committees. Every section of the course must use this key assessment or an equivalent.  For students’ final literary analysis essay in ENG 131, they will compare/contrast two literary texts from the syllabus, making an argument, not just about the similarities and differences between the texts, but about the societal value of these texts—in other words, how these texts advocate for marginalized subjects and endeavor to solve problems in our world such as systemic racism, sexism, and homophobia; climate justice and related barriers to immigration or land ownership in terms of indigenous rights; ableism; and addiction—through the lived experiences of diverse authors and/or their speakers and characters. It is my hope that this assignment counts towards the ELO of “equity, diversity, and inclusion,” as the literary analysis essays covered in ENG 131 will focus on marginalized writers to encourage faculty to be critical of, and teach outside, the literary canon in order to amplify these voices, acknowledge power structures, and invite students to respectfully interact with diverse cultures and differing worldviews, which, in turn, will encourage readers of literature to advocate for intersectionality, liberation, and the reader as witness and ally.  To prepare for this essay, which includes at least two literary texts as well as outside research to support the existence of problems beyond a literary context—such as privilege and oppression—the instructor will model how to craft a compare/contrast literary analysis essay through Venn diagramming with two texts. As part of their prewriting process, each student will submit their own Venn Diagram to the instructor for feedback as well as an outline that identifies the students’ working thesis statements, topic sentences, and supporting details from close reading the texts, etc. and the instructor will respond as well.  These essays alongside scaffolded process work will be assessed by Core Curriculum Committees in a portfolio format. | | | | | |
| For the second ELO, explain how the current ELO rubric aligns with the key assessment. List the dimensions on the rubric, the degree of alignment, and the level that we can reasonably expect from a student in this class.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Dimension | Alignment  (2=good alignment, 1=some alignment, 0=no alignment) | **Level (1-4)** | | *Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion* | 2 | 3 – Frequently articulates strong connections between cultures with acknowledgment of power structures, demonstrating respectful interaction with varied cultures and worldviews. | | *Intersectionality* | 2 | 2 - Occasionally applies connections to intersectional identity experiences. | | *Privilege, Oppression, and Liberation* | 2 | 3 - Frequently analyzes ways that privilege and oppression occur within their lives and/or field and evaluate the consequences of individual and collective actions. | | *Allyship* | 1 | 1 - Rarely communicates and/or takes informed and responsible action to address an instance of historical or systemic injustice. | | | | | | |
| Additional information for the review committee regarding the two ELOs and key assessments (optional) | | | | | |
| Names of faculty members who have reviewed this proposal in its entirety (note the full- and part-time instructors who also teach this course):  Gregory Robinson, Laura Decker, Joanna Shearer | | | | | |
| Proposal checklist  X I have consulted with all the appropriate stakeholders, particularly the Department Chair and the other instructors who teach this class. | | | | | |
| Approval Process  1. Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee (Recommend / Do not recommend)  2. School Curriculum Committee (Approve / Do not approve) | | | | | |
| Notes | | | | | |