Annual Assessment Report to the College 2010-2011

College:  HUMANITIES

Department:  MODERN AND CLASSICAL LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

Program:  -

Note:  Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator and to the Associate Dean of your College by September 30, 2011. You may submit a separate report for each program which conducted assessment activities.

Liaison:  VAHRAM SHEMMASSIAN

1.  Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s)

1a. Assessment Process Overview:  Provide a brief overview of the intended plan to assess the program this year.  Is assessment under the oversight of one person or a committee?

One person oversees assessment.  The SLO chosen for the AY 2010-2011 was SLO #5: “Analyze and clearly articulate interpretations of literary texts.”  Upper and lower division courses including Foreign Literature in Translation (FLIT) courses were considered.  The MCLL Assessment Liaison reviewed the SLO in question in faculty meetings, as well as provided the faculty with questions as a guideline.  The instructors responded in writing.  This report is based on their assessments.

1b. Implementation and Modifications:  Did the actual assessment process deviate from what was intended?  If so, please describe any modification to your assessment process and why it occurred.

No.
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2. **Student Learning Outcome Assessment Project**: Answer questions according to the individual SLO assessed this year. If you assessed an additional SLO, report in the next chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2a. Which Student Learning Outcome was measured this year?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO #5: Analyze and clearly articulate interpretations of literary texts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2b. What assessment instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL 2010</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLIT 150: See Appendix 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLIT 295B: Students were assessed based on effective use of bibliography, identification of sources, organization, format, grammar, style, and integration of multi-source information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLIT 331: Students were assessed through: 1) specific oral questions at the beginning of each class to demonstrate whether or not they studied the assigned material. This procedure allowed the instructor to check the level of literary knowledge the students achieved at that point in time; 2) a collective debate of various literary themes in each class. This allowed the instructor to check the capacity of the class to understand the material and realize the improvement they made in expressing themselves in literary terms; 3) oral presentation by groups (however, each student making a separate presentation on a different aspect of the same group topic or related topics); 4) written midterm and final exams in the form of essay. A portion of the midterm exam was a take-home to allow students to incorporate research material. By the end of the semester, the instructor assessed each student fully (understanding, ability to conceptualize orally and in writing their opinions).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

March 30, 2009, prepared by Bonnie Paller
FLIT 380: See Appendix 3.

SPAN 307: The students were assessed based on the following: bibliography, organization, superior level of ACTFL standards, format modeling the MLA, grammar, research skills, integration of multi-source information.

SPAN 363: The students were assessed based on the following: bibliography, organization, superior level of ACTFL standards, format modeling the MLA, grammar, research skills, integration of multi-source information, and application of contemporary literary theory to literary discourse.

SPAN 508: Discussions and analysis of literary texts in class, applying the appropriate theory and/or criticism; biweekly quizzes on the material covered in class and assigned readings at home; two exams during the semester; final project/essay; final exam consisting of three parts: multiple choice, short essay, and text analysis.

SPAN 550: Four components were taken into account: Speaking (discussion), reading (text analysis), writing (research), and listening (lecture deliverance). Students were provided with questions and paragraphs related to the novels read in class. Students were also provided with websites and scholarly journal references related to the history and politics of Latin America. They were able to research the eras and political events and thus become aware of the message and depth of the authors’ writings. Speaking was produced by the discussions and debates on the writers’ points of view, the role of the narrator, and the fine line that exists when it comes to analyze historical novels. Reading was complemented by the use of the web, the examination of six major contemporary Latin American novels, and the interpretation of scholarly journals. Writing was based on reaction papers, analysis of related works by similar authors, and the focus on the capstone paper for Seniors, while the Graduate students were to turn in a scholarly essay backed up by research bibliography.

SPAN 580: Same as SPAN 508.

SPAN 584: The students were assessed based on the following: bibliography, organization, superior level of ACTFL standards, format modeling the MLA, grammar, research skills, integration of multi-source information, and application of contemporary literary theory to literary discourse.

SPRING 2011

FLIT 150: See Appendix 1.

March 30, 2009, prepared by Bonnie Paller
FLIT 295A: 2 midterm exams, a final exam, and a 15-20 minute oral presentation on an assigned topic.

FLIT 371: 2 midterm exams and a final exam. The oral section involved a critical debate on the part of the entire class on four novels, as well as questions and answers on the topic of the day at the beginning of each lesson.

JAPN 304: 2 mid-term exams.

SPAN 307: Same as in Fall 2010

SPAN 364: The students were assessed based on the following: bibliography, organization, superior level of ACTFL standards, format modeling the MLA, grammar, research skills, integration of multi-source information, and application of contemporary literary theory to literary discourse.

SPAN 587: The students were assessed based on the following: bibliography, organization, superior level of ACTFL standards, format modeling the MLA, grammar, research skills, integration of multi-source information, and application of contemporary literary theory to literary discourse.

**2c. Describe the participants sampled to assess this SLO:** discuss sample/participant and population size for this SLO. For example, what type of students, which courses, how decisions were made to include certain participants.

**FALL 2010**

FLIT 150: 45 students. More than 90% from outside the College of Humanities. Virtually all students take this course to fulfill a GE requirement. The vast majority are first- or second-year students. The course has SLO #5 set at the Beginning level.

FLIT 295B: 20 students, freshmen to senior. Four students were French major, 3 Spanish, major, 2 Languages and Cultures major, and the rest History, Art, Journalism, and Management majors.

FLIT 331: 31 students, all but one undergraduate (1 freshman, 1 sophomore, 15 juniors, 13 seniors). Their majors: 2 in French; 2 in Linguistics; 6 in Languages and Cultures (L & C)/Japanese; 1 in L & C/Italian; 2 in Art; 2 in CTV; 1 in Humanities; the rest in various other fields. In general, students whose general performance in class is weak were those to whom the instructor asked more questions in the preliminary debate about the class topic in order to get from them a higher level of participation—thus improving their chance to get a better grade. Students who did well from the outset contributed once the debate was open for everyone.
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FLIT 380: 33 undergraduate students, as follows: 2 seniors, 23 juniors, 8 sophomores. Their primary language is English.

SPAN 307: 26 students, including 4 sophomores, 15 juniors, and 7 seniors. Twenty students were Spanish major, 4 Linguistics major, and 3 Journalism major.

SPAN 363: 33 students, including 11 juniors and 22 seniors. Thirty students were Spanish majors and three were double majors (Spanish/Linguistics, Spanish/Chicana-o Studies, Spanish/Journalism).

SPAN 508: 13 graduate students and 16 undergraduate students.

SPAN 550: 20 students, 3 of whom in the MA program.

SPAN 580: 10 students, 2 of whom graduate students. Six of the undergraduate students majored in Spanish.

SPAN 584: 14 students, including 1 junior, 7 seniors, and 6 graduate students. Eleven were Spanish majors, and 3 were English, Journalism, and Education majors.

SPRING 2011

FLIT 150: 26 students. More than 90% from outside the College of Humanities. Virtually all students take this course to fulfill a GE requirement. The vast majority are first- or second-year students. The course has SLO #5 set at the Beginning level.

FLIT 295A: 13 students, 8 of whom majoring in one of the disciplines of the College of Humanities.

FLIT 371: 28 students, half of whom majoring in one of the disciplines of the College of Humanities.

JAPN 304: 17 students: 3 students studied abroad (in Japan), the remaining 14 students have never studied abroad.

SPAN 307: 17 students, including 1 freshman, 2 sophomores, 7 juniors, 6 seniors, and 1 graduate. Eleven students were Spanish major, 3 Journalism, 1 Humanities, 1 Psychology.

SPAN 364: 21 students, including 1 sophomore, 2 juniors, and 18 seniors. 18 students were Spanish majors, 1 Psychology, 1 Child Development, and 1 Chicano/a.
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2d. **Describe the assessment design methodology:** For example, was this SLO assessed longitudinally (same students at different points) or was a cross-sectional comparison used (comparing freshmen with seniors)? If so, describe the assessment points used.

### FALL 2010

**FLIT 150:** Embedded question on midterm exam. Format was essay writing. Three questions were offered. One was a literary question. Approximately 40-50% of students elected to write on the literary question.

**FLIT 295B:** The SLO was assessed longitudinally. The students had to do an oral presentation, write a 5-6 page essay using 2 critical sources, take a midterm exam, and take a final exam.

**FLIT 331:** The SLO was assessed longitudinally. All students made a class presentation, participated in debates, and took the midterm and final exams.

**FLIT 380:** SLO #5 was assessed longitudinally. The students were given weekly short writing assignments. They were required to submit discussion outlines for every chapter, detailing their knowledge and understanding of the literary texts. They also took a quiz after each major topic covered in class, and a final exam based on the course readings, film screening, class discussions, and student presentations. In addition, each student made a 10- to 15-minute class presentation as well as submitted a written project on any aspect of the materials covered in the course.

**SPAN 307:** SLO #5 was assessed longitudinally: 3 analytical research papers, 1 oral presentation, 2 partial exams (on narrative and poetry), and a final exam.

**SPAN 363:** SLO #5 was assessed longitudinally: 2 analytical research papers using three critical sources, 2 oral presentations, 2 partial exams, and a final exam.

**SPAN 508:** SLO #5 was assessed longitudinally and by establishing a cross-sectional comparison between graduate and undergraduate students. Longitudinally, each student was measured during the semester using the assessment instruments described in question #1. At the same time, more was demanded from graduate students in terms of critical analysis of the literary texts (Inclusion of more theory) and the size of the final project.

---
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SPAN 550: Graduate students were assessed based on a 15-page term paper, a class presentation on interpreting a scholarly article related to a historical topic and its relation to a historical novel, and two midterm exams. The seniors also presented an analysis of a short article from a journal and discussed its application to any of the texts read in class, took two midterm exams, and wrote their capstone paper. The methodology thus incorporated the assessment of both graduate and undergraduate students.

SPAN 580: Same as SPAN 508.

SPAN 584: SLO #5 was assessed longitudinally, as follows: 3 analytical research papers using four critical sources, 2 oral presentations based on journal articles, 1 mid-term exam, and, for undergraduate students, a final exam or a final research paper, and, for graduate students, a final research paper.

SPRING 2011

FLIT 150: Embedded question on midterm exam. Format was essay writing. Three questions were offered. One was a literary question. Approximately 30% of students (8/26) elected to write on the literary question.

FLIT 295A: NA

FLIT 371: NA

JAPN 304: A cross-sectional comparison in week 5 and week 10. Group A: students who returned from their study abroad; Group B: students who have studied Japanese only at CSUN.

SPAN 307: Assessed longitudinally. 3 analytical research papers, 2 oral presentations, 2 partial exams (on narrative and poetry), and a final exam were required.

SPAN 364: Assessed longitudinally. Two analytical research papers using 3 critical sources, 2 oral presentations, 2 partial exams, and a final exam.

SPAN 587: Assessed longitudinally. Three analytical research papers using 4 critical sources, 2 oral presentations based on journal articles, and 1 midterm exam. For undergraduate students, a final exam or a final research paper was required, and for graduate students a final research paper was required.

2e. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO: Provide a summary of how the data were analyzed and highlight important findings from the March 30, 2009, prepared by Bonnie Paller
FALL 2010

FLIT 150: The essay question was 50% of the midterm exam. A grade was also assigned indicating how well the student evaluated the importance of genre and how it affects the author and the audience (a scale of 1-4). Class discussion focused on the interrelationship of audience and author in the choice of ideas and their expression as an appropriate genre (drama, epic, history, ethnography, religious texts).

FLIT 295B: 90% received grades ranging from B-A, 10% received a C.

FLIT 331: At the time this report was turned in in November, 50% of students had C/C-; 41% B-/B+; 9% A/A-.

FLIT 380: The majority of students demonstrated an average (35%) or above average (50%) ability to interpret literary texts and articulate their understanding of those texts. The remaining 15% performed below average but did not fail. The instructor believes that the SLO #5 success rate was adequate.

SPAN 307: The students demonstrated the same ability level to analyze and clearly articulate interpretations of literary texts. The distribution of grades was as follows: A 3, B 9, C 9, D 2, WU 3.

SPAN 363: The students demonstrated the same ability level to analyze and clearly articulate interpretations of literary texts. The distribution of grades was as follows: A 17, B 9, C 5, WU 2.

SPAN 508: The results of the SLO #5 were satisfactory. Most of the students got a grade of B+ or above. They demonstrated, both in the final exam and the term project, that they were able to correctly analyze and articulate interpretations of literary texts. The results also show the importance of reading and writing skills. Some of the undergraduate students especially, showed a lack of competency in writing, with spelling mistakes and poor articulation of their thoughts. In this sense, SLO #5 charges us to exert extra effort in developing these skills among students through different techniques/exercises.

SPAN 550: From the data collected based on the performance of the two groups, that is, seniors and graduates, the instructor concludes that both did fine in all aspects except for two undergraduate students. These two performed at the C+ level. They missed some of the most important points of the second midterm exam such as the connection between the historical events and how they are reflected throughout the historical novel. They also failed to apply the scholarly article to the analysis of the work in question. The rest of the students were able to connect and apply the proper literary theory to their research.
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SPAN 580: Same as SPAN 508.

SPAN 584: The students demonstrated the same ability level to analyze and clearly articulate interpretations of literary texts. The distribution of grades was as follows: A 6, B 7, C 1.

**SPRING 2011**

FLIT 150: The essay question was 50% of the midterm exam. A grade was also assigned indicating how well the student evaluated the importance of genre and how it affects the author and the audience (a scale of 1-4). Class discussion focused on the interrelationship of audience and author in the choice of ideas and their expression as an appropriate genre (drama, epic, history, ethnography, religious texts).

FLIT 295A: Each exam consisted of written short essays in which students had to demonstrate their knowledge of the subject matter and ability to express their personal opinions. The class presentation allowed students to show their ability to present a work not familiar to other students and be able to answer posited to them.

FLIT 371: The three exams were based mostly on essay questions, which focused on analytical skills as an expression of one’s view and on the ability to synthesize what was learned from reading and studying in class. In addition, a class discussion on a novel allowed students to show their ability to express themselves orally and in a critical manner.

JAPN 304: Kanji skills play a crucial role in comprehending Japanese texts. None of the Group A students got an A on the first midterm exam. The data show that their performance was necessarily better than that of Group B (a student who has never studied abroad actually got the highest score in the class). However, the instructor does not think that Group A students did not do well or study abroad did not help. Rather, this is so perhaps because Japanese 304 materials were designed upon what was introduced in Japanese 300 in the Fall 2010, which group A students did not take since they were in Japan. Group A students simply did not know enough kanji that were introduced last semester. As group A students adjusted and became more aware of what they needed to catch up with, they got much better. For the second midterm exam, the two top students were Group A students. Similarly, the instructor has noticed that Group A students were able to read “between the lines” in literature, while Group B students tended to grab the literal meaning only. It seemed difficult for Group B to fully understand metaphors. It would take much more time for them to read and understand the texts. See Appendix 2.

SPAN 307: The distribution of grades was as follows: A 4, B 9, C 3, F 1.

SPAN 364: The distribution of grades was as follows: A 7, B 8, C 6.

SPAN 587: The distribution of grades was as follows: A 12, B 9, C 3, I 1.
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2f. **Use of Assessment Results of this SLO:** Think about all the different ways the results were or will be used. For example, to recommend changes to course content/topics covered, course sequence, addition/deletion of courses in program, student support services, revisions to program SLO’s, assessment instruments, academic programmatic changes, assessment plan changes, etc. Please provide a clear and detailed description of how the assessment results were or will be used.

**FALL 2010**

FLIT 150: The essay question assesses the success on the part of the instructor in clearly articulating the connection between the author’s choice of genre and expectations of his audience. The results are much the same from year to year (the instructor has been teaching the course for 22 years). Most students have little or no experience with literature, and therefore a major goal is to acquaint students with the importance of genre in determining content and presentation of ideas in a work of literature. This can only take place on an elementary level in a survey course of this type. Every semester the size of the course works toward a uniformity of statistical result, with the average around 3.0/4. The random enrollment of students based on letter of the alphabet causes some noticeable variation from time to time.

FLIT 380: More students will perform above average if instructor gave them more individual attention outside of the class to work on their final oral projects. The course/program strategic plan is to expand Russian studies and to enroll in the SLI program. The instructor believes that this course will increase students’ understanding and awareness of Russian culture, history, and traditions. As a result, students would want to continue with Russian studies.

FLIT 331: The instructor will make some changes in future teaching by selecting more narrations and plays rather than excerpts from treatises and poetry.

SPAN 508: The activities in this course follow closely the strategic plan of the department by providing students with techniques, strategies, and skills to carry out independent research that would support career choices. They accomplish this goal by establishing a solid foundation of critical theories and analysis of Spanish Literature, civilization and culture. The students also develop an advanced level of communication using a variety of rhetorical modes in both oral and written discourse. Needs: Resources to correct spelling mistakes and poor articulation through different techniques/exercises.

SPAN 550: The instructor’s major challenge was to not only explain to the students the historical background of the works students were reading, but also to make them think from critical and philosophical points of view. A critical thinking course related to literature and history is in order. The MCLL does offer a Literary Theory course at the graduate level, but students need to be exposed to an undergraduate course in Theory and another one in History in order for them to understand and be able to develop their critical thinking skills.
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SPAN: 580: Same as SPAN 508.

SPRING 2011

FLIT 150: Same as in Fall 2010 semester. However, in Spring 2011 the quality of writing was somewhat below the level of previous years, as was the degree of perception of essential differences between Greeks and Angelinos. Greater emphasis on these differences will be included in future lectures.

JAPN 304: The instructor strongly believes that more reading comprehension materials should be added to Japanese 101, 102, 201, and 202. The existing textbooks do have reading materials/exercises, but they focus on conversation. Students who have completed up to Japanese 202 do not really have a chance to be exposed to Reading. Nevertheless, when they move on to a third-year level course, they suddenly have to read many “authentic” materials with too many kanji. The instructor feels there is a huge level gap between Japanese 202 and the next course. Furthermore, because the students are not really exposed to reading and writing, writing skills in Japanese 304 (third-year level) students show weakness; they may be able to write a sentence perfectly, but they cannot structure paragraphs in a cohesive manner. The instructor thinks that reading/writing exercises should be introduced from the first semester of Japanese as well, since it takes time to build these skills.

Some programs assess multiple SLOs each year. If your program assessed an additional SLO, report the process for that individual SLO below. If you need additional SLO charts, please cut & paste the empty chart as many times as needed. If you did NOT assess another SLO, skip this section.

2a. Which Student Learning Outcome was measured this year?

2b. What assessment instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO?

2c. Describe the participants sampled to assess this SLO: discuss sample/participant and population size for this SLO. For example, what type of students, which courses, how decisions were made to include certain participants.
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2d. Describe the assessment design methodology: Was this SLO assessed longitudinally (same students at different points) or was a cross-sectional comparison used (comparing freshmen with seniors)? If so, describe the assessment points used.

2e. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO: Provide a summary of how the data were analyzed and highlight important findings from the data collected.

2f. Use of Assessment Results of this SLO: Think about all the different ways the results were (or could be) used. For example, to recommend changes to course content/topics covered, course sequence, addition/deletion of courses in program, student support services, revisions to program SLO’s, assessment instruments, academic programmatic changes, assessment plan changes, etc. Please provide a clear and detailed description of each.

3. How do your assessment activities connect with your program’s strategic plan?

Fall 2011

FLIT 150: This is essentially a service course, both for the GE program and (occasionally) for students in the Classical Greek and Roman Civilization Interdisciplinary Minor Program. There is no essential programmatic connection between one course and another.

FLIT 331: The class, as always, was open to a lot of cultural material in order to enhance the students’ curiosity and participation. Topics assigned for oral presentation especially were used as a venue to generate in the students the desire to continue with Italian.

SPAN 307: The activities are clearly connected with one of the fundamental premises of our program, which is to provide high quality teaching to improve student learning. The students acquired the theoretical and critical skills to study and analyze all literary genres.
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SPAN 363: The activities are clearly connected with the fundamental premises of our program, namely, to provide high quality teaching to improve student learning. The students were exposed to the complex process of the historical evolution of diverse aesthetic and cultural traditions represented in Latin American Literature.

FLIT 380: The course/program strategic plan is to expand Russian program and to attract more students to the SLI program. The instructor believes that this course will increase students’ understanding and awareness of Russian culture, history, and traditions. As a result, students would want to continue with Russian studies.

SPAN 584: The activities are clearly connected with the fundamental premises of our program, namely, to provide high quality teaching to improve student learning. The students read 6 books and were exposed to contemporary literary theory and its application to texts.

SPRING 2011

FLIT 150: This is essentially a service course, both for the GE program and (occasionally) for students in the Classical Greek and Roman Civilization Interdisciplinary Minor Program. There is no essential programmatic connection between one course and another.

SPAN 307: Same as in Fall 2010.

SPAN 364: Same as in SPAN 307.

SPAN 587: Same as SPAN 307.

4. Overall, if this year’s program assessment evidence indicates that new resources are needed in order to improve and support student learning, please discuss here.

General observation:

Instructors are cognizant of the changes that they need to make, if any, in certain areas of teaching to achieve SLO #5 fully. With very few exceptions, instructors appear to have adequate resources to enhance student learning. It perhaps behooves us to explore the available technology/programs that are available in the computer lab to attain better results.
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5. Other information, assessment or reflective activities not captured above.

6. Has someone in your program completed, submitted or published a manuscript which uses or describes assessment activities in your program? Please provide citation or discuss.

N/A
# APPENDIX 1

## FLIT 150

### MCLL Assessment  SPRING 2011

**FLIT 150: Gateways to Western Civilization**

**SLO 5: Analyze and clearly articulate interpretations of literary texts**

Class size: 26 students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Components</th>
<th>Point Scale</th>
<th>Student's Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the student clearly identify the audience?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the student understand the genre used?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the student perceive the connection between author and ideas?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FLIT 150 “Gateways to Western Civilization”

Describe the assessment design methodology. For example, was the SLO assessed longitudinally (same student at different points) or was a cross-sectional comparison used (comparing freshmen with seniors)? If so, describe the assessment points.

Embedded question on Midterm Exam. Format was essay writing. Three questions were offered. One was a literary question. The format was take-home and open-book:

LITERARY QUESTION: Pick FOUR works of literature from the list below, and discuss the relationship that existed for each work between the Author of the work and the original first audience (at the ‘world première’)? What did an Author expect, as he thought about what his audience was going to be? What was he trying to do for his audience?

- Sophocles, Oedipus Tyrannos
- Homer’s Iliad
- Herodotus’ History (Croesus and his Family)
- Aristotle, The Politics
- Genesis Chapter 2 (the second creation story from "J")
- Xenophon’s Spartan Constitution

Approximately 30% of students (8/26) elected to write on the question.

FLIT 150 MIDTERM EXAM

The Essay Question is due in class on Friday March 25, at the time of the class. Failure to turn in an essay will result in a penalty of three points a day until the Essay is turned in. The essay must be printed out; no handwritten submissions will be accepted. Be sure to keep a copy for yourself, just in case something unexpected happens to the original.
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PART III. **THE ESSAY.** Choose ONE (-1-) of the following essay topics and write an essay [or rather the outlines of what would be a real essay, if you had enough time to write fully], in which you show (1) that you have read and understood the text(s); (2) that you know what the principal ideas are; (c) that you can connect ideas and facts together.

[50%]

**QUESTION I:** POLITICAL/SOCIAL QUESTION: Discuss the Greek approach to the idea of a person doing extraordinary (heroic) things in society. Consider (if you want) the epic view (Gilgamesh, Achilles), the tragic view (Oedipus the King), the historical view (King Croesus), the mythical-philosophical view (Tellus the Athenian, or Solon). What makes each kind of hero a hero?

**QUESTION II:** INTELLECTUAL QUESTION: Discuss the theme of the relationships between the divine (god/gods) and human beings, as seen in the literature we have been reading. Which of these relationships are positive? Why? Which of them are negative? Why? Discuss in detail several of the following [How many you discuss, and in what detail, will depend on the grade you are seeking]:

- *The Epic of Gilgamesh*
- Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannos*
- Herodotus, *The Histories* (Croesus & Apollo, for example; or Leonidas’ prophecy)
- *Genesis*: Creation story, *Adam & Eve, Cain & Abel, Noah*
- Homer, *Iliad* (Zeus and Agamemnon, Apollo and the Greeks, Hera, Athena)
- and any other texts (not excluding Chambers) that you think might be relevant.

**QUESTION III:** LITERARY QUESTION: Pick FOUR works of literature from the list below, and discuss the relationship that existed for each work between the Author of the work and the original first audience (at the ‘world première’)? What did an Author expect, as he thought about what his audience was going to be? What was he trying to do for his audience? (Be sure to read the Introduction to each selection in Gochberg, before you try to answer this question. Do not try to “wing it”.)

- Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannos*
- Homer’s *Iliad*
- Herodotus’ *History* (Croesus and his Family)
- Aristotle, *The Politics*
- *Genesis* Chapter 2 (the second creation story from "J")
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APPENDIX 2

JAPN 304

Assessment results and analysis of SLO #5. Provide a summary of how the data were analyzed and highlight important findings from the data collected.

Group A: Students who just returned from their study abroad (Japan).

Group B: Students who have been studying Japanese only at CSUN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mid-Term #1 Group A</th>
<th>Mid-Term #1 Group B</th>
<th>Mid-Term #2 Group A</th>
<th>Mid-Term #2 Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91 – 100 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 – 90%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 – 80%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 – 70%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 60%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mid-Term includes translation (English to Japanese), reading comprehension, and kanji.
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FLIT 380

Assessment rubric:

**Above Average:**
Student shows complete understanding of material and has little to no errors. Student can clearly articulate interpretations of cultural texts.

**Average:**
Student shows average understanding, but lacks details.

**Below Average:**
Student clearly did not understand the material and is unable to articulate interpretations of cultural texts.
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