

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH**

**Self-Study**

**Spring 2006**

## **English Department Self-Study 2005-2006**

- I. **Program Introduction/History:** In “The Undergraduate English Major,” a report from the ADE Ad Hoc Committee on the English Major, published in Professions 2004, the Committee notes:

English is no longer homogeneous—if it ever was—or perhaps the nature of its heterogeneity has altered. On the one hand, in some institutions areas once deemed an integral part of English have broken away. . . .On the other hand, by some measures, English departments must be seen as markedly more inclusive than ever. English studies may now embrace a more catholic interpretation of what constitutes a literary text or even claim the right to comment on or otherwise embrace texts apparently sub-, supra-, extra-, or nonliterary. . . .Long ago, we invaded territory of our colleagues in modern languages and annexed world literature; more recently, under the banner of globalization, we have begun to venture beyond the traditional focus on English and American literature into Canadian literature, Commonwealth literature, Caribbean literature (Anglophone at least), postcolonial literature, or most comprehensively, literature in English. Creative writing courses and programs have become increasingly popular. . . .

There are, then, good reasons not to attempt a comprehensive definition of what English ought to be or to chart a single passage for its future. A key strength of English as a centerpiece of liberal education has surely been its breadth and adaptability. . . .As John Gerber, a longtime chair at Iowa wisely observed more than twenty-five years ago: “English is not a neat, discrete discipline, but a congeries of subject matters that varies from place to place and time to time.” (183-184)

The description of an emerging, inclusive “English Studies” program most accurately describes California State University, Sacramento’s English Department, and its strength over the last five years has, indeed, been its breadth and adaptability.

### **A. Program Mission and Goals:**

The English Department of California State University, Sacramento, is a community of teachers, scholars, writers, and support staff whose primary mission is to promote learning in composition, creative writing, English education, linguistics, literature, and the teaching of English as a second language. The department seeks to help students acquire knowledge, develop skills, and realize their own intellectual and creative goals. At the undergraduate and graduate levels, the English Department presents a broad and balanced curriculum designed to develop the reading and writing skills, the interpretative abilities, and the cultural awareness of its students by maintaining and enhancing a tradition of strong teaching, solid scholarship, and vigorous support of creative literary activity. Graduates of the department are well equipped to enter advanced degree programs and to pursue careers in teaching, law, publishing, the arts, and other areas in which the ability to read and write the English language effectively is paramount.

To fulfill the “Mission Statement” printed above and on our department website, the English Department offers and/or participates in the following programs:

**Undergraduate:** These include the English Major Program (revised for 2004-2006 catalog); English Single Subject Matter Program (revised in 2005); Minors in

English, Creative Writing, and TESOL; Participation in Film Studies minor; General Education Areas—A2 (Written Communication), A3(Critical Thinking); C2 (Intro to the Arts), C3 (Intro to the Humanities), C4 (Further Studies in the Arts & Humanities); and E (Understanding Personal Development); we also offer courses that fulfill the GE Writing Intensive and Race & Ethnicity requirements, as well as College Composition II which fulfills a graduation requirement. The English Department is also committed to student retention and has participated fully in Freshman Programs (EOP Learning Communities; University Learning Communities; and Freshman Seminar).

In 2004, the English Department instituted revised major requirements that more fully reflect our commitment to a “broad and balanced curriculum,” more accurately represent the various sub-disciplines in English Studies and the strengths of our own faculty, and provide students with a greater opportunity to “realize their own intellectual and creative goals.”

Revision of the undergraduate major came about in response to several factors. Primarily, the department sought to reach out beyond English and American literature as a way of incorporating the other strands of the department into the major other than through electives and as a way of interacting with changes in the profession and the department brought about by changes in the field and by the additions of new hires and potential new hires. The 12-unit “area of interest” that is central to the new major, thus, allows undergraduate students the option to focus on areas outside of literary study such as “English Language [Linguistics]” and “Creative and Professional Writing” or to focus on areas of literary study such as “English Literature,” “American Literature,” “Poetry,” “Fiction,” or “Drama.” In addition, three “areas of interest” reflect recent critical trends in English Studies such as “Race, Nation, and Ethnicity,” “Gender and Sexuality,” and “Literary Theory and Cultural Studies.” (Undergraduate Programs Committee Report)

In addition to the options provided by “Areas of Interest,” students also have 12 units of English electives. These electives provide students with a “no-fault” opportunity to explore the full range of courses offered by the English Department before selecting their “area of interest.” Furthermore, the lower division survey requirement “venture[s] beyond the traditional focus on English and American Literature” by adding a course in World Literature (primarily focused on Asian and African literature) and allowing students to choose four of the five survey courses. Interest in English 65 “World Literature” has been evident in its recent enrollment patterns; we offer one section each semester, and this year both sections filled quickly to near capacity (40 students). In our recent hiring cycle, candidates for a position in Creative Writing (Fiction) and Contemporary/Modern Literature and a position in Multi-Ethnic Literature spoke positively about the opportunities they perceived available to them in our new major.

The new major culminates in English 198T, a Senior Seminar—both a vehicle for and response to the Department’s assessment goals which will be discussed later in this study. The topics and themes vary (sample topics have included “African Fiction,” “Sex and

Death in Children's Literature," "Monstrous Britain, 1870-1914," "Nature Writing and Ecocriticism," "Consumer Culture and the Novel," and "Love, Sex, and Marriage in the Middle Ages"), providing the same range and breadth as our various "areas of interest." The primary goals and objectives of the course, however, support our mission of "develop[ing] the reading and writing skills, the interpretative abilities, and the cultural awareness of [our] students." Course requirements for the Senior Seminar also engage students in the kinds of "Information Literacy Competence" expected in the discipline and now required by the University. Currently, we are offering two sections a semester of 198T as the number of new majors has increased. This semester, these courses are over-subscribed, so next year we will be offering a third section in the spring.

The English Subject Matter Program has also responded both to internal and external needs. Typically, a third to one-half of our incoming transfer students express an interest in teaching English at the junior or senior high school level; in addition, the Department contributes multiple sections of three courses (Engl 16, Structure of English; Engl 116A, Applied Linguistics; and 116B, Children's Literature) to the Liberal Studies Program for those interested in teaching K through 6. In response to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and statewide standards, Professor Lucien Agosta drafted and the English Department submitted its revised English Subject Matter Program proposal for approval in Summer 2004. In Spring 2005, the Department received provisional approval of its new program; minor revisions were requested and are about to be submitted. While the new major provides "English Education" as an "area of interest," the new 48-unit English Subject Matter Program requirements (including an additional three unit course in Communication Studies) also provide a greater degree of flexibility with its increased number of electives.

Since the last Program Review, two new Minors (Creative Writing and TESOL) have been added to the existing Minor in English. Both were created to allow students in other majors to develop additional skills and expertise which will provide them with personal and professional opportunities beyond their majors. For example, in response to community and regional needs, as well as wider global demands, the TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) Minor effectively supplements a major in a foreign language. With expertise in both a foreign language and TESOL, students can enter professions that address either the needs of a widely multi-lingual community here in the United States or in foreign countries. The Minor in Creative Writing complements programs both in the College of Arts & Letters (particularly those in the School of the Arts) and the larger university community with its emphasis on "competence in some genre of imaginative writing," "improvement in creative writing techniques," and "increased awareness of a range of creative writing styles and models."

### **General Education:**

In addition to its own undergraduate and graduate majors, the English Department serves the entire University population with the following writing courses: Engl 1: Basic Writing Skills (pre-collegiate composition); Engl 1X and 2X (multilingual version); College Composition Bridge—small group tutorial to aid students placed in freshman

composition with slightly lower placement scores; Engl 1A and 2 (multilingual version): College Composition; Engl 20, 20M (multilingual version), and 20T (technical disciplines' version): College Composition II which fulfills a graduation writing requirement; Engl 109 and 109 M(multilingual version): Writing for Proficiency which satisfies the statewide GEAR for students who fail the Writing Proficiency Exam. The English Department also contributes to the university's freshman retention efforts by offering many of its writing courses (Engl 1 and 1A) as part of EOP and University Learning Communities. It also offers a section of Engl 21 (Freshman Seminar: GE Area E).

Furthermore, the English Department addresses the literacy needs of Sacramento State students with its administration and staffing of the university's Writing Center which serves approximately 1,100 undergraduate and graduate students per year from 40-50 different majors with one-on-one tutorials. In Fall 2003, the university and the English Department expanded its campus-wide literacy outreach efforts by institutionalizing a Writing Across the Curriculum Program and hiring a University Reading and Writing Coordinator and faculty member of the English Department, Professor Dan Melzer. Since 2003, the university WAC program which is housed in the English Department "has had a significant impact on campus-wide reading and writing and has helped to persuade faculty across the disciplines that teaching students to read and write is a campus-wide responsibility and not the sole responsibility of the Department of English." "After three years, WAC at Sacramento State is now poised to move into what Susan McCleod refers to as the 'second stage' of WAC: a mature program that has become an important part of the campus culture" (Writing Programs Report).

Finally, the English Department offers over thirty courses in Area C of General Education—some of which also fulfill either the university's Writing Intensive (previously "Advanced Study") and/or Race and Ethnicity requirements.

### **Graduate Programs:**

Despite limited resources, the English Department's graduate programs have grown since the last program review to approximately 250 students—serving the largest number of graduate students in the College of Arts & Letters. The Department offers two Masters degrees: one in English (with Concentrations in Literature, Composition & Rhetoric, and Creative Writing) and one in TESOL (a general TESOL MA and an international program in conjunction with the Peace Corp) and multiple certificate programs (TESOL; Teaching College Composition; and beginning in fall 2006, an Adult Reading Certificate in collaboration with the College of Education). The wide range and breadth of these programs prepare students effectively to respond to the changing demographic and educational needs in both domestic and international learning environments (both inside and outside traditional academic institutions) as well as life-long learning opportunities to assist our students in changing careers or to supplement their existing careers.

## **B. Effectiveness of Changes since the last Self-Study (1999-2000) and Response to Program Review Recommendations.**

In Spring 2002, the English Department responded fully to the Recommendations in its last Program Review (cf. Department minutes from February 22 and March 15, 2002; Memo from Hennelly). In September 2005, we revisited the Recommendations once more. It is imperative to note here the limitations placed on the English Department by the current statewide CSU budget crisis. The effects of that budget crisis were felt most keenly beginning in Spring 2004 when the Department was asked to make cuts in its schedule of course offerings (by approximately 50 sections) for 2004-2005, its re-assigned time units for administrative and supervisory positions, as well as to its Operating Budget (10%), and those effects continue to be felt today. Not only have these cuts not been restored, but since enrollment has suffered, not just in English but throughout the university—in part, I would argue, in direct relation to the higher fees and limited schedule of courses prompted by the budget crisis—we are in some danger of further budget constraints. Therefore, any recommendations that involved additional funding have not been met; furthermore, in a number of instances, we are actually in worse shape than we were during the last program review.

The following recommendations have been acted upon.

Recommendations to the English Department:

#1. The English Department has developed a mission statement (cf. above).

#2. The English Department has revised its Constitution and formally established term limits for the Department Chair. According to By-Law II. Section 2. “The Chair and Vice-Chair shall be allowed to succeed themselves two times, for a successive term total of nine years each.” Indeed, since the last program review, one Chair, Mark Hennelly, served two terms (with an additional semester into a third term) before FERPing, and the current Chair, Sheree Meyer, is in her first term.

#9. The Department has carefully examined its course schedule and continues to make adjustments in response to staffing, budget, and student demand. Beginning in fall 2004, we began offering more MW afternoon courses at times more popular with students than MWF offerings. Last spring (May 2005), we surveyed our students for planning purposes. While students continue to express concerns about sufficient evening courses and we continue to make every effort to offer evening sections of required courses, we have been driven by enrollment and budgetary concerns in scheduling those courses. Long-term planning, such as that recommended here, has been complicated by both budgetary and staffing issues; FERPing and retiring faculty members and demands for reducing our total course offerings (while maintaining FTES) have prompted frequent scheduling changes.

#13. The RWAC Coordinator, Professor Dan Melzer, currently provides workshops for Thesis-Writing and has also formed Thesis Writing Groups for graduate students. These activities do not carry course credit; however, students are receiving units for Engl 500. Students who are taking the Comprehensive Exam (Literature) are provided formal workshops by the Graduate Program Coordinator, as part of their enrollment in Engl 500, and informal workshops offered by English Department faculty members.

#15. “More formal career advising.” The English Department continues to address this item as well as the larger question of effective academic advising. We have surveyed our students on Career Advising, have offered programs related to Careers, continue to work on developing effective internship opportunities, etc. In response to a number of student surveys, the Department has formed an Ad Hoc Academic and Career Advising Committee.

#17. A survey of course descriptions and syllabi suggests that faculty teaching in the Graduate Program are incorporating appropriate disciplinary and sub-disciplinary theory and multicultural issues into existing Graduate courses and are proposing new courses (e.g. Post-Colonial Literature) as well. A frequent factor in new faculty hiring since the last Program Review has been the ability to contribute to this effort. A greater focus on theory, multiculturalism, globalism, and transnationalism is also evident in the new undergraduate major (Areas of Interest: “Race, Class, and Ethnicity”; “Gender & Sexuality”; and “Literary Theory and Cultural Studies”) and new courses.

#18. The Department adopted a policy to offer graduate seminars to new faculty immediately upon their joining the department. Indeed, this has been the case; for example, Engl 200A: Methods & Materials in Literary Research in which approximately 50% of the curriculum is devoted to literary theory, is now being taught by a number of new faculty members. This semester (spring 2006), our newest hire, Nancy Sweet, is teaching two graduate seminars.

#19. In addition to the initial response to remove “vestiges of sexism and racism from course names” and “offer more courses that integrate multicultural literature and mainstream literatures,” the Department has just hired two new faculty members (a third offer was rejected based on workload) for 2006-2007—one in Creative Writing (Fiction) and Modern/Contemporary Literature and the other in Multi-Ethnic Literature—who will contribute further to this process.

#20. New courses are being added in Teaching Reading, Teaching Writing with Technology, Testing and Assessment, and Teaching ESL Composition as new faculty and staffing allow. We have, for example,

added Engl 201E, have broadened the range of Engl 220C to include technology and composition, and have proposed new courses and a new Certificate in Adult Reading.

#23. Recommendation to “make an exceptionally vigorous effort” to make a “preponderance of its new hires in the next five years [come] from diverse ethnic backgrounds.” Bound as we are by Proposition 209, we have, indeed, made and continue to make such efforts. The Department Chair has attended both campus and national workshops on Diversity in the Recruiting and Retention of Faculty. As noted above in response to #19, this year we recruited for “crucial hires” in Creative Writing and Multi-Ethnic Literature. Given our commitment to this goal, we requested and received permission to hire two candidates in Multi-Ethnic Literature and made two offers. Unfortunately, one of our candidates accepted an offer elsewhere—one with a lower (2/2) workload and a higher salary. We continue in our commitment to genuine diversity and pluralism in the Department.

#24. As part of its regular Assessment Plan as well as its Self-Study, the Department has done a number of student surveys in all programs.

#25. The Department has revised its Constitution and By-Laws to reflect an accurate description of “Department Officers, Committee Assignments, and Committee duties.”

#26. The Chair provides the summary budget when it is made available.

Of the recommendations made to the English Department and higher administrative bodies, we have moved forward on those for which adequate funding and support were made available. Below is a quick summary of those for which progress has been made and on a number of situations in which the budget crisis has actually made things worse.

#B.1 and 7. The Writing Center continues to seek additional support but has not received stable additional funding since the last Program Review.

#B.2. The English Department has not been allowed an additional staff hire. Indeed, it continues to request funding to extend one of its staff from a 10 month position to a 12 month position.

#B.3. In 2004, Assigned Time units were cut for the following positions: Engl 20 does not have any assigned time and, therefore, we do not currently have a Coordinator for this large, multi-section (over 50 sections) course. We lost 3 units of assigned time for the Basic Writing Coordinator and 3 units of assigned time for the ESL Coordinator.

#B. 4. The English Department has hired three tenure-track faculty in Composition & Rhetoric (Dan Melzer, who as the RWAC Coordinator receives nine units of assigned time for those duties and can only, therefore, teach one course a semester; Fiona Glade; and Cathy Gabor.)

#B.5. Although the English Department has been promised new space as part of the “Master Plan,” no changes have been made-to-date, and it is unlikely that the goal of a 2007 move will be met. We are, therefore, still coping with two of the oldest buildings on campus—Douglass and Calaveras Halls. As for technology, the budget crisis has made it impossible to update our facilities. Many of our faculty complain about equipment in both “Smart Classrooms” and Film classrooms. Neither building has full Wireless Connectivity. We have repeated our request for a renovation of the University Writing Center in this year’s Minor Capitol Outlay Proposal (we were not funded last year).

#B.6. No additional funding has been made available for English 20.

#C.2. Upgrades were made to staff computers.

#C.3, 4 and 5; #H.1. While the English Department has been informed of a timeline for the construction (renovation of Sequoia Hall which will follow the building of a new Science Hall), the timeline is already impossible and we have not received any further revised information. Again, little to no progress has been made with the exception of some “trickle-down” equipment for TA’s and Lecturers. With the exception of some temporary office space in Sequoia, there have been no further space or equipment accommodations since the last Program Review.

#D.1. At this time, there is still no movement on hiring full-time lecturers. Indeed, recent arbitration and contract agreements have further complicated our temporary staffing.

#H.2. The good news: between 2000 and 2006, we have hired the following eleven outstanding full-time tenure-track faculty: Jason Gieger, David Toise, Dan Melzer, Wendy Matlock, Fiona Glade, Cathy Gabor, John Clark, Julian Heather, Nancy Sweet, Supriya Goswami, Brad Buchanan. Two additional hires, Peter Grandbois and Hellen Lee, have just been made for fall 2006. The bad news: we continue to lose faculty to FERP and full retirement (and a couple to better positions). For example, six full-time tenured faculty members FERPed this year, four fully retired, and one left for another position. An additional faculty member FERPed beginning fall 2006. While the English Department has been able to hire such fine new faculty members, the recruitment and retention (not-to-mention the lowered morale of stagnant salaries and high workloads) of high quality faculty is becoming increasingly difficult. We know, for

example, of a number of instances in which our first choice candidates have rejected our offers because of workload and/or salaries (especially in light of Sacramento's increasing cost-of-living and housing costs).

### **C. Major state and national trends in the discipline and Department responses.**

With a discipline or disciplines as broadly defined as those that fall under the umbrella of English Studies, as well as an arena as culturally contentious as ours, it is difficult to briefly trace state and national trends in theory, research, and pedagogy. Indeed, one need only take a glimpse at the so-called canon and theory wars (which may or may not be over), the divorces and reconciliations between Composition and Literature, and the hot debates about language and literacy to recognize the faultlines in responding to such trends. The English Department has, however, responded to certain developments in its various fields; indeed, with the dramatic turnover in faculty that has occurred in the last ten years and continues, it is inevitable that changes are taking place. Our new major has already been described above. Some of our other changes will be summarized briefly below.

**Writing Programs:** Since the late 1990's, the English Department has hired four faculty members with Ph.D.s in Composition & Rhetoric—all of whom have already made their presence felt. In response to increasing statewide pressures to “reduce” remediation despite a national trend of lower literacy rates, the English Department has further developed a small-group peer tutorial program (1X and 2X) to help students make the transition to successful college-level reading and writing. A number of faculty members have also been actively incorporating community-based or “service” learning into our composition courses. As already mentioned, the English Department is also a strong participant in Learning Communities and other Freshman Programs. Professor Dan Melzer, the RWAC Coordinator, has since 2003, developed an outstanding University Writing Across the Curriculum program—one that is on the cusp of helping the University articulate a more coherent and consistent response to our students' need to develop strong, discipline-based reading and writing skills. We have also made progress in meeting the needs of our multilingual learners with fully developed, parallel tracks at each level of development; for example, since the last Program Review, we have offered a growing number of sections of Engl 20M—our sophomore-level course for multilingual learners. The Writing Programs faculty and staff also continue to examine and revise the programs that fulfill our statewide GWAR requirements (the Writing Proficiency Exam and English 109). We have, for example, revised our Engl 109 courses so that they are portfolio-based; this allows those students who cannot succeed on a high-stakes timed test like the WPE to produce college-level writing over time and hence fulfill the criteria of the GWAR.

At the graduate level, the Writing Programs Committee has reviewed and revised the requirements for the Teaching of Composition Certificate and the Concentration in Composition & Rhetoric (which has replaced the Concentration in Pedagogy). These programmatic revisions and new courses (220D, Research in the Teaching of Composition, and 220R, Topics in Rhetoric, as well as a course change in 220C so that the faculty can rotate various topics, including, for example, Technology and Composition) reflect the latest theory and pedagogy and broaden both the experiential and curricular offerings to more fully address the needs of our graduates who continue to teach high school, those who go on to teach at the community college, and those who may go on to Ph.D. programs in Composition & Rhetoric.

**Literature Program (undergraduate and graduate):** As suggested above, one of the major trends in literature curriculum and pedagogy relates to contesting earlier borders and limits placed on the curriculum, as well as a coverage model that precluded certain kinds of process pedagogies. The English Department continues to push the borders in a number of ways. Here, as in the case of Writing Programs, the influx of new faculty has made a profound difference. New courses proposed and taught over the last five years include but are not limited to: a lower division survey in World Literature, Post-Colonial Literature, Jewish-American Literature, Modern Indian Literature, a Senior Seminar in African literature and Romance literature. In more “traditional” courses that typically have privileged “masterpieces” and “classics,” such as surveys and upper division period courses in British and American literature, canonical works are placed in dialogue with non-canonical—and these discussions are framed by questions of race, gender, sexuality, class, and ethnicity. The disciplinary trend towards Cultural Studies and a deeper historical contextualization of literature can be seen in our syllabi where one notes a greater range in the kinds of texts studied (including visual texts, theoretical and “non-literary” texts). Such trends reflect the discipline’s effort to avoid “deracination”—the presentation of texts as artifacts, torn from the cultures that produced them (Guillory). On the other hand, despite the anxiety voiced throughout the discipline that such study comes at the expense of “close reading” or textual analysis, courses offered by the English Department do not seem caught up in such an opposition. Learning objectives include both the application of various theoretical approaches and the appreciation of various aesthetic forms. The new major also is less likely to privilege certain kinds of literature over others by providing the students with a less-prescribed and more flexible program with fewer common requirements. A quick review of literature syllabi also suggests a broad range of pedagogies—with a variety of active learning strategies such as individual and small group presentations, formative writing assignments (journals, response papers, thought-questions, study questions), and student-led discussions.

**Creative Writing:** As with literature, Creative Writing programs are pushing their own boundaries—particularly those of genre—beyond the typical “fiction,” “poetry,” and “drama.” In particular, there has been a movement towards

developing more courses in creative non-fiction. The English Department has responded to this movement by proposing new courses (Theorizing Memoir) and recently hiring a faculty member with a secondary area of expertise in creative non-fiction. “Theorizing Memoir” also implies a hybrid between theory and creative writing which is explored in a number of our creative writing courses. A new “paired course” 130/230D in Meter & Rhythm also pushes at the boundary of creative writing and literature—providing students with the knowledge about poetic forms that can inform both their own creative writing as well as their interpretive analysis. Faculty in Creative Writing courses seek to balance workshop with analytical work—the production of texts with active reading of texts. Our Creative Writing faculty members are also exploring opportunities for more interdisciplinary creative projects such as a poetry/music performance project assigned last year. Last, but not least, the Creative Writing faculty continues to develop extra-curricular outlets for publication and performance, as well as for visiting writers. Currently, they are exploring options for an on-line literary journal to provide a broader audience than the current *Calaveras Station Journal* which is struggling to maintain its quality in light of weaker financial support.

**TESOL:** TESOL faculty members who teach undergraduate courses in applied linguistics for English Education programs, our undergraduate major program and a new minor, as well as our TESOL Certificates, also have developed a vital and growing MA program that addresses the needs of local, state, national and international trends in language acquisition and teaching. The discipline’s focus, for example, on assessment has prompted a new graduate course on curriculum and assessment, while the demands of growing multilingual populations in K-12 education has prompted the offering of a new undergraduate course in academic reading and writing for ESL learners. The current TESOL Coordinator, Julian Heather, along with colleagues in Composition & Rhetoric and the College of Education have also addressed a particular demand for reading instructors at the community college with their development of a Certificate program in Adult Reading. Given the global nature of their field, faculty members in this program continue to explore international collaborations, too—both for themselves and for their students.

**Technology:** Across the curriculum of the English Department, there has been an increased effort to incorporate appropriate technology in the teaching of our disciplines; yet, the lack of equipment budgets in the last couple of years has affected that effort. A number of our faculty have participated each year in the University’s “Teaching Using Technology” workshops; these summer workshops are focused on projects for incorporating interactive technology into particular courses. The Department has also offered workshops to help its faculty adopt and adapt technology to their needs and the needs of their students. Although we are limited by the number of “smart” classrooms available to us and two buildings that currently lack wireless connectivity, more and more professors are using WebCT or Locus, or other forms of interactive technologies to engage with their

students in highly productive ways—both inside and outside the classroom. Faculty members and students are also using power-point in class. We also offer a number of Web-assisted courses in linguistics and composition. The English Department's student assistants also now provide "scanning" services, in addition to photocopying, which allow faculty to distribute texts electronically in PDF or other electronic forms.

In addition to classroom use of technology, the English Department has developed its website to provide a greater range of resources to its students. Course Description booklets are now provided online each semester, and we are beginning to post syllabi as well. Furthermore, in Spring 2004, we began an English Department moderated List-Serve for students. We now have approximately 700 subscribers and distribute weekly calendars, advising and enrollment updates, work and scholarship opportunity announcements, etc. Students are encouraged to post their own questions, announcements, and appropriate concerns. For example, last year, a number of students used the List to form student writing groups. In our latest student surveys, a number of students specifically praised the improved communication offered by the List. The English Department's Teaching Associates also now have a common website to foster curricular collaboration and coherence in English 1A.

**II. Academic Programs:** In his "Afterward" to *The Relevance of English: Teaching that matters in students' lives* (NCTE 2002), Richard M. Ohmann summarizes the concerns that sometimes set up seemingly conflicting goals and outcomes for English Studies.

"Now, many of these writers [in this collection] acknowledge the importance to their students of knowledge and skills that will translate into decent jobs, and some writers locate relevance squarely in that sort of economic credentialing. But almost all want something less immediately practical for their students, too. One cluster of goals includes creativity, pleasure in language, the ability to go on learning, conscious production of culture, human growth, purpose in life, self-understanding, validation of the self, or a new and fuller self—in short, versions of personal fulfillment. Another cluster of goals includes effective social agency, active citizenship, democratic collaboration, critical or subversive awareness, radical utopian hope. The two clusters are compatible. . ." (417)

According to Ohmann, many English Studies teacher-scholars are concerned about the fulfillment of such goals "because powerful agents and forces outside of education are trying to set terms of relevance that are at odds with what committed professionals think is most needed for their students" (417).

And lastly, Ohmann acknowledges the difficulty students, such as those as Sacramento State, might have with the goals and objectives of an English Department: "Understandably, many students—especially those trying to

hoist themselves out of poverty—have a hard time looking beyond what the economy ‘wants’ to other ideals for their education. Against their economically driven idea of relevance, the humane ideals of many who work in English studies may seem a distraction or worse. On the other hand, the essays in this collection offer abundant evidence of students who yearn to read and write about what is important, in some less instrumental way, who would like richer lives and even a more democratic society in which to live those lives. I take it as a good sign for our disorganized profession that many of its practitioners want the same things” (418).

The Academic Programs—those that serve its own graduate and undergraduate majors as well as those that serve the University—offered by the English Department reflect learning expectations and goals that cover all three “clusters” identified by Ohmann: the economic or practical, personal fulfillment, and democratic participation.

### **A. Learning Expectations**

1. **Specify Expectations:** In our Assessment Plan of Spring, 2000, the English Department articulated a broad range of fourteen goals and subsequent Learning Expectations (cf. Appendix). As we note in that document, “we fully acknowledge that it is impossible to measure and assess all of these goals. Nonetheless, we state them here because we believe it is important to convey a full account of our expectations for our students and ourselves.”

**The Discipline:** English Department goals and student expectations range across the discipline(s) of English Studies and include knowledge of literature, theory, grammar/language; understanding of cultural diversity; a lifelong appreciation for reading and literature; skills in self-reflection/self-understanding and informed judgment; competence in some genre of imaginative writing and the forms and techniques of that genre; pedagogical approaches to literature, language, and writing and the theories that underlie those approaches.

**Writing and Reading in the Major: Goal #4:** The CSUS English major will be expected to read literature critically with appropriate interpretive skills. **Goal #5:** The CSUS English major is expected to produce advanced level expository prose. **Goal #7:** The CSUS English major is expected to use critical thinking and problem-solving in reading and writing. We should note, furthermore, that many courses in the major require “Writing-to-Learn” activities that create an effective dialectic between reading and writing. The Writing

Standards and Criteria are distributed each semester throughout our curriculum and are available on-line.

## English Department Writing Standards

The English Department has established a number of goals and expectations for student writing, whereby students will be able to enter the discourse community of literary analysis by

- analyzing, interpreting, and critiquing literary texts clearly, employing a range of reading strategies;
- writing interactive responses to literary texts and engaging in different kinds of literary analysis;
- demonstrating the ability to use writing for a variety of purposes, including exploring one's thinking, expressing one's original thoughts, and explaining what one understands about a variety of written texts;
- addressing assignments with a focused controlling idea, a sense of purpose, and audience awareness;
- demonstrating coherent and rhetorically sophisticated organization and sustaining an argument of some length and complexity;
- providing clear generalizations with specific textual support and analysis, citing and analyzing relevant sources;
- demonstrating consistent control of grammar, sentence variety, and diction and the ability to analyze and articulate the sentence-level grammatical structures contained in their own and others' writing.

### **A EXCELLENT**--a paper in this category

Addresses assignment thoughtfully, setting a challenging task.  
Demonstrates critical reading and clear analysis, interpretation, and/or critique of literary texts. Establishes a clearly focused controlling idea.  
Displays awareness of and a sense of purpose in communicating to an audience.  
Demonstrates coherent, sophisticated organization; makes effective connections between ideas.  
Provides compelling support for and cogent analysis of generalizations.  
Cites relevant sources and effectively integrates them into text where appropriate.  
Displays superior control of syntax, sentence variety, diction, and conventions of Standard English.

### **B STRONG**--a paper in this category

Addresses assignment clearly, setting a meaningful task.  
Demonstrates critical reading and clear analysis, interpretation, and/or critique of literary texts.  
Establishes a clearly focused controlling idea.  
Addresses audience needs and expectations.  
Demonstrates clear and coherent organization.  
Provides clear generalizations and effective support and analysis.  
Cites relevant sources, effectively integrating them into text when appropriate.  
Shows consistent control of syntax, sentence variety, diction, and conventions of Standard English.

### **C ADEQUATE**--a paper in this category

Addresses the assignment with some analysis.  
Demonstrates close reading and some analysis of literary texts.  
Establishes a controlling idea.  
Demonstrates adequate organization.

Provides support for and some analysis of generalizations.  
Cites appropriate sources, adequately integrating them into text.  
Displays adequate control of syntax, sentence variety, diction and conventions of Standard English; errors do not slow the reader, impede understanding, or seriously undermine authority of the writer.

**D SERIOUSLY FLAWED**--a paper in this category

Addresses the assignment inadequately.  
Shows insufficient close reading and/or a lack of analysis of the literary text.  
Shows insufficient audience awareness.  
Strays from the controlling idea, or the idea is unclear.  
Displays formulaic, random, or confusing organization.  
Lacks generalizations, or provides generalizations with inadequate support or analysis.  
Fails to cite sources or cites and/or integrates them inappropriately.  
Shows deficient control of syntax, diction, and conventions of Standard English; errors impede understanding.

**F FUNDAMENTALLY DEFICIENT**--a paper in this category

Fails to address assignment.  
Shows inadequate close reading and/or analysis of literary text.  
Demonstrates a lack of audience awareness.  
Lacks a controlling idea.  
Lacks organization or organizes illogically.  
Displays inability to generalize, analyze, or support ideas.  
Fails to use outside sources or misuses the texts of others.  
Shows inadequate control of syntax, word choice, and conventions of Standard English.

**Computer/Information Competence: Goal #6**—CSUS English majors are expected to learn competence in computer skills related to research technology.

While all five of the learning goals for the “Information Competence Graduation Requirement” are infused throughout our curriculum—primarily as they contribute to our primary mission which “is to promote learning in composition, creative writing, English Education, linguistics, literature, and the teaching of English as a second language”—these specific competencies are taught in the required course, English 120A, Advanced Composition, and are further reinforced and assessed in another required course, English 198T, Senior Seminar. Indeed, these two courses are the foundation for the English Department’s Assessment Plan.

**Engl 120A** Course Description and Learning Outcomes

A workshop in academic writing for students who have completed the lower division writing requirement.

- Students will engage in extensive research projects focused on academic inquiry: they will evaluate, analyze, and interpret a variety of primary and secondary sources in order to enter into scholarly conversations; learn how to integrate

- primary and secondary sources into their texts; and practice a variety of research methods and rhetorical strategies.
- Students will read, analyze, and interpret a range of challenging and complex texts, which will include print, visual, electronic, and spoken discourse.
  - Students will be challenged to move beyond formulaic writing and practice the rhetorical strategies appropriate to a course in advanced composition: writing for a variety of audiences, a variety of purposes, and a variety of genres, which may include both print and electronic forms of discourse.
  - Students will engage in a writing process which will include extensive revision and feedback from both peers and instructors during the writing process.
  - Student writing will be the focus of the course: students will reflect on their own writing process and gain an awareness of themselves as writers and researchers.

### **Engl 198T** Course Description and Learning Outcomes

Features specialized topics taught by a variety of instructors depending upon the semester. . . . Tend to the production of a significant research paper, a paper that will emphasize the student's ability to: analyze and interpret multiple texts; integrate primary and secondary sources; construct a sustained, coherent, and rhetorically sophisticated piece of writing.

The five "skills" covered by the Information Competency Resolution:

- Determine the extent of the information needed.
- Access needed information effectively and efficiently.
- Evaluate information and its sources critically and use appropriately and effectively.
- Use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.
- Understand the issues associated with legal and ethical access to and use of information.

All five of these are explicitly addressed, taught, and assessed in English 120A, as the learning objectives make evident. Furthermore, these competencies are reinforced and assessed (both for the students and the department) in 198T. It should also be noted that MLA citation and issues of plagiarism are addressed throughout the curriculum; professors frequently "recommend" a handbook for Citation and Research style and/or give students direct instruction in handouts they provide.

Research Paper assignments such as those attached are done in such a way as to emphasize process: researching, drafting, revision, etc. Frequently, oral research presentations and/or annotated bibliographies are also required.

Both the CSUS English Department Writing Assessment Scoring Rubric (used to evaluate essays from 120A and 198T as part of our Assessment Plan) and our Advisory Standards for Writing in the Undergraduate Major (distributed and used in all English courses) include a measure for "integration of texts" and/or "Cites relevant sources and evaluates their validity, effectively integrating them into text when appropriate."

**Curriculum Structure:** At both the undergraduate and graduate levels, our curriculum is structured to reflect the range of expectations for all students and to allow for areas of specialization. The 45-unit new undergraduate major (2004) provides a strong lower division foundation (12 units) in the literatures of England, the United States, and of the World in English with its requirement of four out of five surveys of Literature (40A, 40B, 50A, 50B, and 65). Its upper division requirements (9 units) include: English 120A (Advanced Composition; prerequisite GWAR requirement) which reaffirms Goal #5: The CSUS English major is expected to produce advanced level expository prose; English 145B or C (Shakespeare’s Early or Later Plays); and English 198T, Senior Seminar (prerequisite: Engl 120A), which is taken as a “culminating experience” in which the student pursues an independent research project that can be assessed by the department to affirm that its goals and expectations are being met. These seminars vary by topics that also provide a range similar to our “Areas of Interest.”

By taking elective courses (12 units), the students can find their “Area of Interest” (12 units). The choice of electives and Area of Interest provide students with the opportunity on the one hand, to specialize in a chosen sub-field or discipline, and the other hand, to explore the widest range of courses in the larger discipline of English Studies.

## Roadmap for the Sequence of Courses in the English Major 2004-2006

### Freshmen: Semester 1 Semester 2

English 1A;  
Possible: 1 survey

another survey, or 2 surveys:  
(recommended choices: 40A, 50A, 65)  
Possible: lower division course in  
Concentration (Creative Writing,  
English Language), or as elective

### Sophomores: Semester 3 Semester 4

Complete survey courses  
Begin Concentration,  
especially lower division courses

Complete survey courses  
Take Writing Proficiency Exam

### Juniors: Semester 5 Semester 6

Take WPE (transfer students)  
Or English 120A

Take 120 A as soon as qualified  
Continue Concentration and



Furthermore, Certificates in TESOL or Teaching Composition can supplement other areas and enhance our students' employment options. For example, students in Creative Writing or Literature often take the Certificate in Teaching College Composition which is recognized by Community College Deans as adequate preparation for teaching at the community college. A new Certificate in Adult Reading will supply training that fulfills the Community College separate requirements for Reading Instructors.

- B. Teaching Strategies:** Generally speaking, courses in the English Department usually involve some form of lecture-discussion or workshop-discussion as primary delivery mode; indeed, it is not unusual to note the modifier, “active” defining discussion. One of the most obvious teaching strategies throughout our curriculum includes a variety of “Writing-to-Learn” activities. Our course description booklets and syllabi reflect such assignments that include journals, response papers, thought questions, study questions, etc.; some of these are technologically delivered—e.g. web postings. Some of these informal writing assignments then inform assigned essays and papers. Quite a few of our faculty also assign oral presentations and/or small group activities to further engage students in active learning. Shakespeare courses often require performance projects. Pedagogy courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels frequently require teaching projects and/or portfolios, and may include some type of experiential learning (e.g. tutoring, case studies, teaching demonstrations, etc.). All Composition and Creative Writing courses, as well as many Literature courses, engage students in the full process of writing instruction, including peer review and revision. (Course Syllabi provided in appendix)
- C. Distance & Distributed Education:** minimal. We do offer a couple of Web-Based courses in linguistics and the English Department offers other “Web-Assisted” courses whereby the technology supplements classroom time.
- D. Programs' Assessment Plan:** In Spring, 2000, the English Department submitted an Assessment Plan that included the following:
- Program Goals and Teaching Values
  - An Entry Level Questionnaire
  - An Exit Survey for Graduating Seniors
  - An Alumni Survey
  - The Senior Outcomes Assessment based upon the Senior Seminar
  - Description of the English Major
  - Assessment Plan Grid

Annual Assessment reports for the Department of English have included results of the various surveys as well as the Senior Outcomes Assessment. In the 2000-2001 Assessment Progress Report, responsibility for the Senior Outcomes

Assessment was given to the Undergraduate Programs Committee. In Spring, 2004 the English Department passed the following revisions to our Senior Seminar Assessment Program: 1) collecting essays from Engl 120A to broaden the base for assessment; 2) making the Ad Hoc Subcommittee a permanent Standing Committee; 3) creating a two-semester assessment process; and 4) revising the rubric for assessing both 120A and 198T essays to more accurately reflect our Writing Assessment Outcomes.

Below is the most recent Assessment Committee report (presented to the English Department on April 13, 2006). The Assessment Committee will be hosting a mini-conference for instructors of 120A and 198T to continue their work.

### Background

In 2005/2006, the Writing Assessment Committee scored essays from 198T: Senior Seminar and 120A: Advanced Composition, using a rubric based on the English Department Writing Standards. The purpose was to focus on the two courses required of all English majors in order to get a sense of our students' writing abilities, with the goal that what we found could help inform the way we teach. The Committee collected 28 essays from ENGL 198T courses in the Spring of 2005 and scored 18 of them in the Fall of 2005. We collected 44 essays from 120A courses in the Fall of 2005 and scored 16 of them in the Spring of 2006. We collected the final essays from each course, all of which required a research component and an analytical approach. Each essay was scored by two readers.

#### Quantitative Results of the 120A Scoring for Fall 2005/Spring 2006

	4	3	2	1
<b>Purpose and Audience</b>	2 essays	9 essays	4 essays	1 essay
<b>Organization and Coherence</b>	2 essays	6 essays	7 essays	1 essay
<b>Analysis and Support</b>	2 essays	7 essays	6 essays	1 essay
<b>Integration of Texts</b>	1 essay	8 essays	6 essays	1 essay
<b>Grammar, Mechanics, and Syntax</b>	2 essays	7 essays	6 essays	1 essay

#### Quantitative Results of the 198T Scoring for Fall 2005/Spring 2006

	4	3	2	1
<b>Purpose and Audience</b>	6 essays	3 essays	6 essays	3 essays
<b>Organization and Coherence</b>	5 essays	5 essays	5 essays	3 essay
<b>Analysis and Support</b>	5 essays	6 essays	5 essays	2 essay

<b>Integration of Texts</b>	4 essays	5 essays	9 essays	
<b>Grammar, Mechanics, and Syntax</b>	4 essays	13 essays	1 essays	

**Conclusions:**

The quantitative results reveal that the bulk of students were in the 2/3 range; a similar distribution found in previous writing assessments. The Committee discussed a number of trends found in the assessment:

- Most students were skilled at close readings of primary texts.
- Most students were adept at the sentence level: grammar and syntax tended to only be a “problem” when students were challenging themselves to take on complex ideas and patterns of organization.
- Students had difficulty organizing, sustaining, and supporting complex arguments.
- Students were able to include information from outside sources and cite correctly, but struggled to truly synthesize outside sources—students had difficulty entering the interpretative community and thinking critically about their outside sources.

**Recommendations**

This year the committee has a number of suggestions for “closing the assessment loop” and using what we found in assessment to improve the curriculum and help us as teachers:

- Organize a meeting of past and present 198T instructors to create a list of learning outcomes, similar to the meeting of 120A instructors last year.
- Create a portfolio exit assessment for 198T and 120A scored by 198T and 120A instructors.
- Organize a follow-up meeting of 120A instructors to get feedback on the assessment rubric and discuss the possible creation of a rubric for 120A.
- Collect outstanding essays from 198T and 120A and make them available to students and faculty.
- Organize an English Department mini-conference where students from 198T, 120A, and other upper division courses can present their scholarship to peers, faculty, and family members. This would provide an audience beyond the instructor and further motivation to write, as well as valuable experience presenting research.

- Create website resource pages for 198T and 120A. These pages could include resources for both students and instructors. Student resources might include example essays, advice from former students, advice on the writing and researching process, etc. Instructor resources might include a databank of activities and assignments, resources for teaching citation and source integration, learning outcome statements, rubrics, etc. Student resources could also be made available in hard copy through PDF files or through a custom-published booklet.

#### **E. Effectiveness:**

Our BA and MA Programs have been quite effective in preparing students to go on for further study in English, Composition & Rhetoric, and Applied Linguistics. In the last few years, we have placed students in MA and Ph.D. programs at UC Davis, UC Irvine, UC Riverside, UC San Diego, University of Nevada, Reno, Lehigh University, U of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, U of Arizona, Arizona State, New Mexico State, Syracuse U, U of Pennsylvania, and Purdue University to name just a few highly ranked programs. Many of those students have continued to correspond with their professors at Sacramento State and comment on how well-prepared they were by the programs here at Sac State:

“Good thing the 100+ pages of reading I have for the TA class each week is mostly stuff I read in Engl 220A [at Sac State], so I can skim it.”

“I just finished my first semester of coursework at the University of Arizona. It was a tough semester, but I’m happy to say that my work at Sac State prepared me well for the Rhet/Comp program here. In fact, now that I’ve witnessed the good, the bad, and the ugly of the Research I University, first hand, I appreciate my experience at Sac State even more. Without my graduate work at Sac State, I would have been pretty lost!”

“I am now at the end of my second week of classes in the MA program at UC San Diego. . . .At first I was a little intimidated by the fact that many of my fellow first year grads are from big-name and ivy league schools. . . .On another note, I am also one of the only students who had professors that actually took part in my education. . . .I hope that when you speak to students about graduate school you will relay some of these ideas to them. And also tell them that coming from Sac State, at least in my experience, was not a set back at all. In fact, it gave me a much richer experience and built my confidence in ways that wouldn’t have been possible if I had been at a UC.”

Our Graduating Senior Surveys have been quite consistent in their representation of student perceptions of their achievement of department goals and expectations. Below is a quick summary of the Spring 2005 and Fall 2005 surveys which also appear consistent with our Alumni Survey.

1. Improvement in Writing Skills: 87% of our seniors rated themselves as “very satisfied” or “satisfied.” On a scale of 1-5 with 4 and 5 standing for Satisfied and Very Satisfied, respectively, the alumni average for this question was 4.19.
  2. Improvement in Critical Thinking Skills: In Fall 2005, we added this question and 93% of our seniors rated themselves as “very satisfied” or “satisfied.” On a scale of 1-5 with 4 and 5 standing for Satisfied and Very Satisfied, respectively, the alumni average for this question was 4.37.
  3. Understanding of one or more literary genres: 89% of our seniors were either “very satisfied” or “satisfied.” On a scale of 1-5 with 4 and 5 standing for Satisfied and Very Satisfied, respectively, the alumni average for this question was 4.40.
  4. Improvement in literary analysis: 91% of our seniors were either “very satisfied” or “satisfied.” On a scale of 1-5 with 4 and 5 standing for Satisfied and Very Satisfied, respectively, the alumni average for this question was 4.32.
  5. Continuing Appreciation of literature and the arts: Over 96% of our seniors were either “very satisfied” or “satisfied.” On a scale of 1-5 with 4 and 5 standing for Satisfied and Very Satisfied, respectively, the alumni average for this question was 4.67.
- F. Consistency in multiple sections:** Various department curriculum committees oversee multiple section courses. The British, American, World Literature, and Shakespeare courses fall under the purview of the Undergraduate Program Committee. Many of the 110 and 116 courses are supervised by either the TESOL Committee and/or the English Education Committee. Course Description booklets and the collection of syllabi also contribute to the consistency of multiple section courses. It should be noted that supervision, faculty development, and coordination of multiple section programs has been limited by the elimination of assigned time units for some of these positions.
- G. Changes Needed:** Any changes to the curriculum and or administration of programs depend, in part, on three crucial interrelated factors: hiring, faculty workload, and space/technology improvements. Obviously, all of these respond in some way to the budget constraints we face.

The English Department recently looked into the option of changing its course units from 3 to 4 units to reduce faculty workload from four to three courses and in recognition of the amount of writing and reading instruction required in the majority of our courses. The reduction in courses would open up opportunities for further faculty service, research, and creative activities. After extensive research of programs in the CSU system and elsewhere that have recently made the change from 3-4 unit courses, the Ad hoc Committee on Workload found that since so many of our courses are GE courses (approximately 27 in Area C, as well as all of the composition courses in Area

A and other graduation requirements), the English Department could not make this transition unilaterally.

Each Program Coordinator has articulated a number of “challenges,” “future plans,” and “needs” (cf. Program Reports: Appendix). Below are a few of the curricular recommendations:

**Writing Programs:**

- Develop more undergraduate courses in writing for a Composition emphasis in the new major and possibly a new writing minor.
- Develop more technology-embedded courses.
- The 1X/2X program is poised to grow—consider restructuring remedial program to replace Engl 1 with either a “stretch,” two-semester Engl 1A program and/or an expanded 1X/1A program.

**TESOL:**

- Expand the range and number of pedagogy-related courses.
- Review and revise the Certificate Option A with the goal of replacing graduate courses with undergraduate alternatives.
- Increase international program outreach and collaboration.
- Implementation of Certificate in Adult Reading.

**Creative Writing:**

- Provide greater support for and dissemination of *Calaveras Station Journal*.
- Develop an internship (195/410) in Creative Writing for Publication & Performance.
- Expand range of course offerings at both the undergraduate and graduate levels with “Topics” and genre courses that respond more effectively to faculty expertise, curricular needs, developing national trends and student interests.

**Literature:**

- At both the undergraduate and graduate levels, new and continuing faculty will continue to effect change in curriculum in response to faculty expertise, curricular needs, developing national trends and student interests. Given the “new” major, some of these courses will respond to “Areas of Interest” that are now attracting a greater number of students. At the graduate level, there is a need

for a greater number and variety of graduate seminars in Literature.

- At both levels, the curriculum needs to be more flexible, prompting the development of rotating “Topics” courses.

#### **English Education:**

- Implementation of New Subject Matter Program will require curricular adjustments.
- The development of new electives including courses in reading, multi-ethnic young adult literature, etc.
- Both Liberal Studies courses and SMP courses are endangered by a current lack of full-time faculty. Hiring in this area is critical.

#### **Certificate Programs:**

- For our Certificate Programs in TESOL, Teaching Composition, and Adult Reading, we need to explore alternative admissions processes separate from Graduate Admissions.

H. **GE and/or Service:** All Area A courses (Engl 1A and 1C) were assessed in Fall, 2004. All Area C courses (approximately 27) will be assessed in Fall, 2006. We are currently working on our assessment plans and syllabi for Area C.

All Composition courses (Engl 1, Engl 1A, Engl 20, Engl 109) fall under the purview of the department’s Writing Programs Committee and the Writing Programs Coordinator. In coordination with the University’s Reading & Writing Across the Curriculum Committee, other GE committees, and the Faculty Senate, the English Department consistently monitors the effectiveness of all of its writing courses.

The English Department is also responsible for monitoring students subject to EO665 and continues to carefully address the “remedial” needs of the University’s students. We have, for example, recently (2004-2005) adjusted our placement based on EPT scores so that more students go directly into Engl 1A; some that would have had to do a semester in Engl 1 and then a second semester in English 1A can now do Engl 1A or English 2 with an additional small group tutorial, Engl 1X/2X. Preliminary assessment shows that this has been a very effective way of providing sufficient support for these students, reducing the onus of “remediation,” and decreasing their time to degree completion.

Furthermore, the English Department addresses the needs of the multilingual population in our writing programs with parallel tracks in College Composition I (Engl 1A/Engl 2), College Composition II (Engl 20/20M) and Writing for Proficiency (Engl 109W/109M).

In Fall, 2005 the English Department offered its first section of Engl 021 (Freshman Seminar) in GE Area E.

Our other “service” area is the Liberal Studies Program (K-6). Typically, the English Department offers 6-7 sections of Engl 116A and 6-7 sections of 116B per semester. Some of these sections are set aside for the Liberal Studies cohort program. Our English Education Committee, in consultation with Liberal Studies, oversees these courses. Typically, at least one of our faculty members serves as a Liberal Studies Adviser.

We also offer a number of film courses (Engl 191 and 197) that contribute to the Film Studies program (minor and anticipated major).

## **I. How the Department**

1. **Addresses cultural diversity:** Given the English Department’s primary mission and the various fields that comprise English Studies (composition & rhetoric, linguistics, literature, creative writing, etc.), as well as some of the emerging theoretical and research work done in these fields, it should not be surprising that cultural diversity is addressed in many different ways. On the one hand, even those literature courses that appear most “canonical” are committed to interrogating the cultural differences that comprise our literary identities, e.g. “We will inquire along several broad themes in American literature, including the European encounter with peoples of different ethnicities, the experience of beginning anew, and the establishment of a national identity and literature” (Engl 50B Course Description). On the other hand, certain courses like those in the 180 series foreground such issues. In linguistics, the same holds true in that all courses in the 110 series, for example, situate language in the social and cultural contexts in which it is used; in certain courses, such as 110P 2<sup>nd</sup> Language Learning & Teaching and 110Q English Grammar-ESL Teachers, issues such as “the specific policies impacting linguistic minorities and their teachers in California” (Engl 110P Course Description) are discussed more directly. Courses geared towards future teachers are particularly sensitive to cultural diversity: in English 116B Children’s Literary Classics, for example, “these texts will be considered

from historical, cultural, generic, and theoretical perspectives, with special emphasis on issues of gender, race, class and nation” (Engl 116B Course Description).

The 2004 revision of the major responds to both the cultural diversity of our fields and our students by encouraging students to declare “areas of interest” such as “Race, Nation, and Ethnicity,” “Gender and Sexuality,” and “Literary Theory and Cultural Studies.” The removal of upper division requirements in the British and American Literature series also allows students to more fully explore the full diversity of our course offerings.

Furthermore, our most recent hires in Multi-Ethnic Literature and Creative Writing both bring areas of expertise to the department that will contribute to this goal. While we had hoped to hire an additional faculty member in Multi-Ethnic Literature this year but were unsuccessful, we will continue to pursue this additional line. The English Department recognizes that curricular diversity is a key to both student and faculty diversity.

2. **Accommodates differences in student preparation:** While the English Department accommodates differences in student preparation in all of its courses by providing a wide variety of teaching strategies and assessment techniques, we are most directly involved in assessing and responding to differences in student preparation in our Writing Programs. For example, in the last few years, both in English 1 and English 109, there has been an increased emphasis on portfolio assessment of student proficiency. In English 109 now, students can even turn in their portfolios twice—and either pass the first time, or receive additional feedback that permits them to revise and resubmit. As mentioned earlier, the English 1A/1X combination also meets the needs of students who previously would have had to enroll in two full semesters (one pre-baccalaureate course and then, College Composition). All students across the university also have access to the University Writing Center where tutors are trained to accommodate differences in student preparation.
3. **Helps students gain an effective knowledge of how to live and work in our diverse society.** Again, as stated above, the English Department pursues this goal through its curriculum and content areas. Indeed, such an

objective is quite common from the Freshman Level (cf. course objectives for Engl 021) on up. Internships and service/collaborative community learning projects also directly provide opportunities for such experiences.

**J. Minors, Concentrations, and Certificates:**

1. **Minor in English:** This minor (21 units) provides much of the flexibility of the major with only three required courses (40A, 50A, and 145B or C).
2. **Minor in Creative Writing:** As of the 2004-2006 catalog, this new minor (18 units) provides students in other majors the opportunity to focus on honing creative writing skills. The foundation for the minor is Engl 30A, Introduction to Creative Writing, which provides practice in the major genres of writing, and then either 30B, Introduction to Writing Fiction, or 30C, Introduction to Poetry Writing which allows students to concentrate on the genre of their choice. This minor is attractive to students who are more interested in our Creative Writing courses than in the literature courses that are the foundation of the regular minor in English.
3. **Minor in TESOL:** As of the 2004-2006 catalog, we also provide a new minor in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages). This minor requires 18 units primarily from the Department's applied linguistic courses that provide a theoretical and pedagogical foundation for teaching. It was conceived as complementary, for example, to a major in a foreign language and would provide the basis for either teaching overseas or multilingual students in the United States.
4. **MA Concentrations in English.** For Program Descriptions, please see Appendix.
  - a. Literature
  - b. **Composition & Rhetoric:** Since the last Program Review, the English Department has eliminated the Concentration in Pedagogy and focused the curriculum of this concentration more fully on Composition & Rhetoric (in keeping with the demands of community college hiring and Ph.D. programs in Composition & Rhetoric). This Concentration now culminates in a thesis. Curricular revision (made possible, in part, with the hiring of additional faculty in Composition & Rhetoric) includes broadening the scope of Engl 220C, Topics in Composition Studies, to allow for the inclusion of courses such as Composition and Technology, Writing Across the Curriculum, etc.

We have also added Engl 220R: Topics in Rhetorical Theory and Practice and 220D Teaching and Research in Composition.

- c. Creative Writing
- 5. **Certificates (TESOL, Teaching Composition, and Teaching Reading to Adults):** “These are designed for individuals who seek formal recognition for completing an organized, integrated, specialized program of study. Upon successful completion of the designated course of study, a certificate is awarded.” All three of these Certificate Programs supplement an already existing M.A. or our own programs and extend the employment options for those individuals—particularly in teaching at the community college. For full descriptions, see Appendix.

The Department would like to enhance enrollments in these programs without sacrificing our higher priority graduate programs; furthermore, we would like to enable students who already have their M.A. to enroll in these certificate programs. To do so, however, we need to be able to change the current admission policy/process. At this time, the only way to enroll in these programs is by either applying for admission to one of our MA programs or for “Unclassified” status in the Graduate School. The former precludes those students who already have M.A.’s or who might not be eligible for our M.A. programs from enrolling; the latter limits students to one year of study before matriculating into an M.A. program and gives students lowest enrollment priorities.

- a. **TESOL Certificate** (Options A: Undergraduate & B: Graduate)
- b. **Teaching Composition**
- c. **Teaching Reading to Adults: New Program** (beginning in Fall 2006). The Certificate in Teaching Reading to Adults will provide professional preparation and training in the theory and practice of teaching reading to adults. A combination of coursework in reading theory and pedagogy with teaching and/or tutoring experience provides the competencies and skills necessary to teach reading to adults. The program will meet a currently unmet need for adequate preparation to teach in adult contexts. It is a collaboration between faculty in the College of Education and the

College of Arts & Letters, especially between the three units who will staff courses in the program: the English Department, the Department of Teacher Education, and the Learning Skills Center. Program Requirements include: Engl 215A Reading/Vocabulary Acquisition (existing course); Engl 410L Internship in Teaching Adult Reading (new course); EDTE 207 Advanced Practicum in Reading Difficulties (existing course); Engl 225C Theoretical Issues in Adult Literacies (new course) and EDTE 205 Psychology and Sociology of Literacy Instruction (existing course).

### III. Students

**A. Student Profile:** “Disaggregated to reveal the history of degree awards to women, the data collected over the past four decades suggest how little the declines in the number and share of college graduates majoring in English resulted from developments internal to the field and how much they resulted from the changing demographics of higher education” (“Undergraduate English Major,” 186-187). While this citation refers specifically to the ways in which “greater equity of opportunity for women” has affected the enrollment of a major traditionally dominated by women (indeed, our own enrollment patterns reveal that in our department the women still outnumber the men by a greater percentage than in the national trend for all BA’s), it is helpful to recognize how often enrollment patterns are affected by factors outside the field itself.

**1. Enrollment Patterns:** In our last self-study (1999-2000), we charted an increase of 7% in undergraduate major enrollment from 399 in Fall 1995 to 461 in Fall, 1999. Enrollments since then have been slightly less consistent (442 in Fall 2000; 431 in Fall 2001; 452 in Fall 2002; 440 in Fall 2003; 411 in Fall 2004; and 442 in Fall 2004). On the one hand, one might note a fairly solid average of 436, a dip perhaps from the high of 461 in 1999, but sufficiently consistent to make any statistical evaluation very difficult. The one time where one can, indeed, note a slightly aberrant fall in enrollment is in Fall 2004 during which, as has been previously noted, the effects of the budget crisis--fewer courses and higher student fees, as well as tighter enrollment management, particularly with restrictions on Second BA’s and Unclassified Graduate admission, as well as sophomore-level transfers--were felt most keenly. The reduction in transfer students runs parallel to a reduction College and University-wide. While it may be premature to project growth, slightly

higher freshman and undergraduate transfer enrollments in our major this fall may bode well for the future. In April 2006, we contacted 100 potential majors who had applied and been accepted to the university. At this moment, we have approximately 43 transfer students who have RSVPed for summer transfer orientation (we also typically have around 20-25 at the Spring transfer orientations). With mandatory freshman advising, we should also see approximately 35-40 students. Without an increase in full-time faculty and course offerings, it is unlikely that we will see serious growth in our major enrollments. It should be noted, however, that the English Department serves not just its majors but a tremendous number of students in its “service” courses. In fact, we consistently meet our FTES targets (even with fewer resources) and this past Fall, 2005, we had the highest FTES in the College of Arts & Letters (1201.1 FTES).

At the Graduate level, our Fall 2005 enrollment numbers are somewhat lower than those in the years immediately preceding (221 in Fall 2005; 244 in Fall 2004; 241 in Fall 2003; 216 in Fall 2002; and 180 in Fall 2001). At its height in 2004, the Graduate Program had shown a rebound from its low of 179 in Fall 1999 and even an increase from its previous high of 200. While larger trends in graduate enrollments are immensely difficult to track, in part, what is evident here is growth in the TESOL graduate program and then a slightly delayed response to the budget crisis and subsequent impactation at the graduate level, particularly in our TESOL program—where it is also possible that the general drop in international students may have some effect. (See, for example, the drop in Spring 2005—from 23 in Spring 2004 to 12 in Spring 2005—based on greater restrictions being placed on applications.)

The direct relationship between the reduced number of courses and lower enrollment can be seen, for example, in these statistics from our Spring 2006 CASPER Enrollment Report: “Since Spring 2003, we have lost a possible 736 seats or close to 12% potential enrollment (FTES). On the other hand, in Spring 2003 we were at only 83.4% of our potential enrollment at the end of CASPER compared to our current 88.2%. On the one hand, our tighter scheduling has made us fill a higher percentage of seats; on the other hand we have been steadily losing in FTES despite the fact that our headcount has remained relatively constant.” Given the demographics of our student body—particularly in relation to the amount of hours our students work—it is inevitable that when faced with a more highly restrictive and

limited schedule of courses, our students will choose not to enroll.

- 2. Gender & Ethnic Composition:** At both the Undergraduate and Graduate levels, the English Department is predominantly female and White in higher numbers than the College or University; it is, however, difficult to determine internal, rather than external factors for these numbers. At the Undergraduate level, we have ranged from a high of 74% women in 2000 to a low of 64% women in 2004. At the Graduate level, we have ranged from a high of 69% women in 2001 to a low of 66% in both 2000 and 2004. These numbers are in keeping with national trends and may, in fact, reflect a greater “equity of opportunity” in other fields rather than any substantive trend in our own. In terms of ethnic diversity, at the Undergraduate level, those who identify themselves as “White” have constituted 54% in 2000 and 2001 with a high of 60% in 2003 and again in 2005. At the Graduate level, we may see an indication of growing diversity: those who identify themselves as “White” peaked at 68% in 2000 but hit a low of 49% in 2004. Again, it is difficult to determine factors, although it may be possible that at the Graduate level, some of the diversity may reflect the growing numbers in TESOL—a program that attracts both international and multilingual students. We are also hoping that new hires in Multi-Ethnic Literature along with curricular Areas of Interest in “Gender & Sexuality” and “Race, Nation, and Ethnicity” may improve student diversity in gender and ethnic composition.
- 3. Retention and graduation rates:** The English Department’s 6 yr. Graduation rate (BA) has improved from a low of 36% in 2002 to 50% and 52% in 2004 and 2003 respectively. One year continuation rates have ranged from a low of 59% in 2000 to a high of 81% in 2001 and 2004. We are hopeful that improved advising and the new major will contribute positively to increasing both retention and graduation rates. Seven year completion for the MA has also improved with a high of 71% in 2004 and a dip again in 2005 to 54%. In this case, one factor for improvement may be the increasing number of students taking and passing the MA Comprehensive Exam. Typically, students who take the exam complete the degree in less time than those doing a thesis, and in some cases, students who would not otherwise have been successful in a timely fashion with a thesis as the Culminating Experience respond better to the structure and support of the Comprehensive Exam. We are, however, continuing to support theses and projects with writing groups and stronger mentoring. Here, too, however, faculty workloads

without any compensation for thesis and project advising negatively affect us.

4. **Part and full-time enrollments:** At the Undergraduate level, typically  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the students are enrolled full-time with  $\frac{1}{4}$  enrolled part-time. At the Graduate level, typically we run approximately 60% Part-time and 40% Full-time; this is not surprising since many of our graduate students are older and already employed full-time in teaching and other professions. Furthermore, our graduate program schedule reflects our awareness of these statistics with more courses offered in the late afternoon and evening to accommodate our part-time students with full-time jobs.
5. **“Native” and transfer students:** The ratio of new freshmen to new transfer students has slowly increased from 28% in 2000 to 39.2% in 2005. This percentage increase is similar to the university’s increase of freshmen. The English Department also attracts “native” students through its participation in all freshman programs (Learning Communities and Freshman Seminars); our decision to teach a section of Engl 021 (Freshman Seminar for English majors) reflects our commitment to this group of students. Both freshmen and transfer numbers fell in Fall 2004. New transfers dropped from 97 in 2003 to 69 in 2004 and then slightly increased again in 2005 up to 79. The rebound was a bit faster with freshmen: we dropped from 31 in 2003 to 25 in 2004 with a full rebound back to 31 in 2005. We hope to increase our transfer numbers in the following ways: 1) outreach to the community colleges; 2) Learning Communities for Transfer Students—this was attempted in Spring 2006 with a new course in English but did not receive sufficient enrollment; 3) improved lower division transfer patterns in response to statewide initiatives.

## **B. Student Academic Performance**

1. **Grading Distribution:** Since Fall 2000, the English Department has been remarkably consistent in its grading patterns. Typically, across both undergraduate and graduate divisions, the English Department gives relatively fewer A’s than either the College or the University. This suggests rather high expectations for “Superior” work. Not surprisingly, we give slightly more B’s. We also give fewer D’s and F’s—in part, I would suggest, because for many of our lower division courses, particularly our Composition courses, we emphasize a writing process that requires revision and often grades are given on the basis of portfolio evaluation. If there is any “inflation,” it may be for our upper division students at the C to B range since we offer slightly fewer C’s at this level compared to our colleagues in the College and the University.

2. **GPA's:** Our undergraduate students have consistently maintained a slightly higher Overall GPA in comparison with their peers in the College or the University (e.g. 3.07 in Fall 2005 compared with 2.96 and 2.89 respectively). With the exception of Fall 2002, the Overall GPA has been at 3.00 or better. While it is very difficult to account for all of the factors involved in student success, one might note that our students typically have stronger writing skills than their peers (cf. for example, both their lower need for English remediation and their higher Pass Rate on the WPE).
3. **Students on Probation:** The percentage of our students in “good standing” typically runs higher than both the College and the University—particularly at the undergraduate level and in the last couple of years for which we have data. For example, for Fall 2004 (91%) and Fall 2003 (90%) we exceed the College (88% and 86% respectively) and the University (84% and 84% respectively). As one would expect, there is less variance at the graduate level where the percentage of students in “good standing” runs consistently between 96% and 99%. The Department Chair notifies in writing each student placed on probation of the importance of meeting with her for advising. In addition to discussing balancing course load and workload, the Chair recommends use of the University Writing Center as needed.

Recently, in its report and recommendations to the department (May 12, 2006), the Ad Hoc Advising Committee addressed the needs of this particular population:

- Chair of English forwards the List of Students on Probation to Advising Coordinator who sends it to faculty, asking them to note whether any of these students in their classes are still having trouble.
  - Faculty who volunteer will contact and advise these students.
  - Advisers can use the new “Advising Form for Students on Academic Probation” to find out the reason for the student’s difficulty.
  - Train the Peer Adviser to work with these students.
4. **WPE Pass Rates:** Not surprisingly—given both the self-selection of stronger writers into the English major and the focus on strong reading and writing skills in the English major—English majors typically have a higher pass rate (84%-93%) than their peers in the College (71%-78%) and University (64%-73%).

### C. Student Academic Support

**1. Academic & Career Advising:** Advising in the English Department begins with orientations for freshmen, transfer students, and graduate students; typically, the Chair, the Credentials Advisor, and other faculty and staff members attend the University orientations in the summer and fall. Graduate Coordinators meet with new students at the beginning of the academic year. With the institution of mandatory freshman orientations, we will be more assured of reaching all of our declared freshman majors.

Up until Fall 2005, new English majors were assigned yearly to advisers (advisees were divided among full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty, with FERP faculty being assigned approximately half of the typical advising load). Students were mailed letters informing them of their assigned adviser. We do, however, permit students to formally change their adviser. All students in our Single Subject Matter Program are advised by the Credentials Advisor. Graduate students in the M.A. in English are assigned to advisers as they are accepted into the program. Furthermore, students placed on Academic Probation meet with the Chair. To supplement more formal advising, information is provided in our Course Description Booklets—published and posted on our website each semester—our Graduate Booklet (also on the website) and on our English List-Serve. The Chair posts advising notes and updates throughout the advising and registration periods (CASPER and CASPER-Plus).

In response to a number of initiatives and data suggesting a need to improve advising, in Fall 2005, the English Department began to make some changes.

The Department switched to online advising notices. With over 700 subscribers to our English List-Serve, the Advising Coordinator began to publish online advising notices beginning in Spring, 2006.

The English Department voted on October 24, 2005 to institute mandatory advising for incoming transfer students and newly declared majors. This will mean developing a system whereby a “hold” on registration will be placed for students in these categories who have not met with an English Adviser. We chose not to do so for freshmen because of the new mandatory orientation requirement.

In Fall 2005, the English Department did a survey on Career Advising to supplement the feedback provided in our Graduating Senior Surveys. We received 95 responses (primarily from Juniors & Seniors). The Survey concludes:

Although Creative and Professional Writing [one of our areas of interest] was even more popular than the Single Subject concentration in this group, future career path choices for English majors here are evenly distributed among teaching, grad school, and other careers.

Most Credential students get their career information from the Credential Adviser assigned in English; few English majors use the Careers Center for information on jobs or career paths, relying instead primarily on online sites and their professors.

About half want teaching jobs at the various levels after graduation, and the other half want other careers; however, most majors have not had English-related job experience. Because there is a marked gap between career goals and preparation for almost half our majors, the English Department needs a stronger career advising program. While many students expressed interest in Internships, which bridge classroom learning and professional practice, few majors avail themselves of this means (Fall 2005 195/410C Internship enrollment: 8), so there is need as well for improved publicity and advising, and for continuing to integrate Internships into the curriculum—a process begun by including English 195C in the “Creative and Professional Writing” Area of Interest.

In February, 2006, the English Department Executive Committee voted to establish an Ad Hoc Academic & Career Advising Committee to take on the following specific charges: The charge of this committee will include: a) articulating a plan for implementing mandatory advising for newly declared majors and transfer students in fall 2006; b) responding to this past fall’s Career Advising Survey; c) putting together a proposal for the Faculty Senate initiative on Advising. The current Advising Coordinator has been asked to convene the committee.

On May 12, 2006, the Ad Hoc Academic & Career Advising Committee made the following Report and Recommendations at the Department Meeting.

**Mandatory Advising Program starting in Fall 2006:**

- Mandatory meetings offered on Tues./Thurs. and Mon/Wed schedule as soon as “New Student List” available.
- At that meeting: assignment to Adviser in Area of Interest, Career Advising, Sign up for List-Serve.
- “Hold” placed on record unless student sees Adviser to register for Spring.

### **Advising for English Majors on Probation:**

- Chair of English forwards the List of Students on Probation to Advising Coordinator who sends it to faculty, asking them to note whether any of these students in their classes are still having trouble.
- Faculty who volunteer will contact and advise these students.
- Advisers can use the new “Advising Form for Students on Academic Probation” to find out the reason for the student’s difficulty.
- Train the Peer Adviser to work with these students.

### **Peer Adviser:**

- Create a new Peer Adviser Internship, to be trained and supervised by the Intern and Advising Coordinators.
- Peer Adviser could help “at risk” groups and measure outcomes.
- Funding might be sought for this position.

### **Web Site Revisions and other Advising Materials:**

- Have “Advising” button on web site; Advising screen can include procedures and information, Change of Adviser form, checklist of tasks.
- Change the “Faculty Areas of Advising” in Course Description Booklet to correspond to “Areas of Interest” in the Major.
- Set up clearly the 3 Advising Paths for English Majors: Teaching, Graduate School, Careers with English.

**2. Student Support:** Our majors needing extra assistance with writing have access to the University Writing Center housed in the English Department. Individual faculty members, as noted in many of the subjective comments on student evaluations, provide additional assistance during office hours and conferences. Frequently, peer review groups set up as part of a course requirement also extend beyond the classroom. For example, our graduate students who are studying for the Comprehensive Exam in Literature are encouraged to develop study groups.

**D. Student Professional Development:** The English Department coordinates a number of organizations and opportunities for professional development including, but not limited to: English Club; Sigma Tau Delta Honor Society; EGOIST (a literary theory reading group); *Calaveras Station Journal* (fully edited by students); The Collective (Creative Writing Reading series, organized by students). For our graduate students, we frequently offer programs in “Going on for the Ph.D.” Faculty

members often encourage students to present papers at appropriate disciplinary conferences; indeed, the Graduate Coordinator posts “Calls for Papers” on the department website. In December, 2001 our campus hosted the 1<sup>st</sup> Northern CA CSU Graduate Student Conference which was organized by graduate students. When appropriate, graduate students are invited to attend CSU English Council.

#### **IV. Faculty**

##### **A. Faculty Profile**

As of the start of the 2006-2007 Academic Year, of full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty, we have 13 male and 13 female professors. All but one of the 26 full-time professors holds the Ph.D. as the terminal degree. New hires since 2000 include three Ph.D.s in Composition & Rhetoric, two in TESOL/Applied Linguistics, and eight in English (Literature). FERPing faculty includes 8 male professors and 3 female professors.

**Ethnic Diversity** (see Appendix for data): As discussed throughout this document, overall, despite the number of people we have hired into tenure-track positions, the total number of full-time faculty has fallen (and, indeed, continues to fall). In addition to curricular implications, the total reduction in full-time faculty has also affected our ethnic diversity. For example, we have had two recent retirements—one Hispanic and one African-American—that affect our percentages. On the other hand, both new hires for 2006-2007 add diversity to our faculty: our new Multi-Ethnic literature hire is a recipient of the CSU Forgivable Loan Program—a program that encourages CSU diversity by supporting our own students in graduate study—and Asian-American; our new Creative Writer is fully bilingual in Spanish and has some Native American background. Most important, their areas of expertise support our efforts to diversify the curriculum (the former is qualified to teach Asian American, African American, and Chicano literature; the latter is qualified to teach Contemporary World literatures and is planning on developing courses in Latin American literature and translation). We have also asked one of our retired faculty members, Olivia Castellano, to teach one course a semester for 2006-2007 to insure that our Chicano literature courses are taught.

It is clear, however, that statistically, the English Department still has a long way to go: Between 2000 and 2005, we have ranged from a low of 89.29% “White” in 2003 to 92.31% in 2005 (these numbers include both full and part-time faculty). We believe that all hires provide the opportunity to diversify our faculty and are committed to doing so. For this reason, in fact, we had asked for a second Multi-Ethnic Literature hire and were given it; however, better offers—both in salary and workload—lured a number of our top candidates to other schools and, therefore, the second position was not filled. Obviously, it is difficult enough to compete for top candidates; it is, however, particularly difficult to compete for a smaller pool of ethnically diverse

candidates without an increase in starting salaries and reduction in workload. The English Department will continue to pursue diversity in all of its hiring and retention processes by attending workshops on diversity and instituting effective searches. Feedback from this year's search for both the Multi-Ethnic Literature and Creative Writing positions suggests that our changes in curriculum may help us attract additional faculty who will simultaneously help us further diversify the curriculum and the faculty.

**B. Assessment of Faculty—Ability to offer curriculum and support program goals.**

Since our last self-study (1999-2000), we have been able to hire outstanding new faculty in a variety of literary fields, Creative Writing, TESOL, English Education, and Composition & Rhetoric, and with the exception of two full-time faculty who have left Sacramento State for other institutions, we have been able to retain those we have hired. Despite our successful efforts at hiring, however, our hiring has not kept up with the attrition of FERPs and retirements. At the beginning of fall 2006, we will have nine Full Professors including the Chair who teaches only one course a semester as an overload (compared to 23 in 1999-2000); five Associate Professors (compared to 3 in 1999-2000); and 12 Assistant Professors (compared to 4 in 1999-2000)—including one who is the University RWAC Coordinator and, therefore, only teaches one course a semester for the English Department for a total of **twenty-six** full-time faculty (compared to 30 in 1999-2000). In addition, we have eleven FERP faculty—four of whom teach a 0/4 load while the others teach a 2/2 load.

Three major issues emerge from a quick glance at this “map” of our faculty: 1) the profound need to continue hiring full-time tenure-track faculty—both to replace FERPing and retiring faculty and to address programmatic needs that emerge with the growth and change of our disciplines; 2) a continued effort to hire faculty members who contribute to the University's and Department's commitment to diversity and pluralism; and 3) the need to address workload and salary issues for new hires and continuing faculty to improve retention and morale. We have asked for three hires for 2006-2007 (English Education, 19<sup>th</sup> C. British Literature, and TESOL) and at least two or three for 2007-2008. All of our Program Coordinators note the need for continued hiring in their areas if we are to sustain the quality and diversity of programs.

In addition, we have a ranked list of forty-four lecturers (one of whom is full-time) for Native Speaker Composition Courses (1, 1A, 20, 109W), another ranked list for ESL Composition (2, 20M, 109M), and a third list for Liberal Studies Courses (16, 116A, 116B). Minimum qualifications for these positions include a MA in English and experience teaching college composition. All lecturers have their teaching reviewed annually by the Lecturers Committee and the Department Chair. They are supervised by the

Writing Programs Coordinator. It should be noted that while our Lecturers are well-qualified and effective in their positions, the Department agrees with MLA and NCTE that our percentage of Part-Time to Full-Time faculty is highly problematic.

Typically we also hire between twelve and seventeen Teaching Associates from among our qualified graduate students in English and TESOL who serve as the “Instructor of Record.” Other Instructional Student Assistants serve as Writing Center Tutors, WAC Tutors, and 1X/2X Small Group Tutors.

### **C. Faculty as Teachers:**

As our students often comment, our faculty is the English Department’s greatest strength, exhibiting passion for and knowledge of their various fields, as well as genuine caring and support for their students.

Our students consistently rate our faculty quite highly and praise the “overall quality of instruction provided by English faculty”; 90% or higher of the students surveyed in our Graduating Senior Surveys in the last five years respond as “very satisfied or satisfied.” The average overall scores (on a scale of 1-5 with 5 the highest) on student evaluations for the last few semesters run between 4.42 and 4.48 in Composition courses; between 4.57 and 4.63 in Pedagogy courses; and between 4.62 and 4.64 in Literature courses.

**Subjective Comments:** (In response to “What are the English Department undergraduate program’s strengths?”)

“Good professors—people who are passionate about the subject and relate this well to the students.”

“The faculty. They (seem to) have a genuine interest in my success here and after graduation. They have always been helpful in and out of class.”

“I feel the faculty members have really made an effort in encouraging our interest in literature, poetry, and beyond. The strengths of the department include caring and experienced professors and courses that offer free form discussion.”

“The greatest strength is the faculty!”

“The faculty is amazing. I have learned a great deal because of their diverse teaching capabilities.”

“The professors are all very good at what they do, as they are very passionate and able to instill that passion into their students.”

**Alumni** (cf. Survey in Fall 2005) rated the overall quality of instruction provided by English faculty an average 4.45 (where 5 is the highest rating of “very satisfied”) and often commented on the difference English Department faculty made in their lives; indeed many mentioned specific professors who had a profound effect on their lives.

“My experience as a graduate student in the English Department was very satisfying. Exceptional professors and high standards kept me struggling to improve the quality of my reading and writing.”

“I felt the faculty was extremely supportive of me and in many respects, felt part of a ‘family’ while I was at Sacramento State.”

“Everything I have accomplished professionally is due in large part to a few brilliant professors. . . . These professors are responsible for creating my abiding love of literature, creative writing, literacy theory, and composition.”

“I had the honor of taking courses from knowledgeable and enthusiastic instructors that would go out of their way to help you, or meet you when you needed.”

#### **Professional Development:**

The following faculty members have participated in TUT (Teaching Using Technology) Summer workshops: Julian Heather, Cathy Gabor, Doug Rice. Both Mark Hennelly and Sheree Meyer have participated in ADE workshops for Department Chairs; recently (February 2006), Sheree Meyer attended the ACE Workshop for Department Chairs. Many of our faculty members attend and participate in their disciplinary conferences such as NCTE, CCCC, MLA, CATE, CATESOL, etc. Further development is fostered by strong participation in the CSU English Council. Many of our faculty present and/or participate in Sacramento State University’s Reading & Writing Across the Curriculum Workshops, headed by Professor Dan Melzer.

#### **Recognition for Teaching Excellence:**

Stephanie Tucker, Outstanding Teaching Award, 2006-2006.

Joshua McKinney, Outstanding Teaching Award, 2004-2005.

John Clark, Visiting Lecturer & Scholar Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Talavera de la Reina, Toledo, Spain. May 2005.

Hortense Simmons, Fulbright Scholar & Lecturer, Ukraine, Fall 2004.

Marie Helt, Trainer of Teachers, American-Egyptian Master Teacher Exchange Program, 2001-2002.

#### **D. Faculty as Scholars**

Despite little financial support for research and creative activity in the form of research assigned time, travel funds, etc. and a teaching workload that has “*de facto*” increased with more faculty members teaching a 4/4 load (less assigned time available for coordination and service) and classes that are now often filled to capacity, our faculty members remain committed to maintaining a strong connection between their roles as teachers and as scholars. A number of our faculty have successfully competed for research and sabbatical awards: Doug Rice, President’s Award; Sheree Meyer, Research Assigned Time Award; Susan Wanlass, Sabbatical Award; Marie Helt, Sabbatical Award; Richard Adams, Sabbatical Award; Dana Ferris, Sabbatical Award; Josh McKinney, Sabbatical Award; Julie Yen, Visual Knowledge Grant. Below is

a sample list of recent projects, publications, and presentations from our full-time faculty; it is, by no means, exhaustive or even fully representative.

**Brad Buchanan**: “A Nice Question of Blood: Blood, Race and Religion in *Rumpole’s Return*.” In *Race and Religion in the Postcolonial British Detective Story*. McFarland & Co: 2005.

“Armed with Questions: Mary Butts’s Sacred Interrogative.” *Twentieth Century Literature*, 2003.

**John Clark**: Abstract Inquiry and The Patrolling of Black/White Borders through Linguistic Stylization. (Chapter 23) In: Harris, Roxy and Ben Rampton (eds.) *The Language, Ethnicity and Race Reader*. Routledge, 2003.

La hegemonía lingüística en <tiempo corriente>: Lecciones de una escuela superior en los Estados Unidos.”(‘Linguistic Hegemony in <real time>: Lessons from a high school in the United States.’) Paper presented at the First International Congress on Ethnography and Education. Talavera de la Reina, Spain, July 2004.

**Dana Ferris**: *Response to student writing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003.

“Tricks of the trade: The nuts and bolts of L2 writing research.” In *Second Language Writing Research: Perspectives on the Process of Knowledge Construction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005.

**Catherine Gabor**: “Ethics and Expectations: Developing a Workable Balance Between Academic Goals and Ethical Behavior.” *Reflections: A Journal of Writing, Service-Learning, and Community Literacy*. Forthcoming, March 2006.

“Agents of Change” (co-authored with Carrie Leverenz). *Research Writing Revisited: A Sourcebook for Teachers*, edited by Wendy Bishop and Pavel Zemliansky. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2004. 129-141.

**Jason Gieger**: “When You Don’t Marry Mr. Darcy: Life Beyond the Research University.” *American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, April 2005.

“The Diamonds, the Duchess, and the Ivory Automaton: Gossip, Biography, and William Congreve in Wax.” Group for Early Modern Cultural Studies, October 2003.

**Fiona Glade**: “Writing in the Humanities.” “Writing in the Social Sciences.” “Writing in the Natural and Applied Sciences.” *The Wadsworth Handbook*. Eds. Laurie G. Kirszner and Stephen R. Mandell. Boston, MA: Heinle, 2005. “Affirming Writing As Learning: Where Do We (All) Go From Here?” CCCC San Francisco, CA., March 2005

**Julian Heather**: “Miscommunication between ESL writers and writing center consultants: A case study.” *Arizona Working Papers in Second Language Acquisition and Teaching*, Volume 11, 2004.

“Exploring the validity of computer-mediated communicative language tests.” *American Association of Applied Linguistics*, 2004.

**Amy Heckathorn**: “Moving Toward a Group Identity: WPA Professionalization from the 1940s to the 1970s.” *Historical Studies of Writing Program Administration*.

Eds. Barbara L'Eplattenier and Lisa Mastrangelo. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press, 2004. 191-219.

"Administration as Reflection and Resistance." Presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, San Francisco, California, March 2005.

**Marie Helt:** Biber, D., Conrad, S., Reppen, R. Byrd, P., Helt, M., Clark, V., Cortes, V., Csomay, E. & Urzua, A. Representing language use in the university: Analysis of the TOEFL 2000 Spoken and Written Academic Language corpus TOEFL Monograph Series 25. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 2004.

Review of A History of English: A Sociolinguistic Approach., by Barbara Fennell. Interdisciplinary Journal for Germanic Linguistics and Semiotic Analysis, 9 (2005), 129-132.

**Joshua McKinney:** *The Novice Mourner*. Cohasset, CA: Bearstar Press, 2005.

"The Deer at the Sermon," "scaled invention / silly heaven." 88: *A Journal of Contemporary American Poetry* (October 2004): 31-32.

**David Madden:** "Paul West, An Introduction." Paul West Conference. 15-17 October 2003. Tours, France: Francois Rabelais University.

"*In the Province of Saints*." Thomas O'Malley. Magill's Literary Annual, 2006. Ed. Frank Magill. Pasadena: Salem Press, 2006.

**Fred Marshall:** "Input, Output & Focus on Form." Chiangmai University and Ubon Ratchatani University, August 2002.

Workshop on English Pronunciation, Chiangmai University, September 2002.

**Wendy Matlock:** "'And long to sue it is a wery thyng': Legal Commentary in *The Assembly of Ladies*." *Studies in Philology* 101 (2004): 20-37.

"The Feminine Flesh in the Disputacione betwyx the Body and Wormes" at the 2006 Centre for Medieval Studies / Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies Annual Conference. March 2006.

**Dan Melzer:** "Writing, Reading, and Researching in the Disciplines: A guide for Students." A series of five writing guides for McGraw-Hill Primis custom publishing including humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, business, and engineering. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2005.

"Discourse across the Disciplines." Conference on College Composition and Communication, San Francisco, CA. March 21, 2005.

**Sheree Meyer:** "'Broadly Representative'? The MLA's Approaches to Teaching World Literature Series." *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition and Culture* 3.1 (2003): 21-51.

"Shall We Dance? The Teaching of Teaching and Spaces for/of Movement." (In collaboration with Fiona Glade). Convention of the Modern Language Association, December 2005.

**Doug Rice:** *Skin Prayer: Fragments of Abject Memory*. [Selected stories and theoretical humor.] Introduction by Don Harrold and Alejandro Espinoza. Preface by Leslie Heywood. Afterword by Larry McCaffery. Portland, OR: Eraserhead Press, 2002.

"Alice Doesn't Live (T)here Anymore." In *Alice Redux*. Ed. Richard Peabody. Baltimore, MD: Peacock Press, 2006. 129-134.

**Chauncey Ridley:** "Tension, Conversation, and Collectivity: Examining the

Space of Double-Consciousness in the Search for Shared Knowledge” co-written with CSUS Professors Sheree Meyer and Olivia Castellano. Re-Viewing Race and Ethnicity in American Texts Ed. David Goldstein-Shirley, U of Washington Press, Fall 2006.

"Dutiful Minorities and Erudite Minoritarians: Double- in Multi-Cultural America and The Third World." 18<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of MELUS—the Society for the Study of Multi-Ethnic Literatures of the United States, 2004.

**Cherryl Smith:** *After Being Somewhere Else, poems*, Regent Press, 2005.

“Inventing the PhD in Composition,” Conference on College Composition and Communication. March 2005.

**Nancy Sweet:** “Dissent and the Daughter in the Early Works of Catherine Maria Sedgwick and Lydia Maria Child.” *Legacy: A Journal of American Women Writers* 22 (2005): 107-125.

Review of Anne E. Boyd, *Writing for Immortality: Women Writers and the Emergence of High Literary Culture in America*. *New England Quarterly* 78 (2005): 469-471.

**David Toise:** “The Public Sphere, The Masquerade, and Haywood’s Episodic *Fantomina*.” American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies Conference, April 2005.

“‘As Good As Nowhere’: The Historicity of the Public/Private Divide, the Contingency of Value, and Dicken’s *Dombey and Son*.” *Criticism* 41.3: 323-348.

**Susan Wanlass:** Co-Editor, *The F. Scott Fitzgerald Review*. 2003-present.

“Hemingway’s and Fitzgerald’s Great War Storytelling.” Tenth International Hemingway Conference, July 2002.

**Julie Yen:** “If it be sinne to love a sweet-fac’d Boy’: Rereading Homoerotic Desire in Barnfield’s Ganymede Poems.” In *The Affectionate Shepherd: Celebrating Richard Barnfield*. Susquehanna UP, 2001.

“A Poet I Am neither Borne, nor Bred’: Margaret Cavendish’s Wit in *Poems and Fancies*” Fourth Biennial International Margaret Cavendish Conference, Wheaton College and Brown University, 2001.

Many of our FERP faculty members have remained very active scholars as well. Some recent achievements include:

Mark Hennelly, Jr. “‘The Secrets of Good Brewing, The Folly of Stinginess’: *Adam Bede*’s Carnival.” *Victorian Literature and Culture* 34 (2006): 47-69.

Mary Mackey (under the pen name of Kate Clemens). *Sweet Revenge* (a novel). New York: Kensington Books, 2004.

Stephanie Tucker. “A Kind of Integrity: Sir Alan’s *House* and Ayckbourn’s *Garden*.” *New Theatre Quarterly*, U Cambridge Pr. 2006 (forthcoming).



### **E. Faculty Service to the University & Community**

All full-time faculty members in the English Department are assigned to a minimum of two department committees per year. Committee assignments are either elected (for all Personnel Committees and the Executive Committee) or appointed by the Executive Committee (on the basis of a committee preference form). Coordinators—some of whom have lost re-assigned time since Fall 2004 (Basic Writing Coordinator, ESL Coordinator, Lecturers Coordinator)—oversee large programs and/or essential department responsibilities; furthermore, the decision to split the Vice-Chair and Schedules Coordinator positions into separate positions (both of which are funded from the Chair's Overload) beginning in Fall 2003 also limits the amount of re-assigned time for these two positions (three units for the Schedules Coordinator in the fall; three units for the Vice-Chair in the spring). This raises two interdependent issues: 1) The Department Chair—of the third largest department in the university—is in the untenable position of having to teach one course per semester as an overload (the Department Chair is a full-time 12 unit, 12 month position) to fund the assistance of a Schedules Coordinator and a Vice-Chair; 2) Both the Schedules Coordinator and the Vice-Chair positions are genuinely full year appointments funded for only one semester of re-assigned time. Historically, the individuals who have served as Chairs have been willing to teach; it is, however, quite possible that this may not always be the case. In fact, this double-bind of having to take an overload in order to support the much-needed assistance of a Schedules Coordinator and a Vice-Chair could severely impact individuals' willingness to serve as Chair.

At the department-level, our biggest challenge is workload for the Personnel Committees (Lecturers; Appointments; RTP; and Student); while the English Department allows and invites FERPers to participate in all committees and allows junior (non-tenured, but tenure-track) faculty to serve on the Appointments and Student Committees, with our dwindling numbers of Full Professors and the increasing numbers of Assistant Professors who need yearly periodic review, the Department is hard-pressed. It should also be noted that the College of Arts & Letters also needs a percentage of our tenured faculty members for the Secondary ARTP Committees, which reduces the number available for the primary level. We have begun discussions about whether or not we will need to make changes to the make-up of our Lecturers and RTP Committees in light of this problem.

The faculty of the English Department has contributed greatly to the needs of the college, university, and broader communities. In the last few years, three of our colleagues have won awards for Outstanding Service (Amy Heckathorn, Linda Palmer, and Joan Bauerly). Many serve in leadership roles throughout the university and beyond: Jason Gieger, Vice Chair, Faculty Senate (2005-2006); Sheree Meyer, Faculty Coordinator, University Learning Communities Program (2000-2004); Catherine Gabor, Assessment Consultant (2005-present); Dan Melzer (RWAC Coordinator); Fiona Glade, GEAR Coordinator (2005-present); Jonathan Price, GEAR Coordinator (2000-2005); David Toise, Chair of the College of Arts & Letters Outstanding Teacher/Service Award Committee; Chauncey Ridley, Board Member (2005-present); the CSUS Center For

African Peace and Conflict Resolution: CAPCR; Marie Helt, Coordinator of English course revision teams for the Blended Elementary Teacher Education Program (BETEP) for Liberal Studies (2001-2).

Both Professors Mark Hennelly and Jonathan Price have served on the Executive Committee of our statewide CSU English Council.

Many of our faculty members also serve as peer reviewers or editors for journals in our discipline: John Clark, *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*; Sheree Meyer, *College Literature*; Catherine Gabor, *Composition Studies*; Dana Ferris, *TESOL Quarterly*; Susan Wanlass, co-editor, *The F. Scott Fitzgerald Review*.

Finally, our faculty members also participate fully in the larger Sacramento community. Recently, a number of them have started a new non-profit literacy organization, Giant Ink. In 2005-2006, Professors Price, Madden, Buchanan, Cook, and Matlock offered introductory lectures for the CALectures authors' series at the Crest Theatre; we will continue these preview lectures in 2006-2007 with Professors Matlock, Bauerly (Emerita), Madden, McKinney, Glade, Tucker, and Ridley participating. Our Creative Writing faculty and students frequently give readings at the Sacramento Poetry Center and other venues in the community. Other faculty members give guest lectures at high schools and organizations throughout the region.

Others, such as Professors Clark, Simmons, Marshall and Adams have been involved in international programs.

## V. Governance Process at the Program, College and University Levels

### A. Faculty Involvement

- 1. Role of the Chair:** The Chair of the English Department works in consultation and collaboration with Program Coordinators (who typically meet with the Vice-Chair at least once a semester) and the Executive Committee (an elected committee). The Executive Committee (cf. Constitution) sets the Department Meeting agendas, consults with the Chair on budget, personnel, curricular, and other programmatic needs, and appoints faculty members to committees. While the Chair is enjoined by the MOU to offer independent reviews in the evaluation of Lecturers and Post-tenure review, in all other personnel deliberations, he/she functions as one member of the committee (RTP and Appointments).
- 2. Department Constitution:** Following the previous self-study and program review, the English Department updated and revised its Constitution which fully describes all major committee charges, election proceedings, term limits, etc.

**B. Student Involvement:** While there has been the occasional volunteer student representative on department committees, we have not had consistent, institutionalized student participation in department governance. Therefore, on March 10, 2006, the English Department amended its by-laws to include one student representative in each of its major curricular committees: Writing Programs Committee, Undergraduate Program Committee, and Graduate Program Committee. The Writing Programs Committee piloted an election process using our English List-Serve in 2005-2006 that will be adapted by all three committees in September 2006.

**C. Department Relationships with College & University Governance:** The English Department is represented by two Faculty Senators (and their alternates). In addition, we have had a number of our faculty members serve on the Executive Committee of the Senate (in 2005-2006, Prof. Jason Gieger served as Vice-Chair of the Senate) and various committees at both the University (e.g. Research & Creative Activity Committee, RWAC Committee, etc.) and College (Budget & Curriculum Committee, ARTP, etc.) levels. The Department Chair attends both the College Chairs' Council and the University's Department Chair meetings and was a member of the Search Committee for the Dean of Arts & Letters (2004-2005).

## Appendices

Appendix A: Past Program Review and Self-Study.

Appendix B: OIRC Data

[http://www.oir.csus.edu/Assessment/Prog\\_lvl/ProgRev/ENGL.cfm](http://www.oir.csus.edu/Assessment/Prog_lvl/ProgRev/ENGL.cfm)

Appendix C: Vitae and Syllabi (on disk)

Appendix D: Catalog Copy and Course Description Booklets for 2005-2006.

<http://aaweb.csus.edu/catalog/current/PROGRAM/ENGL.asp>

<http://www.csus.edu/Engl/course.htm>

Appendix E: Assessment Plan (2000)

Appendix F: Program Coordinators Reports