

## 2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE

This template intends to make our annual assessment and its reports simple, clear, and of high quality not only for this academic year but also for the years to come. Thus, it explicitly specifies some of the best assessment practices and/or expectations implied in the four WASC assessment rubrics we have used in the last few years (see the information below\* that has appeared in Appendices 1, 2a, 2b, and 7 in the *Feedback for the 2011-2012 Assessment Report*; Appendix 2 in the *Feedback for the 2012-2013 Assessment Report*, and Appendices 5 to 8 in the *2013-2014 Annual Assessment Guideline*).

We understand some of our programs/departments have not used and/or adopted these best practices this year, and that is okay. You do not need to do anything extra this year, and ALL YOU NEED TO DO is to report what you have done this academic year. However, we hope our programs will use many of these best practices in the annual assessment in the future.

We also hope to use the information from this template to build a digital database that is simple, clear, and of high quality. If you find it necessary to modify or refine the wording or the content of some of the questions to address the specific needs of your program, please make the changes and highlight them in red. We will consider your suggestion(s). Thank you!

If you have any questions or need any help, please send an email to Dr. Amy Liu ([liuqa@csus.edu](mailto:liuqa@csus.edu)), Director of University Assessment. We are looking forward to working with you.

\*The four WASC rubrics refer to: 1) WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes”; 2) WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Use of Capstone Experience for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes”; 3) WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Use of Portfolio for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes”; and 4) WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews”.

### Part 1: Background Information

#### B1. Program name:

English Major

#### B2. Report author(s):

Hellen Lee

Associate Professor and Vice Chair, Department of English  
Chair, Curriculum and Assessment Committee, Department of English

Members of the Curriculum and Assessment Committee, Department of English

- Professor Jason Gieger, Literature and Literary Theory;
- Professor Josh McKinney, Creative Writing;

- Associate Professor Susan Fanetti, English Education;
- Associate Professor Dan Melzer, Composition/Rhetoric;
- Assistant Professor Mi-Suk Seo, TESOL; and
- The Committee has one student representative: Lillie Apostolos.

**B3. Fall 2012 enrollment:**

Use the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2012 enrollment:

<http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html>).

FTES: 462.07

# of students: 2257

**B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]**

X	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
	2. Credential
	3. Master's degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
	5. Other, specify:

**Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment**

**Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2013-2014.**

**Q1.1.** Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess in 2013-2014? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). **[CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1)*
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
X	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above: a. b. c.

\* One of the WASC’s new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance **at graduation** in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy.**

**Q1.1.1.** Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

**Brief Overview and Background on English Department Assessment Strategies:**

The Department created, voted on, and approved a Five-Year Assessment Plan in 2011-2012. This is the second year of the implementation of that Plan. This year’s focus was on Critical Writing skills.

Until last year, assessment for the Department has been conducted discretely from year to year. The Department has incorporated an exit survey in 2008, conducted a portfolio review of

the students enrolled in Senior Seminar in 2009, surveyed alumni in 2012, and other activities. While we were able to gather information about specific aspects of the Major, it lacked clear direction to collect data intentionally across the whole program, encompassing all aspects of the program.

In Fall 2011, the Department began updating and revising the Assessment Plan and Learning Outcomes to be a more cohesive program, based on the recommendation of the 2007-2008 Department of English Assessment Committee Report. The 2008-2009 Department of English Assessment Committee chose not to pursue creating a 5-year plan, but strongly recommended that it be acted upon. The 2011-2012 Department of English Assessment Committee, chaired by Julie Yen, brought forward a proposal that was approved by the Department in the fall. Additionally, based on the campus-wide Graduation Initiative, the assessment plan coordinates and responds to the University’s Baccalaureate Learning Goals.

**New Plan**

The new Assessment Plan and Learning Outcomes plan is now a 5-year review cycle, with each of the first four years examining a different Learning Outcome and the fifth year taking a more holistic review of the preceding 4-year cycle. In brief, the four major Learning Outcomes are related to:

- Critical Reading,
- Critical Writing,
- Scholarly Research, and
- Content Area Knowledge.

**Description of Critical Writing:**

“ In a process that includes revision based on feedback from peers and instructors, students will produce a variety of written texts that demonstrate an ability to analyze language, ideas, and forms and creatively engage with the writing traditions of our various disciplines.”

**Q1.2.** Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don’t know

**Q1.3.** Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No <b>(If no, go to Q1.4)</b>
	3. Don’t know <b>(Go to Q1.4)</b>

**Q1.3.1.** If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

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

**Q1.4.** Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)* \* to develop your PLO(s)?

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

\* **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details: [http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The\\_Degree\\_Qualifications\\_Profile.pdf](http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf) and <http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.html>.

**Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.**

**Q2.1.** Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed in **2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

X	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for <b>ALL</b> PLOs assessed in <b>2013-14.</b>
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for <b>SOME</b> PLOs assessed in <b>2013-14.</b>
	3. No ( <b>If no, go to Q2.2</b> )
	4. Don't know ( <b>Go to Q2.2</b> )
	5. Not Applicable ( <b>Go to Q2.2</b> )

**Q2.1.1.** If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

**Rubric for Writing**

	4 (outstanding)	3 (more than satisfactory)	2 (satisfactory)	1 (unsatisfactory)
--	-----------------	----------------------------	------------------	--------------------

Writing Process, including revision based on feedback	The text shows a comprehensive command and use of the process of revision based on feedback	The text shows adequate command and use of the process of revision based on feedback	The text shows a limited command and use of the process of revision based on feedback	The text shows inadequate command and use of the process of revision based on feedback
Analysis of language, ideas, and forms	Demonstrates sophisticated and nuanced ability to thoroughly analyze language, ideas, and forms	Demonstrates ability to analyze language, ideas, and forms in an adequate way	Demonstrates an inconsistent or limited ability to analyze language, ideas, and forms	Shows little or no analysis
Engagement with writing traditions of various disciplines	Demonstrates sophisticated and nuanced ability to thoroughly engage with writing traditions of various disciplines	Demonstrates ability to engage with writing traditions of various disciplines in an adequate way	Demonstrates an inconsistent or limited ability to engage with writing traditions of various disciplines in an adequate way	Shows little or no engagement with writing traditions of various disciplines

**Q2.2. Have you published the PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s) you assessed in 2013-2014?**

X	1. Yes
	2. No <b>(If no, go to Q3.1)</b>

**Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the PLOs/expectations/rubrics published? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

	1. In <b>SOME</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In <b>ALL</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters

X	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
X	10. In other places, specify: On the Department-wide 9.1 module, accessible to all tenure-line and lecturer faculty members

**Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO**

**Q3.1.** Was assessment data/evidence collected for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

**Q3.2.** If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

**Q3.3.** If yes, what **DATA** have you collected? What are the **results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s)** for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including **tables and graphs** if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

**Course Descriptions:**

**ENGL 40A: Introduction to British Literature I.** Major developments in the literature of England from Chaucer through the close of the Augustan Age.

**ENGL 65: Introduction to World Literatures in English.** An introduction to world literature written in English that places writers and their works within colonial, post-colonial, and literary contexts. Texts may come from Africa, India, Southeast Asia, the Middle East, the Caribbean, Canada, and non-English Britain. **Graded:** Graded Student. **Units:** 3.0

**ENGL 110P: Second Language Learning and Teaching.** Surveys the major issues involved in the acquisition of second languages and in teaching second language (L2) students. Topics covered include differences between first and second language acquisition, including age, biology, cognitive styles, personality, sociocultural factors, and linguistic variables; in addition, various models, techniques and approaches to L2 teaching are covered. Special attention is given to the unique demographics and characteristics of language minority students in California's public schools.

**ENGL 120A: Advanced Composition.** An intensive writing workshop in which student writing is the focus. Students will engage in a writing process that will include feedback from peers and the instructor throughout the process. This writing process may occur in a variety of rhetorical situations and genres. Through reflection on their writing products and processes, students will gain an awareness of themselves as writers. By the end of the course students will complete an extensive research project focused on academic inquiry. **Note:** ENGL 120A is a requirement for English majors. **Prerequisite:** GWAR Certification before Fall 09, or WPJ score of 70+, or at least a C- in ENGL 109M/W. **Graded:** Graded Student. **Units:** 3.0

**ENGL 170H: Introduction To Comedy.** Focuses on various comic genres and theories--from 4th century BC to the present. It examines romantic comedy, tragicomedy, comedies of manners, of humors, of menace; farce, satire, slapstick. Students also read widely in comic theory, examining aspects psychological, phenomenological, aesthetic--in drama, fiction, poetry and prose. **Prerequisite:** GWAR certification before Fall 09; or WPJ score of 80+; or 3-unit placement in ENGL 109M/W; or 4-unit placement in ENGL 109M/W and co-enrollment in ENGL 109X; or WPJ score 70/71 and co-enrollment in ENGL 109X. **Graded:** Graded Student. **Units:** 3.0



**Course Categories:**

**ENGL 40A Introduction to British Literature I** and **ENGL 65 Introduction to World Literatures in English** are two of the five large-lecture, undergraduate literature survey courses (ENGL 40A Introduction to British Literature; ENGL 40B Introduction to British Literature II; ENGL 50A Introduction to American Literature I; ENGL 50B Introduction to American Literature II; ENGL 65 Introduction to World Literatures in English) from which students are required to take three, of which one must be American (ENGL 50A or ENGL 50B) and one British (ENGL 40A or ENGL 40B). In this way, it can be considered one of our core undergraduate survey courses as well as an elective.

**ENGL 110P** is one of our required courses for several tracks in the major and minors. ENGL 110P is required for the Single Subject Matter Program; Teaching English to Speakers of other Languages (TESOL) Minor; Certificate - Advanced Study in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL); and TESOL Certificate Program: Undergraduate. It also serves as an elective for the major.

**ENGL 120A Advanced Composition** is one our two required writing-intensive courses in the major (ENGL 120A Advanced Composition and ENGL 198T Senior Seminar). Every English major must take this course (replacing and fulfilling the ENGL 20 College Composition II/ENGL 20M College Composition II for Multilingual Students graduation requirement).

**ENGL 170H Introduction To Comedy** is an upper-division elective course that also fulfills the University Graduation Requirement in for Writing Intensive (3-unit supervenient).

COURSE	OUTSTANDING 4-A	%	MORE THAN SATISFACTORY 3-B	%	SATISFACTORY 2-C	%	UNSATISFACTORY 1-D and below	%	TOTAL ENROLLED
ENGL 40A	51	0.65	21	0.18	6	0.08	0	0	78
ENGL 65	12	0.10	74	0.63	31	0.26	0	0	117
ENGL 120A	5	0.24	14	0.67	1	0.05	1	0.05	21
ENGL 120A F	2	0.06	19	0.59	10	0.31	1	0.03	32

ENGL 120A S	4	0.14	13	0.46	10	0.36	1	0.04	28
ENGL 110P	12	0.22	24	0.44	18	0.33	1	0.02	55
ENGL 170H	12	0.30	19	0.48	9	0.23	0	0	40

As the raw data indicates, our majors are performing according as expected, based on the variety of kinds of assignments asked of the students. For example, while there appears to be a wide discrepancy between the grade distribution between the two lower-division literature courses (40A and 65), the kinds of assignments—both appropriate for the introductory course level—differed significantly: one focused on prosody and was graded on comprehension and demonstration of the mechanics of the formal properties of the sonnet and the other focused on argumentation and was graded on reading comprehension, originality, organization, analysis, and incorporation of textual evidence.

When comparing similar, required courses for the major (ENGL 120A), we see that the grade distribution indicate similar levels of assessment and student achievement across three sections over two semesters. The data suggests that students who enter this stage of the academic coursework are similarly prepared to progress to upper-division coursework and the senior seminar.

The two elective courses (ENGL 110P and ENGL 110P) show similar levels of performance in our students. We see a higher level of performance in ENGL 110P, which is probably due to the fact that this course is required for several tracks in the major, minor, and certificate programs and serves as a gatekeeping course for subsequent courses in some of those tracks. Thus, students have greater motivation to perform well and move along their track.

**Q3.4.** Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

**Q3.4.1.** First PLO: Critical Writing

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

**[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]**

**Q3.4.2.** Second PLO: [\_\_\_\_\_]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
--	--------------------------------

	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

**Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.**

**Q4.1.** How many PLOs **in total** did your program assess in the 2013-2014 academic year? One

**Q4.2.** Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in 2013-14, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) <sup>1</sup>
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
X	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

**Direct Measures**

**Q4.3.** Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No <b>(If no, go to Q4.4)</b>
	3. Don't know <b>(Go to Q4.4)</b>

**Q4.3.1.** Which of the following **DIRECT** measures were used? [Check all that apply]

	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
X	2. Key assignments from other <b>CORE</b> classes
X	3. Key assignments from other classes
	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

**Q4.3.2.** Please provide the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

**ENGL 65: Introduction to World Literatures in English:** Paper, close reading of a primary text.

**ENGL 120A: Advanced Composition:** Research paper, close reading of a primary text supported by secondary sources.

**ENGL 170H: Introduction To Comedy:** Research paper, close reading of a primary text supported by secondary sources.

**Q4.3.2.1.** Was the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

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

**Q4.3.3.** Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

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

**Q4.3.4.** How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [Select one only]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
X	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

**Q4.3.5.** What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? **[Select one only]**

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
X	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

**Q4.3.6.** Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

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

**Q4.3.7.** Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

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

**Q4.3.8.** Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

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

**Q4.3.9.** Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

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

**Q4.3.10.** How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)?  
Please briefly specify here:

In order to assess writing skills, the Committee considered the types of courses to be relevant in assessing critical writing. For this purpose, the Committee asked for volunteers from all teaching faculty in the Department and made specific requests to faculty teaching courses that required writing and from core course in the major.

In response to the request for volunteers, the Committee received replies from three (3) faculty members who offered to provide assessment data. The courses varied significantly in size and instructional format. Included in the sample were workshops/seminars, discussion-based courses, and large lecture courses.

***Indirect Measures***

**Q4.4.** Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
--	--------

X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.5)
---	---------------------------

**Q4.4.1.** Which of the following indirect measures were used?

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

**Q4.4.2.** If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

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

**Q4.4.3.** If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

**Other Measures**

**Q4.5.** Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Q4.6</b> )

**Q4.5.1.** Which of the following measures was used?

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

**Q4.6.** Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
	2. No ( <b>Go to Q4.7</b> )
X	3. Don't know ( <b>Go to Q4.7</b> )

**Q4.6.1.** If yes, please specify: [\_\_\_\_\_]

**Alignment and Quality**

**Q4.7.** Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Examples of student work from a few courses were collected and evaluated from a representative array of subfields and types of courses (e.g. required, electives, seminars/workshops, discussion, and large lectures) to determine the level of critical writing skills demonstrated by students taking courses in the English major, minor certification, and other degree programs of the Department. The courses were:

- ENGL 40A: Introduction to British Literature I.
- ENGL 65: Introduction to World Literatures in English.
- ENGL 110P: Second Language Learning and Teaching.
- ENGL 120A: Advanced Composition.
- ENGL 170H: Introduction To Comedy.

All student materials and data were submitted by faculty who volunteered to participate in the assessment. The materials were compared against the department evaluation rubrics by the Curriculum and Assessment Committee for parity in grade/achievement classification. Because of this “norming” by the Committee, the data and evaluation are highly reliable.

**Q4.8.** How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? 1

**NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.**

**Q4.8.1.** Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. No
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Don't know

**Q4.8.2.** Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. No
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Don't know

**Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.**

**Q5.1.** To what extent have the assessment results **from 2012-2013** been used for? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	<b>Very Much (1)</b>	<b>Quite a Bit (2)</b>	<b>Some (3)</b>	<b>Not at all (4)</b>	<b>Not Applicable (9)</b>
1. Improving specific courses					
2. Modifying curriculum					X
3. Improving advising and mentoring					X
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals					X
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations					X
6. Developing/updating assessment plan					X
7. Annual assessment reports					X
8. Program review					X
9. Prospective student and family information					X
10. Alumni communication					X
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					X



12. Program accreditation					X
13. External accountability reporting requirement					X
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					X
15. Strategic planning					X
16. Institutional benchmarking					X
17. Academic policy development or modification					X
18. Institutional Improvement					X
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					X
20. New faculty hiring					X
21. Professional development for faculty and staff					X
22. Other Specify:					

**Q5.1.1.** Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

Because we are only in the second year of a 5-year assessment cycle, we are waiting until we complete one full cycle before we make any changes or revisions to the curriculum. Further, because we are so short staffed, we are struggling to offer the courses that we need to offer to help our students proceed to timely graduation. Since we can only offer a reduced number of electives at this point in order to offer a sufficient number of required courses, there is little change that we can make in our curriculum until we can hire more faculty.

**Q5.2.** As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

X	1. Yes
	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Q5.3</b> )
	3. Don't know ( <b>Go to Q5.3</b> )

**Q5.2.1.** What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Our new assessment plan is still in its initial stages of implementation, so it is difficult to say which changes the Department will find necessary to make. At this point, it does seem that we will need to focus on assessing required courses in the future so that we establish a baseline for student learning in the major.

**Q5.2.2.** Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

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

**Q5.3.** Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

**Question 6 (Q6).** Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) <sup>1</sup>
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
X	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
X	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
X	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to assess but not included above: a. Content knowledge b. c.

**Part 3: Additional Information**

**A1.** In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
X	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet <b>developed</b> a formal assessment plan

**A2.** In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
X	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet <b>updated</b> the assessment plan

**A3.** Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

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

**A4.** Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment of **student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

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

**A5.** Does the program have any capstone class?

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

**A5.1.** If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: ENGL 198T Senior Seminar

**A6.** Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

	1. Yes
--	--------

X	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A7.** Name of the academic unit: English Bachelor of Arts (BA)

**A8.** Department in which the academic unit is located: Department of English

**A9.** Department Chair's Name: David Toise, Ph.D.

**A10.** Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014:  
One

**A11.** College in which the academic unit is located:

X	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

***Undergraduate Degree Program(s):***

**A12.** Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: Five

**A12.1.** List all the name(s):

1. English Bachelor of Arts (BA)
2. English Bachelor of Arts (BA) with Pre-Credential Preparation
3. English Minor
4. Creative Writing Minor
5. TESOL Minor

**A12.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? One

***Master Degree Program(s):***

**A13.** Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: Two

**A13.1.** List all the name(s):

1. English Master of Arts (MA)
2. TESOL Master of Arts (MA)

**A13.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program?

1. English Master of Arts (MA): Three
2. TESOL Master of Arts (MA) : One

**Credential Program(s):**

**A14.** Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: None

**A14.1.** List all the names: NA

**Doctorate Program(s)**

**A15.** Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: None

**A15.1.** List the name(s): NA

**A16.** Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit\*?

	1. Yes
X	2. No

\*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

**16.1.** If yes, please specify the name of each program: NA

**16.2.** If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: NA