

2014-2015 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), 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):

Julie Yen

Professor and Acting Vice Chair, Department of English

Acting Chair, Curriculum and Assessment Committee, Department of English

David Toise

Chair, Department of English

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 Kim Zarins, Creative Writing;
- Associate Professor Angus Dunstan, English Education;
- Assistant Professor Reiko Komiyama, TESOL;
- The Committee has two student representatives: Valerie Smith (Undergraduate Student Representative) and Brittney Farrand (Graduate Student Representative).

B3. Fall 2013 enrollment:

Use the *Department Fact Book 2014* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2014 enrollment:

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

FTES: 1,265.3 FTEs for Fall 2013 (department total)

of students: **452 majors, 96 graduate students**

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 2014-2015 Annual Assessment

Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2014-2015.

Q1.1. Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess **in 2014-2015**? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) *
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	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
X	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above: a. Content Knowledge 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 Knowledge.

Description of Content Knowledge:

“Students will demonstrate content knowledge appropriate to one or more 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 (If no, go to Q1.4)
	3. Don’t know (Go to Q1.4)

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 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 **2014-2015 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 ALL PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for SOME PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	3. No (If no, go to Q2.2)
	4. Don't know (Go to Q2.2)
	5. Not Applicable (Go to Q2.2)

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 Content Knowledge

Students will demonstrate content knowledge appropriate to one or more of our various disciplines.

	4	3	2	1
Content knowledge appropriate to one or more of our various disciplines	Demonstrates thorough understanding of content knowledge appropriate to one or more of our various disciplines	Demonstrates adequate understanding of content knowledge appropriate to one or more of our various disciplines	Demonstrates limited understanding of content knowledge appropriate to one or more of our various disciplines	Demonstrates inadequate understanding of content knowledge appropriate to one or more of our various disciplines

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

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q3.1)

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

	1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In ALL 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 50A. Introduction to American Literature I. Major developments in the literature of America from the beginnings through the Civil War.

ENGL 110A. Linguistics and the English Language. Survey of modern English and the basic concepts of modern linguistics. Students will learn how linguists view regularity in language, as exemplified by data from English. Students will also learn how English spelling is an imperfect representation of sounds, how the sound system of English operates, how words and sentences are formed and may be analyzed, how the language changes over time, space, and social setting, and how the language is learned by children and adults.

ENGL 130D. Meter and Rhythm. Offers an in-depth study of prosody including the principles of meter (line measurement) and scansion (the marking of stressed syllables to determine meter and rhythm), as well as examining the relationship of these principles to verse in English. Examines a variety of poetic schemes, tropes, and forms.

ENGL 198T. Senior Seminar In English. Features specialized topics taught by a variety of instructors depending upon the semester. Topics can include subject matter from literature, linguistics, English education, creative writing, composition/rhetoric, and film. Tend to the production of a significant research paper, a paper which 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. Prerequisite: ENGL 120A and a minimum of 90 units.

Course Categories:

ENGL 50A Introduction to American Literature I is one 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. It is also a required course for the Single Subject Matter Program.

ENGL 110A Linguistics and the English Language is one of our required upper-division 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 130D Meter and Rhythm is an upper-division elective course.

ENGL 198T Senior Seminar In English 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

FALL 2014 BY COURSE	OUTSTANDING 4-A	%	MORE THAN SATISFACTORY 3-B	%	SATISFACTORY 2-C	%	UNSATISFACTORY 1-D and below	%	TOTAL ENROLLED
ENGL 50A	60	53%	25	22%	14	12%	14	12%	113
ENGL 110A (Quiz 1, both sections)	24	31%	19	24%	12	15%	23	29%	78
ENGL 110A (Quiz 2, both sections)	49	64%	12	16%	11	14%	5	6%	77
ENGL 130D	7	44%	5	31%	2	13%	2	13%	16
ENGL 198T	4	21%	10	53%	2	11%	3	16%	19
FALL 2014 TOTAL ENROLLED									303
303	144	48%	71	23%	41	14%	47	16%	

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].

Yes; 85% of the students meet the expectations/standard are satisfactory or above.

Additional observations:

A) Please note that the quizzes in Engl 110A were taken at different points in the semester: quiz 1 was taken early on in the semester; quiz 2 was taken towards the end. Combining the two quiz results would bring those scores into line with the other upper and lower division classes

assessed. For example, if we combine the “outstanding” category for each quiz together (73 quizzes) then approximately 47% of the scores fall in to that category.

B) There is a fall-off in the number of students in the “outstanding” category in our capstone senior-seminar course. While 85% of the senior seminar students are “satisfactory” or above for this PLO, and that is consistent with the overall results of our assessment, the percent of students in the “outstanding” category is only 21% (compared with 48% overall).

We speculate two factors might account for this difference: 1) Overall, the senior seminar places greater demands on students in terms of combining content knowledge, research, and writing. The greater emphasis on the synthesis of several different kinds of (related) skills in this course may mean that students have difficulty achieving “outstanding” in any one category. Another factor may be that the greater emphasis independent research and writing and revision may overshadow students’ work on other skills. This might suggest the need for a greater number of smaller classes in the major where students can get more practice and feedback in both of those areas.

Overall, however, the fact that the same number of students are doing work that is “satisfactory” and above in a consistent way (85%) suggests that students in the senior seminar and other courses are meeting the expectations and standards of this outcome.

Q3.4.1. First PLO: Content Knowledge

	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) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	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
X	19. Other PLO. Specify: Content Knowledge

Direct Measures

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

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

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

X	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
X	2. Key assignments from other CORE 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 50A Introduction to American Literature I: Final Exam

ENGL 110A Linguistics and the English Language: Two mid-semester quizzes.

ENGL 130D Meter and Rhythm: Prosody assignment applying iconic and frame theories.

ENGL 198T Senior Seminar In English: 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 content knowledge, the Committee considered the types of courses to be relevant in assessing knowledge in the various disciplines housed in the Department. For this purpose, the Committee asked for volunteers from all teaching faculty in the Department and made specific requests to faculty teaching courses across the disciplines and from core course in the major.

In response to the request for volunteers, the Committee received replies from four 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 (If no, go to Q4.6)

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 (Go to Q4.7)
X	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.7)

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]

The data is reliable and valid. Examples or test scores of student work from several 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 content knowledge demonstrated by students taking courses in the English major, minor certification, and other degree programs of the Department.

The courses were:

- ENGL 50A. Introduction to American Literature I;
- ENGL 110A. Linguistics and the English Language;
- ENGL 130D. Meter and Rhythm; and
- ENGL 198T. Senior Seminar In English.

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?

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

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

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	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**]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicabl e (9)
1. Improving specific courses					X
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 in the third 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 (If no, go to Q5.3)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q5.3)

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) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	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
X	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to assess but not included above: a. Scholarly Research 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 developed 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 updated 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 2014-2015:
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