

## 2016-2017 Annual Assessment Report Template

For instructions and guidelines visit our [website](#)  
or [contact us](#) for more help.

Please begin by selecting your program name in the drop down. If the program name is not listed, please enter it below:

BA English

OR

### Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

#### Q1.1.

Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs), and emboldened Graduate Learning Goals (GLGs) did you assess? [Check all that apply]

- 1. **Critical Thinking**
- 2. **Information Literacy**
- 3. **Written Communication**
- 4. **Oral Communication**
- 5. Quantitative Literacy
- 6. **Inquiry and Analysis**
- 7. Creative Thinking
- 8. Reading
- 9. Team Work
- 10. Problem Solving
- 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- 12. **Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives**
- 13. Ethical Reasoning
- 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**
- 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**
- 19. **Professionalism**
- 20. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a.

b.

c.

#### Q1.2.

Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information including how your specific PLOs are **explicitly** linked to the Sac State **BLGs/GLGs**:

**a. Brief History**

In years past, assessment for the Department has been conducted discretely from year to year. The Department had 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.

We are at Year 5 of the current 5-year Assessment Plan and Learning Outcomes plan. In this fifth year, we are taking a more holistic review of the preceding 4-year cycle, which focused on:

- critical reading,
- critical writing,
- scholarly research, and
- content area knowledge.

**b. Assessment Timeline****i. 2012-2013 Critical Reading**

"Students will demonstrate an ability to apply critical reading strategies to a variety of texts, which may include written, oral, or visual works, and to analyze language and texts using appropriate critical, theoretical, rhetorical, and disciplinary methodologies."\*

**ii. 2013-2014 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."\*

**iii. 2014-2015 Content Knowledge**

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

**2015-2016 Scholarly Research**

"Students will demonstrate an ability to perform scholarly research that incorporates analysis of primary and secondary sources using appropriate disciplinary methodologies."\*

**Q1.2.1.**

Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

1. Yes, for all PLOs
2. Yes, but for some PLOs
3. No rubrics for PLOs
4. N/A
5. Other, specify:

**Q1.3.**

Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

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

**Q1.4.**

Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?

1. Yes
2. No (skip to **Q1.5**)
3. Don't know (skip to **Q1.5**)

**Q1.4.1.**

If the answer to Q1.4 is **yes**, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

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

**Q1.5.**

Did your program use the *Degree Qualification Profile* ("DQP", see <http://degreeprofile.org>) to develop your PLO(s)?

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

**Q1.6.**

Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?

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

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

## Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO

**Q2.1.**

Select **OR** type in **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the correct box* for this PLO in Q1.1):

Select PLO

If your PLO is **not listed**, please enter it here:

5th year holistic assessment of the major: 1) critical reading, 2) critical writing, 3) scholarly res...

**Q2.1.1.**

Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

## Q2.1.1. BA ENGLISH

### a. *Assessment Data, Collection Process*

Each year of the cycle, CAC sent out a call to Program Coordinators to identify which faculty members teaching in that area might be willing to share their results for assessment. If no one was identified, then CAC sent out a general invitation to instructors of courses in the Major to participate. If that garnered no useful results, then CAC sent out targeted requests to individuals who were teaching courses that CAC thought would be important from which to collect data. For example, while individual faculty members were willing to participate, instructors of lower-division and introduction courses—such as ENGL 16, ENGL 40A/B, and ENGL 50A/B—would have produced no relevant results for the scholarly research assessment year since research is usually taught and assigned in upper-division courses. In most years, all areas were represented.

*It is important to note that instructors volunteered to participate in the assessment and were and continue to be reassured that this is **not** an assessment of their course, but rather it is an assessment of how our students are performing in those areas of assessment.*

In general, instructors were asked to provide the following:

- The instructions for a single assignment;
- Grades for one assignment relevant to the assessment focus for that year;
- o Grades were to be aggregated into 4 categories according to the rubric (i.e. outstanding, more than satisfactory, satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
- Criteria or rubric for the grades;
- o CAC cross-checked each instructor's grading criteria/rubric against the Department Assessment Rubric for norming purposes since the types of assignments ranged dramatically
- o In nearly all cases, the instructor's grading criteria/rubric closely matched the Department's

The variety of types of assignments were impressive, indicating that our Faculty design assignments that are both creative and rigorous. Also, it is important to note that the classes assessed ranged from workshops/seminars, discussion-based courses, and large lecture courses, with enrollments ranging from 23 to 120+ students per class.

[page break to keep tables on one page]

**b. Assessment Outcomes, Data**

In the following tables, the data collected from 1000 students over four years are listed. The overall data appears first, then it is listed separately by each Learning Outcome and the associated rubric on the subsequent pages.

	4			3			2		1			
	A-Range	%		B-Range	%		C-Range	%	D-Range	%	Total	
	Outstanding			More Than Satisfactory			Satisfactory		Unsatisfactory and below		Enrolled	
<b>2012-2013, CRITICAL READING</b>												
ENGL 30A (Section 1)	10	37%		9	33%		7	26%	1	4%	27	
ENGL 30A (Section 2)	6	21%		11	39%		8	29%	3	11%	28	
ENGL 30B (2 sections)	11	35%		7	23%		8	26%	5	16%	31	
ENGL 65	2	8%		15	63%		7	29%	0	0%	24	
ENGL 100B	18	51%		10	29%		7	20%	0	0%	35	
ENGL 110P	22	59%		8	22%		7	19%	0	0%	37	
ENGL 120A (3 sections)	7	49%		6	42%		1	9%	0	0%	15	
ENGL 125A	0	0%		0	0%		0	0%	0	0%	0	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>39%</b>		<b>66</b>	<b>34%</b>		<b>45</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>197</b>	
<b>2013-2014, CRITICAL WRITING</b>												
ENGL 40A	51	65%		21	18%		6	8%	0	0%	78	

ENGL 65	12		10%		74		63%	31	26%	0		0%	117	
ENGL 120A	5		24%		14		67%	1	5%	1		5%	21	
ENGL 120A F	2		6%		19		59%	10	31%	1		3%	32	
ENGL 120A S	4		14%		13		46%	10	36%	1		4%	28	
ENGL 110P	12		22%		24		44%	18	33%	1		2%	55	
ENGL 170H	12		30%		19		48%	9	23%	0		0%	40	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>98</b>		<b>26%</b>		<b>184</b>		<b>50%</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>1%</b>	<b>371</b>	
<b>2014-2015, CONTENT KNOWLEDGE</b>									99%					
ENGL 110A (Quiz 1, 2 sections)	24		31%		19		24%	12	15%	23		29%	78	
ENGL 110A (Quiz 2, 2 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	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>84</b>		<b>44%</b>		<b>46</b>		<b>24%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>33</b>		<b>17%</b>	<b>190</b>	
<b>2015-2016, SCHOLARLY RESEARCH</b>									83%	38%				
ENGL 110Q	9		35%		13		50%	4	15%	0		0%	26	
ENGL 110Q	7		21%		12		46%	7	27%	0		0%	26	
ENGL 120A	3		10%		13		45%	11	38%	2		7%	30	
ENGL 145C	20		69%		12		41%	8	28%	5		17%	47	
ENGL 150C	14		48%		15		52%	6	21%	5		17%	41	

ENGL 165F (Assn 1)	9		31%		14		48%	11		38%	1		3%	36	
ENGL 165F (Assn 2)	14		48%		15		52%	4		14%	2		7%	36	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>76</b>		<b>31%</b>		<b>94</b>		<b>39%</b>	<b>51</b>		<b>21%</b>	<b>15</b>		<b>6%</b>	<b>242</b>	
										<b>91%</b>					
<b>4-YR TOTALS</b>	<b>334</b>		<b>33%</b>		<b>390</b>		<b>39%</b>	<b>208</b>		<b>21%</b>	<b>61</b>		<b>6%</b>	<b>1000</b>	

*i. 2012-2013 Critical Reading*

"Students will demonstrate an ability to apply critical reading strategies to a variety of texts, which may include written, oral, or visual works, and to analyze language and texts using appropriate critical, theoretical, rhetorical, and disciplinary methodologies."\*

	<b>4</b>		<b>3</b>		<b>2</b>		<b>1</b>		
	<b>A-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>B-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>C-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>D-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>Outstanding</b>		<b>More Than Satisfactory</b>		<b>Satisfactory</b>		<b>Unsatisfactory and below</b>		<b>Enrolled</b>
30A (Section 1)	10	37%	9	33%	7	26%	1	4%	27
30A (Section 2)	6	21%	11	39%	8	29%	3	11%	28
30B (2 sections)	11	35%	7	23%	8	26%	5	16%	31
65	2	8%	15	63%	7	29%	0	0%	24
100B	18	51%	10	29%	7	20%	0	0%	35
110P	22	59%	8	22%	7	19%	0	0%	37

120A (3 sections)	7	49%	6	42%	1	9%	0	0%	15
125A	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>197</b>

<b>RUBRIC</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Application of critical reading strategies	Ability to read texts in a sophisticated and nuanced way	Ability to read texts in an adequate way	Demonstrates an inconsistent or limited ability to read texts in an adequate way	Fails to apply critical reading strategies
Analysis of language and texts	Demonstrates sophisticated and nuanced ability to thoroughly analyze texts	Demonstrates ability to analyze texts in an adequate way	Demonstrates an inconsistent or limited ability to analyze texts	Shows little or no analysis

**ii.**      *2013-2014 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."\*

	<b>4</b>		<b>3</b>		<b>2</b>		<b>1</b>		<b>Total Enrolled</b>



	<b>A-Range Outstanding</b>		<b>B-Range More Than Satisfactory</b>		<b>C-Range Satisfactory</b>		<b>D-Range Unsatisfactory and below</b>		
		%		%		%		%	<b>Total Enrolled</b>
ENGL 40A	51	65%	21	18%	6	8%	0	0%	78
ENGL 65	12	10%	74	63%	31	26%	0	0%	117
ENGL 120A	5	24%	14	67%	1	5%	1	5%	21
ENGL 120A F	2	6%	19	59%	10	31%	1	3%	32
ENGL 120A S	4	14%	13	46%	10	36%	1	4%	28
ENGL 110P	12	22%	24	44%	18	33%	1	2%	55
ENGL 170H	12	30%	19	48%	9	23%	0	0%	40
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>371</b>
<b>RUBRIC</b>	<b>4</b>			<b>3</b>			<b>2</b>		<b>1</b>
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
---	--	--	---	--

iii. *2014-2015 Content Knowledge*

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

	<b>4</b>		<b>%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total Enrolled</b>
	<b>A-Range Outstanding</b>			<b>B-Range More Than Satisfactory</b>		<b>C-Range Satisfactory</b>		<b>D-Range Unsatisfactory and below</b>		
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	



					<b>Satisfactory</b>						<b>tory and below</b>			
	ENGL 110Q		9		35% 13		50% 4			15% 0			0%	26
	ENGL 110Q		7		21% 12		46% 7			27% 0			0%	26
	ENGL 120A		3		10% 13		45% 11			38% 2			7%	30
	ENGL 145C		20		69% 12		41% 8			28% 5			17%	47
	ENGL 150C		14		48% 15		52% 6			21% 5			17%	41
	ENGL 165F, Assn 1		9		31% 14		48% 11			38% 1			3%	36
	ENGL 165F, Assn 2		14		48% 15		52% 4			14% 2			7%	36
	<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>76</b>		<b>31% 94</b>		<b>39% 51</b>			<b>21% 15</b>			<b>6% 242</b>	
<b>RUBRIC</b>			<b>4</b>			<b>3</b>			<b>2</b>				<b>1</b>	
Incorporate analysis of sources				The text thoroughly integrates primary, and when appropriate, secondary texts.		The text adequately analyzes texts and adequately develops ideas with supporting details.			The text shows limited analysis and development and limited				The text shows little or no analysis or development of ideas and supporting evidence,	

									supporting details.			if present, is inadequate.		
Use of appropriate disciplinary methodologies			Demonstrates sophisticated use of appropriate disciplinary methodologies			Demonstrates ability to use appropriate disciplinary methodologies			Demonstrates an inconsistent or limited ability to use appropriate disciplinary methodologies			Shows little or no ability to use appropriate disciplinary methodologies.		

v. *Combining Learning Outcomes by Course Level across Years.* When we aggregate across Learning Outcomes to assess how our students are doing holistically within the Major, we see similarly impressive results at all levels. Whether in lower-division, upper-division required, or upper-division elective, English Majors meet or exceed our standards overall.

	<b>A-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>B-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>C-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>D-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>Outstanding</b>		<b>More Than Satisfactory</b>		<b>Satisfactory</b>		<b>Unsatisfactory and below</b>		<b>Enrolled</b>

ENGL 30A (Section 1), 2012-2013	10	37%	9	33%	7	26%	1	4%	27
ENGL 30A (Section 2), 2012-2013	6	21%	11	39%	8	29%	3	11%	28
ENGL 30B (2 sections), 2012- 2013	11	35%	7	23%	8	26%	5	16%	31
ENGL 65, 2012-2013	2	8%	15	63%	7	29%	0	0%	24
ENGL 40A, 2013-2014	51	65%	21	18%	6	8%	0	0%	78
ENGL 65. 2013-2014	12	10%	74	63%	31	26%	0	0%	117
	<b>92</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>305</b>

1. *Lower-Division courses.* We weren't able to collect data from ENGL 16, but we see that in Lower-Division courses, 97% of students are performing at Satisfactory or above.

	<b>A-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>B-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>C-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>D-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	
	<b>Outstanding</b>		<b>More Than Satisfactory</b>		<b>Satisfactory</b>		<b>Unsatisfactory and below</b>		
ENGL 120A (3 sections), 2012-2013	7	49%	6	42%	1	9%	0	0%	15

ENGL 120A, 2014-2015	3	10%	13	45%	11	38%	2	7%	30
ENGL 198T, 2014- 2015	4	21%	10	53%	2	11%	3	16%	19
	<b>14</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>64</b>

2. *Upper-Division, Required Courses.* In our upper-division required courses, 91% of our students are meeting or exceeding Satisfactory Learning Outcomes.

	<b>A-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>B-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>C-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>D-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>Outstanding</b>		<b>More Than Satisfactory</b>		<b>Satisfactory</b>		<b>Unsatisfactory and below</b>		<b>Enrolled</b>
ENGL 100B, 2012- 2013	18	51%	10	29%	7	20%	0	0%	35
ENGL 110P, 2012- 2013	22	59%	8	22%	7	19%	0	0%	37
ENGL 125A, 2012-2013	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
ENGL 120A F, 2013-2014	2	6%	19	59%	10	31%	1	3%	32
ENGL 120A S, 2013-2014	4	14%	13	46%	10	36%	1	4%	28

ENGL 110P, 2013- 2014	12	22%	24	44%	18	33%	1	2%	55
ENGL 170H, 2013-2014	12	30%	19	48%	9	23%	0	0%	40
ENGL 110A (Quiz 1, both sections), 2014-2015	24	31%	19	24%	12	15%	23	29%	78
ENGL 110A (Quiz 2, both sections), 2014-2015	49	64%	12	16%	11	14%	5	6%	77
ENGL 130D, 2014-2015	7	44%	5	31%	2	13%	2	13%	16
ENGL 110Q, 2015-2016	9	35%	13	50%	4	15%	0	0%	26
ENGL 110Q, 2015-2016	7	21%	12	46%	7	27%	0	0%	26
ENGL 120A, 2015-2016	3	10%	13	45%	11	38%	2	7%	30
ENGL 145C, 2015- 2016	20	69%	12	41%	8	28%	5	17%	47



ENGL 150C, 2015-2016	14	48%	15	52%	6	21%	5	17%	41
ENGL 165F (Assn 1), 2015-2016	9	31%	14	48%	11	38%	1	3%	36
ENGL 165F (Assn 2), 2015-2016	14	48%	15	52%	4	14%	2	7%	36
	<b>226</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>640</b>

3. *Upper-Division Elective Courses.* The bulk of our Major courses are electives that serve the Open Major and Pre-Credential. In those courses, we also see evidence of high achievement, with 92% of students at Satisfactory or above.

**Q2.2.**

Has the program developed or adopted **explicit** standards of performance for this PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know
- 4. N/A

**Q2.3.**

Please **provide the rubric(s) and standards of performance** that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix.

See Q2.1.1

No file attached

No file attached

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdrd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the <b>PLO</b> , the <b>standard</b> of performance, and the <b>rubric</b> that was used to measure the PLO:
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. In <b>SOME</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. In <b>ALL</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. In the university catalogue
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10. Other, specify: <input type="text" value="Department Meetings"/>

### Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

**Q3.1.**

Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to Q6)
- 3. Don't know (skip to Q6)
- 4. N/A (skip to Q6)

**Q3.1.1.**

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

4

**Q3.2.**

Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?

1. Yes
2. No (skip to **Q6**)
3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

**Q3.2.1.**

Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected:

see Q2.1.1

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

### Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

**Q3.3.**

Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?

1. Yes
2. No (skip to **Q3.7**)
3. Don't know (skip to **Q3.7**)

**Q3.3.1.**

Which of the following direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) were used?

**[Check all that apply]**

1. Capstone project (e.g. theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
2. Key assignments from required classes in the program
3. Key assignments from elective classes
4. Classroom based performance assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques
5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects
6. E-Portfolios
7. Other Portfolios
8. Other, specify:

**Q3.3.2.**

Please **provide** the direct measure (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) you used to collect data, THEN **explain** how it assesses the PLO:

### Q3.3.2. BA ENGLISH

a. In brief, the data collected from 1000 students in 26 different courses over the last four years indicate strongly that our English majors are demonstrating satisfactory or better competency in the four learning outcomes that have been determined by the Department Faculty. These statistics combined with the Department's graduation rate indicate that our curriculum prepares our students well and allows them to graduate in a timely fashion.

With 93% of our Majors meeting Satisfactory or higher levels of achievement, it is clear that our courses and instructors are training our students extremely well according to the Department's Learning Goals. Further, the English Majors' 32% 4-year graduation rate for First-Year Native students (double the College graduation rate and quadruple the University graduation rate) and their 40% 2-Year graduation rate for Junior Transfer students (well above the 33% College rate and 26% University rate), suggests that our current structure of the Open Major also allows our students to graduate in a timely fashion.

In *Critical Reading* (2012-2013), English Majors are demonstrating strong reading skills in all 5 program areas. 95% of English Majors demonstrate competency at or above the Satisfactory level. At 39%, slightly more students demonstrate competency at the Outstanding level than at the Satisfactory level (34%). The data suggest that about 23% of English Majors' of English Majors may still with satisfactory competency in reading. *Please note: This data may be flawed as this was our first year of norming and we combined Inconsistent-but-Satisfactory and Inconsistent-and-Unsatisfactory. In subsequent years, we acknowledged that Satisfactory-but-Inconsistent belonged in the Satisfactory category and sorted the data to reflect that.*

In *Critical Writing* (2013-2014), English Majors are able to write well, with 99% showing competency at or above the Satisfactory level. The data collected here represented literature, composition, and rhetoric/linguistics. While the large majority (83%) are at the Satisfactory or More than Satisfactory levels, a significant number (26%) demonstrate Outstanding writing skills. It appears that only about 1% of English Majors are not demonstrating satisfactory competency with writing.

In *Scholarly Research* (2015-2016), English Majors are able to research and incorporate that material into their work. 93% of English Majors demonstrate competency at or above the Satisfactory level. At 61%, almost twice the number of students demonstrate competency at the Satisfactory or More than Satisfactory levels and 34% demonstrate an Outstanding level of proficiency. 6% of English Majors are not demonstrating satisfactory competency with this area.

In *Content Knowledge* (2014-2015), English Majors demonstrate knowledge appropriate for one or more disciplines. 83% of English Majors demonstrate competency at or above the Satisfactory level, with 44% demonstrating Outstanding competency and 38% at the Satisfactory or More than Satisfactory levels. 17% fall into the Unsatisfactory range.

## 2) **ASSESSMENT, 5-YEAR REVIEW: Open Discussion of Possible Future Directions**

In this section, we present a variety of possible directions for future assessment activities, in Section 3) Assessment, 5-Year Review: CAC Recommendation we present two options that seem to be important areas to cover before embarking on a new assessment cycle/plan. In the spirit of full disclosure and shared governance, however, here are the possibilities presented to CAC.

a. *Portfolio-Based Assessment and Reconfigure 198T into a Portfolio-Based course*  
ENGL 198T could be reconfigured from a topics-based research course into a Portfolio compilation course.

b. *ENGL 120A/ENGL 198T Assessment*

Since these are the only two courses that English Majors are required to take, they could be a means to track how our students are doing from one course ostensibly in the middle of their course work to the final culminating experience.

c. *Exit Exam Assessment*

Administer a required Exit Exam for all Seniors before being approved for graduation. The GRE and concomitant Subject Tests could be required of all graduating seniors.

d. *Writing Intensive Assessment*

Use the WI courses as the site for assessment.

### **3) Assessment, 5-Year Review: CAC Recommendation for Future Assessment**

After examining all the options presented to CAC at the open meeting on Friday, February 3, 2017, CAC suggests that we move in two possible directions for future assessment cycles/plans.

a. *Study how our native First-Year students compare to our Junior-Transfer students.*

A possible important piece of information that we lack is how our native First-Year and our Junior-Transfer students perform as separate groups. Since a significant portion of our Majors are Junior Transfers, are we doing the best we can to serve their needs? Do we also serve our First-Year students well? Do we need to revisit our curriculum and advising to serve both populations equitably and well?

This could be a long-range plan (5 years) that allows us to collect new information and compare that to data from the Office of Institutional Research for the previous 5 years. This kind of longitudinal study would allow us to evaluate our major and make any adjustments in terms of the kinds of courses and frequency along with advising that would help our students be more

successful in coverage of materials and skills and in time to graduation.

*b. Examine and adjust how we assess Content Knowledge.*

It is very difficult to assess how our students learn and retain Content Knowledge in the various areas of our major since our students self-select into courses based on their interests and needs.

In three of our Learning Outcomes areas, our students are demonstrating competency at or above Satisfactory levels (Reading 95%, Writing, 99%, and Research 93%), but we noticed a lower number of students demonstrating competency at Satisfactory (or above) with the outcomes for Content Knowledge (a very high 83%, but still a noticeable difference).

We discussed possible reasons for the difference:

- i. With little to no required prerequisites for many of our upper-division courses, students are sometimes being introduced to and involved in deeper learning in the materials and skills simultaneously;
- ii. Not all areas were represented (only linguistics, creative writing, and ENGL 198T submitted data) and the sample size was the smallest of the four years under review, so we have incomplete data.

What became clear from the discussion is that we need better means to assess Content Knowledge in our Majors.

 No file attached No file attached**Q3.4.**

What tool was used to evaluate the data?

1. **No** rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
7. Used other means (Answer **Q3.4.1.**)

**Q3.4.1.**

If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [Check all that apply]

1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
4. Other, specify:  (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

**Q3.4.2.**Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. N/A

**Q3.4.3.**Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the rubric**?

1. Yes
2. No

3. Don't know  
 4. N/A

**Q3.4.4.**

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

1. Yes  
 2. No  
 3. Don't know  
 4. N/A

**Q3.5.**

How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

6

**Q3.5.1.**

How many faculty members participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

6

**Q3.5.2.**

If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?

1. Yes  
 2. No  
 3. Don't know  
 4. N/A

**Q3.6.**

How did you **select** the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?

see q2.1.1

**Q3.6.1.**

How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?



see q2.1.1

**Q3.6.2.**

How many students were in the class or program?

approx 450

**Q3.6.3.**

How many samples of student work did you evaluated?

see q2.1.1

**Q3.6.4.**

Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?

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

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

### Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

**Q3.7.**

Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

1. Yes
2. No (skip to **Q3.8**)
3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8**)

**Q3.7.1.**

Which of the following indirect measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

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

**Q3.7.1.1.**

Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:

**Q3.7.2.**If surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?**Q3.7.3.**If surveys were used, how did you **select** your sample:**Q3.7.4.**

If surveys were used, what was the response rate?

### Question 3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)

---

**Q3.8.**

Were external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?

1. Yes
2. No (skip to **Q3.8.2**)
3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

**Q3.8.1.**

Which of the following measures was used? [Check all that apply]

1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams

2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.)
3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.)
4. Other, specify:

**Q3.8.2.**

Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

1. Yes
2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)
3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

**Q3.8.3.**

If other measures were used, please specify:

 No file attached

 No file attached

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

## Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

**Q4.1.**

Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO in **Q2.1**:

#### Q4.1 BA ENGLISH

a. In brief, the data collected from 1000 students in 26 different courses over the last four years indicate strongly that our English majors are demonstrating satisfactory or better competency in the four learning outcomes that have been determined by the Department Faculty. These statistics combined with the Department's graduation rate indicate that our curriculum prepares our students well and allows them to graduate in a timely fashion.

With 93% of our Majors meeting Satisfactory or higher levels of achievement, it is clear that our courses and instructors are training our students extremely well according to the Department's Learning Goals. Further, the English Majors' 32% 4-year graduation rate for First-Year Native students (double the College graduation rate and quadruple the University graduation rate) and their 40% 2-Year graduation rate for Junior Transfer students (well above the 33% College rate and 26% University rate), suggests that our current structure of the Open Major also allows our students to graduate in a timely fashion.

In *Critical Reading* (2012-2013), English Majors are demonstrating strong reading skills in all 5 program areas. 95% of English Majors demonstrate competency at or above the Satisfactory level. At 39%, slightly more students demonstrate competency at the Outstanding level than at the Satisfactory level (34%). The data suggest that about 23% of English Majors' of English Majors may still with satisfactory competency in reading. *Please note: This data may be flawed as this was our first year of norming and we combined Inconsistent-but-Satisfactory and Inconsistent-and-Unsatisfactory. In subsequent years, we acknowledged that Satisfactory-but-Inconsistent belonged in the Satisfactory category and sorted the data to reflect that.*

In *Critical Writing* (2013-2014), English Majors are able to write well, with 99% showing competency at or above the Satisfactory level. The data collected here represented literature, composition, and rhetoric/linguistics. While the large majority (83%) are at the Satisfactory or More than Satisfactory levels, a significant number (26%) demonstrate Outstanding writing skills. It appears that only about 1% of English Majors are not demonstrating satisfactory competency with writing.

In *Scholarly Research* (2015-2016), English Majors are able to research and incorporate that material into their work. 93% of English Majors demonstrate competency at or above the Satisfactory level. At 61%, almost twice the number of students demonstrate competency at the Satisfactory or More than Satisfactory levels and 34% demonstrate an Outstanding level of proficiency. 6% of English Majors are not demonstrating satisfactory competency with this area.

In *Content Knowledge* (2014-2015), English Majors demonstrate knowledge appropriate for one or more disciplines. 83% of English Majors demonstrate competency at or above the Satisfactory level, with 44% demonstrating Outstanding competency and 38% at the Satisfactory or More than Satisfactory levels. 17% fall into the Unsatisfactory range.

#### 2) **ASSESSMENT, 5-YEAR REVIEW: Open Discussion of Possible Future Directions**

In this section, we present a variety of possible directions for future assessment activities, in Section 3) Assessment, 5-Year Review: CAC Recommendation we present two options that seem to be important areas to cover before embarking on a new assessment cycle/plan. In the spirit of full disclosure and shared governance, however, here are the possibilities presented to CAC.

a. *Portfolio-Based Assessment and Reconfigure 198T into a Portfolio-Based course*  
ENGL 198T could be reconfigured from a topics-based research course into a Portfolio compilation course.

b. *ENGL 120A/ENGL 198T Assessment*

Since these are the only two courses that English Majors are required to take, they could be a means to track how our students are doing from one course ostensibly in the middle of their course work to the final culminating experience.

c. *Exit Exam Assessment*

Administer a required Exit Exam for all Seniors before being approved for graduation. The GRE and concomitant Subject Tests could be required of all graduating seniors.

d. *Writing Intensive Assessment*

Use the WI courses as the site for assessment.

### **3) Assessment, 5-Year Review: CAC Recommendation for Future Assessment**

After examining all the options presented to CAC at the open meeting on Friday, February 3, 2017, CAC suggests that we move in two possible directions for future assessment cycles/plans.

a. *Study how our native First-Year students compare to our Junior-Transfer students.*

A possible important piece of information that we lack is how our native First-Year and our Junior-Transfer students perform as separate groups. Since a significant portion of our Majors are Junior Transfers, are we doing the best we can to serve their needs? Do we also serve our First-Year students well? Do we need to revisit our curriculum and advising to serve both populations equitably and well?

This could be a long-range plan (5 years) that allows us to collect new information and compare that to data from the Office of Institutional Research for the previous 5 years. This kind of longitudinal study would allow us to evaluate our major and make any adjustments in terms of the kinds of courses and frequency along with advising that would help our students be more

successful in coverage of materials and skills and in time to graduation.

*b. Examine and adjust how we assess Content Knowledge.*



It is very difficult to assess how our students learn and retain Content Knowledge in the various areas of our major since our students self-select into courses based on their interests and needs.

In three of our Learning Outcomes areas, our students are demonstrating competency at or above Satisfactory levels (Reading 95%, Writing, 99%, and Research 93%), but we noticed a lower number of students demonstrating competency at Satisfactory (or above) with the outcomes for Content Knowledge (a very high 83%, but still a noticeable difference).

We discussed possible reasons for the difference:



- i. With little to no required prerequisites for many of our upper-division courses, students are sometimes being introduced to and involved in deeper learning in the materials and skills simultaneously;
- ii. Not all areas were represented (only linguistics, creative writing, and ENGL 198T submitted data) and the sample size was the smallest of the four years under review, so we have incomplete data.

What became clear from the discussion is that we need better means to assess Content Knowledge in our Majors.

 No file attached No file attached**Q4.2.**

Are students doing well and meeting the program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

see q4.1

 No file attached No file attached**Q4.3.**

For the selected PLO, the student performance:

- 1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard
- 2. **Met** expectation/standard
- 3. **Partially** met expectation/standard
- 4. Did not meet expectation/standard
- 5. No expectation/standard has been specified
- 6. Don't know

## Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

**Q4.4.**

Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

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

**Q4.5.**

Were **all** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?

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

## Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

**Q5.1.**

As a result of the assessment effort and based on prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate *making any changes* for your program (e.g. course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to **Q5.2**)

- 3. Don't know (skip to Q5.2)

**Q5.1.1.**

Please describe *what changes* you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes.

see q4.1

**Q5.1.2.**

Do you have a plan to assess the *impact of the changes* that you anticipate making?

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

**Q5.2.**

Since your last assessment report, **how have the assessment data from then been used** so far?

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Improving specific courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Modifying curriculum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Improving advising and mentoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Annual assessment reports	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Program review	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Prospective student and family information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Alumni communication	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Program accreditation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. External accountability reporting requirement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Strategic planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Institutional benchmarking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. Academic policy development or modifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. Institutional improvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



20. New faculty hiring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Recruitment of new students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

23. Other, specify:

**Q5.2.1.**

Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above:

See Q4.1. The department is currently examining its assessment procedures.

**Q5.3.**

To what extent did you apply **last year's feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in the following areas?

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Program Learning Outcomes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Standards of Performance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Measures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Rubrics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Alignment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Data Collection	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Data Analysis and Presentation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Use of Assessment Data	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Other, please specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q5.3.1.**

Please share with us an example of how you applied **last year's feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in any of the areas above:

Attended assessment workshops; discussed different possibilities of assessment moving forward.

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

### Additional Assessment Activities

**Q6.**

Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspect of their program *that are not related to the PLOs* (i.e. impacts of an advising center, etc.). **If** your program/academic unit has collected data on program *elements*, please briefly report your results here:

 No file attached

 No file attached

**Q7.**

What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? [Check all that apply]

- 1. **Critical Thinking**
- 2. **Information Literacy**
- 3. **Written Communication**
- 4. **Oral Communication**
- 5. Quantitative Literacy
- 6. **Inquiry and Analysis**
- 7. Creative Thinking
- 8. Reading
- 9. Team Work
- 10. Problem Solving
- 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- 12. **Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives**
- 13. Ethical Reasoning
- 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**
- 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**
- 19. **Professionalism**
- 20. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:

- a.
- b.
- c.

**Q8.** Please attach any additional files here:

 No file attached

 No file attached

 No file attached

 No file attached

**Q8.1.**

Have you attached any files to this form? If yes, please list every attached file here:

Q8 BA ENGLISH

ATTACHMENT BUTTON DOES NOT WORK; PASTED ENTIRE ASSESSMENT REPORT THAT WAS DISTRIBUTED/DISCUSSED IN THE DEPARTMENT BELOW.

Curriculum and Assessment Committee  
Department of English

**5-YEAR REVIEW  
ASSESSMENT REPORT**

March 3, 2017

Report authored by:

Jason Gieger  
Hellen Lee

Additional information provided by:

Susan Fanetti  
Ti Macklin  
Doug Rice  
Mi-Suk Seo

## 2016-2017 COMMITTEE

Susan Fanetti, Associate Professor  
Jason Geiger, Professor  
Doug Rice, Professor  
Mi-Suk Seo, Associate Professor  
Hellen Lee (Chair),  
Associate Professor and Vice Chair

## **INTRODUCTION**

This is the final report of a 5-year review cycle. There are three parts of this report:

**1. Assessment, 5-Year Review: Status of the English Major**

- a. Summary
- b. Brief History
- c. Assessment Timeline
- d. Assessment Data, Collection Process
- e. Assessment Outcomes, Data
  - i. 2012-2013 Critical Reading
  - ii. 2013-2014 Writing
  - iii. 2014-2015 Content Knowledge
  - iv. 2015-2016 Scholarly Research
  - v. Combining Learning outcome by Course Level across Years
- 1. Lower-Division courses
- 2. Upper-Division, Required courses
- 3. Upper-Division, Elective courses
- f. Assessment Outcomes, Analysis

**2. Assessment, 5-Year Review: Open Discussion of Possible Future Directions**

**3. Assessment, 5-Year Review: CAC Recommendations for Future Assessment**

The bulk of the report, Part 1, is data collected over 4 years. Part 2 encapsulates the discussion held at the Open Meeting of CAC on Friday, February 3. Part 3 includes CAC recommendations.

**1) ASSESSMENT, 5-YEAR REVIEW: Status of the English Major**

***a. Quick Summary***

Across all four Learning Outcomes, an average of 93% of 1000 English Majors perform at or above the Satisfactory level. The samples were taken from 26 different courses—ranging from introductory, large lectures to Senior Seminars—where instructors

volunteered to participate in the Department Assessment.

**b. *Brief History***

In years past, assessment for the Department has been conducted discretely from year to year. The Department had 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.

We are at Year 5 of the current 5-year Assessment Plan and Learning Outcomes plan. In this fifth year, we are taking a more holistic review of the preceding 4-year cycle, which focused on:

- critical reading,
- critical writing,
- scholarly research, and
- content area knowledge.

**c. *Assessment Timeline***

i. *2012-2013 Critical Reading*

"Students will demonstrate an ability to apply critical reading strategies to a variety of texts, which may include written, oral, or visual

works, and to analyze language and texts using appropriate critical, theoretical, rhetorical, and disciplinary methodologies."\*

ii. *2013-2014 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."\*

iii. *2014-2015 Content Knowledge*

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

iv. *2015-2016 Scholarly Research*

"Students will demonstrate an ability to perform scholarly research that incorporates analysis of primary and secondary sources using appropriate disciplinary methodologies."\*

d. *Assessment Data, Collection Process*

Each year of the cycle, CAC sent out a call to Program Coordinators to identify which faculty members teaching in that area might be willing to share their results for assessment. If no one was identified, then CAC sent out a general invitation to instructors of courses in the Major to participate. If that garnered no useful results, then CAC sent out targeted requests to individuals who were teaching courses that CAC thought would be important from which to collect data. For example, while individual faculty members were willing to participate, instructors of lower-division and introduction courses—such as ENGL 16, ENGL 40A/B, and ENGL 50A/B—would have produced no relevant results for the scholarly research assessment year since research is usually taught and assigned in upper-division courses. In most years, all areas were represented.

*It is important to note that instructors volunteered to participate in the assessment and were and continue to be reassured that this is **not** an assessment of their course, but rather it is an assessment of how our students are performing in those areas of assessment.*

In general, instructors were asked to provide the following:

- The instructions for a single assignment;
- Grades for one assignment relevant to the assessment focus for that year;
- o Grades were to be aggregated into 4 categories according to the rubric (i.e. outstanding, more than satisfactory, satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
- Criteria or rubric for the grades;
- o CAC cross-checked each instructors grading criteria/rubric against the Department Assessment Rubric for norming purposes since the types of assignments ranged dramatically
- o In nearly all cases, the instructor's grading criteria/rubric closely matched the Department's

The variety of types of assignments were impressive, indicating that our Faculty design assignments that are both creative and rigorous. Also, it is important to note that the classes assessed ranged from workshops/seminars, discussion-based courses, and large lecture courses, with enrollments ranging from 23 to 120+ students per class.

[page break to keep tables on one page]

**e. Assessment Outcomes, Data**

In the following tables, the data collected from 1000 students over four years are listed. The overall data appears first, then it is listed separately by each Learning Outcome and the associated rubric on the subsequent pages.

	4		3		2		1			
	A-Range	%	B-Range	%	C-Range	%	D-Range	%	Total	
	Outstanding		More Than Satisfactory		Satisfactory		Unsatisfactory and below		Enrolled	
<b>2012-2013, CRITICAL READING</b>										
ENGL 30A (Section 1)	10	37%	9	33%	7	26%	1	4%	27	



ENGL 30A (Section 2)	6		21%		11		39%	8		29%	3		11%	28	
ENGL 30B (2 sections)	11		35%		7		23%	8		26%	5		16%	31	
ENGL 65	2		8%		15		63%	7		29%	0		0%	24	
ENGL 100B	18		51%		10		29%	7		20%	0		0%	35	
ENGL 110P	22		59%		8		22%	7		19%	0		0%	37	
ENGL 120A (3 sections)	7		49%		6		42%	1		9%	0		0%	15	
ENGL 125A	0		0%		0		0%	0		0%	0		0%	0	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>76</b>		<b>39%</b>		<b>66</b>		<b>34%</b>	<b>45</b>		<b>23%</b>	<b>9</b>		<b>5%</b>	<b>197</b>	
<b>2013-2014, CRITICAL WRITING</b>															
ENGL 40A	51		65%		21		18%	6		8%	0		0%	78	
ENGL 65	12		10%		74		63%	31		26%	0		0%	117	
ENGL 120A	5		24%		14		67%	1		5%	1		5%	21	
ENGL 120A F	2		6%		19		59%	10		31%	1		3%	32	
ENGL 120A S	4		14%		13		46%	10		36%	1		4%	28	
ENGL 110P	12		22%		24		44%	18		33%	1		2%	55	
ENGL 170H	12		30%		19		48%	9		23%	0		0%	40	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>98</b>		<b>26%</b>		<b>184</b>		<b>50%</b>	<b>85</b>		<b>23%</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>1%</b>	<b>371</b>	
<b>2014-2015, CONTENT KNOWLEDGE</b>										99%					
ENGL 110A (Quiz 1, 2 sections)	24		31%		19		24%	12		15%	23		29%	78	

ENGL 110A (Quiz 2, 2 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	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>84</b>		<b>44%</b>		<b>46</b>		<b>24%</b>	<b>27</b>		<b>14%</b>	<b>33</b>		<b>17%</b>	<b>190</b>	
<b>2015-2016, SCHOLARLY RESEARCH</b>										83%	38%				
ENGL 110Q	9		35%		13		50%	4		15%	0		0%	26	
ENGL 110Q	7		21%		12		46%	7		27%	0		0%	26	
ENGL 120A	3		10%		13		45%	11		38%	2		7%	30	
ENGL 145C	20		69%		12		41%	8		28%	5		17%	47	
ENGL 150C	14		48%		15		52%	6		21%	5		17%	41	
ENGL 165F (Assn 1)	9		31%		14		48%	11		38%	1		3%	36	
ENGL 165F (Assn 2)	14		48%		15		52%	4		14%	2		7%	36	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>76</b>		<b>31%</b>		<b>94</b>		<b>39%</b>	<b>51</b>		<b>21%</b>	<b>15</b>		<b>6%</b>	<b>242</b>	
										<b>91%</b>					
<b>4-YR TOTALS</b>	<b>334</b>		<b>33%</b>		<b>390</b>		<b>39%</b>	<b>208</b>		<b>21%</b>	<b>61</b>		<b>6%</b>	<b>1000</b>	

*i. 2012-2013 Critical Reading*

"Students will demonstrate an ability to apply critical reading strategies to a variety of texts, which may include written, oral, or visual works, and to analyze language and texts using appropriate critical, theoretical, rhetorical, and disciplinary methodologies."\*

	<b>4</b>		<b>3</b>		<b>2</b>		<b>1</b>		
	<b>A-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>B-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>C-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>D-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>Outstanding</b>		<b>More Than Satisfactory</b>		<b>Satisfactory</b>		<b>Unsatisfactory and below</b>		<b>Enrolled</b>
30A (Section 1)	10	37%	9	33%	7	26%	1	4%	27
30A (Section 2)	6	21%	11	39%	8	29%	3	11%	28
30B (2 sections)	11	35%	7	23%	8	26%	5	16%	31
65	2	8%	15	63%	7	29%	0	0%	24
100B	18	51%	10	29%	7	20%	0	0%	35
110P	22	59%	8	22%	7	19%	0	0%	37
120A (3 sections)	7	49%	6	42%	1	9%	0	0%	15
125A	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>197</b>

<b>RUBRIC</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Application of critical reading strategies	Ability to read texts in a sophisticated and nuanced way	Ability to read texts in an adequate way	Demonstrates an inconsistent or limited ability to read texts in an adequate way	Fails to apply critical reading strategies
Analysis of language and texts	Demonstrates sophisticated and nuanced ability to thoroughly analyze texts	Demonstrates ability to analyze texts in an adequate way	Demonstrates an inconsistent or limited ability to analyze texts	Shows little or no analysis

ii. 2013-2014 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."\*

	4		3		2		1		Total Enrolled
	A-Range Outstanding		B-Range More Than Satisfactory		C-Range Satisfactory		D-Range Unsatisfactory and below		Total Enrolled
		%		%		%		%	Total Enrolled
ENGL 40A	51	65%	21	18%	6	8%	0	0%	78
ENGL 65	12	10%	74	63%	31	26%	0	0%	117
ENGL 120A	5	24%	14	67%	1	5%	1	5%	21
ENGL 120A F	2	6%	19	59%	10	31%	1	3%	32
ENGL 120A S	4	14%	13	46%	10	36%	1	4%	28
ENGL 110P	12	22%	24	44%	18	33%	1	2%	55
ENGL 170H	12	30%	19	48%	9	23%	0	0%	40
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>371</b>

<b>RUBRIC</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
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

iii. *2014-2015 Content Knowledge*

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

	<b>4</b>			<b>3</b>		<b>2</b>		<b>1</b>		
	<b>A-Range Outstanding</b>		%	<b>B-Range More Than Satisfactory</b>	%	<b>C-Range Satisfactory</b>	%	<b>D-Range Unsatisfactory and below</b>	%	<b>Total Enrolled</b>

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
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>84</b>		<b>44%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>190</b>

<b>RUBRIC</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
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



RUBRIC			4			3			2			1		
Incorporate analysis of sources	The text thoroughly integrates primary, and when appropriate, secondary texts.		The text adequately analyzes texts and adequately develops ideas with supporting details.			The text shows limited analysis and development and limited supporting details.			The text shows little or no analysis or development of ideas and supporting evidence, if present, is inadequate.					
Use of appropriate disciplinary methodologies	Demonstrates sophisticated use of appropriate disciplinary methodologies		Demonstrates ability to use appropriate disciplinary methodologies			Demonstrates an inconsistent or limited ability to use appropriate disciplinary methodologies			Shows little or no ability to use appropriate disciplinary methodologies.					

v. *Combining Learning Outcomes by Course Level across Years.* When we aggregate across Learning Outcomes to assess how our students are doing holistically within the Major, we see similarly impressive results at all levels. Whether in lower-division, upper-division required, or upper-division elective, English Majors meet or exceed our standards overall.



	<b>A-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>B-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>C-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>D-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>Outstanding</b>		<b>More Than Satisfactory</b>		<b>Satisfactory</b>		<b>Unsatisfactory and below</b>		<b>Enrolled</b>
ENGL 30A (Section 1), 2012-2013	10	37%	9	33%	7	26%	1	4%	27
ENGL 30A (Section 2), 2012-2013	6	21%	11	39%	8	29%	3	11%	28
ENGL 30B (2 sections), 2012-2013	11	35%	7	23%	8	26%	5	16%	31
ENGL 65, 2012-2013	2	8%	15	63%	7	29%	0	0%	24
ENGL 40A, 2013-2014	51	65%	21	18%	6	8%	0	0%	78
ENGL 65. 2013-2014	12	10%	74	63%	31	26%	0	0%	117
	<b>92</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>305</b>

1. *Lower-Division courses.* We weren't able to collect data from ENGL 16, but we see that in Lower-Division courses, 97% of students are performing at Satisfactory or above.

	<b>A-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>B-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>C-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>D-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	
	<b>Outstanding</b>		<b>More Than Satisfactory</b>		<b>Satisfactory</b>		<b>Unsatisfactory and below</b>		
ENGL 120A (3	7	49%	6	42%	1	9%	0	0%	15

sections), 2012-2013									
ENGL 120A, 2014-2015	3	10%	13	45%	11	38%	2	7%	30
ENGL 198T, 2014- 2015	4	21%	10	53%	2	11%	3	16%	19
	<b>14</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>64</b>

2. *Upper-Division, Required Courses.* In our upper-division required courses, 91% of our students are meeting or exceeding Satisfactory Learning Outcomes.

	<b>A-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>B-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>C-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>D-Range</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>Outstanding</b>		<b>More Than Satisfactory</b>		<b>Satisfactory</b>		<b>Unsatisfactory and below</b>		<b>Enrolled</b>
ENGL 100B, 2012- 2013	18	51%	10	29%	7	20%	0	0%	35
ENGL 110P, 2012- 2013	22	59%	8	22%	7	19%	0	0%	37
ENGL 125A, 2012-2013	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
ENGL 120A F, 2013-2014	2	6%	19	59%	10	31%	1	3%	32

ENGL 120A S, 2013-2014	4	14%	13	46%	10	36%	1	4%	28
ENGL 110P, 2013- 2014	12	22%	24	44%	18	33%	1	2%	55
ENGL 170H, 2013-2014	12	30%	19	48%	9	23%	0	0%	40
ENGL 110A (Quiz 1, both sections), 2014-2015	24	31%	19	24%	12	15%	23	29%	78
ENGL 110A (Quiz 2, both sections), 2014-2015	49	64%	12	16%	11	14%	5	6%	77
ENGL 130D, 2014-2015	7	44%	5	31%	2	13%	2	13%	16
ENGL 110Q, 2015-2016	9	35%	13	50%	4	15%	0	0%	26
ENGL 110Q, 2015-2016	7	21%	12	46%	7	27%	0	0%	26
ENGL 120A, 2015-2016	3	10%	13	45%	11	38%	2	7%	30

ENGL 145C, 2015-2016	20	69%	12	41%	8	28%	5	17%	47
ENGL 150C, 2015-2016	14	48%	15	52%	6	21%	5	17%	41
ENGL 165F (Assn 1), 2015-2016	9	31%	14	48%	11	38%	1	3%	36
ENGL 165F (Assn 2), 2015-2016	14	48%	15	52%	4	14%	2	7%	36
	<b>226</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>640</b>

3. *Upper-Division Elective Courses.* The bulk of our Major courses are electives that serve the Open Major and Pre-Credential. In those courses, we also see evidence of high achievement, with 92% of students at Satisfactory or above.

f. *Assessment Outcomes, Analysis*

In brief, the data collected from 1000 students in 26 different courses over the last four years indicate strongly that our English majors are demonstrating satisfactory or better competency in the four learning outcomes that have been determined by the Department Faculty. These statistics combined with the Department's graduation rate indicate that our curriculum prepares our students well and allows them to graduate in a timely fashion.

With 93% of our Majors meeting Satisfactory or higher levels of achievement, it is clear that our courses and instructors are training our students extremely well according to the Department's Learning Goals. Further, the English Majors' 32% 4-year graduation rate for First-Year Native students (double the College graduation rate and quadruple the University graduation rate) and their 40% 2-Year graduation rate for Junior Transfer students (well above the 33% College rate and 26% University rate), suggests that our current structure of the Open Major also allows our students to graduate in a timely fashion.

In *Critical Reading* (2012-2013), English Majors are demonstrating strong reading skills in all 5 program areas. 95% of English Majors demonstrate competency at or above the Satisfactory level. At 39%, slightly more students demonstrate competency at the Outstanding level than at the Satisfactory level (34%). The data suggest that about 23% of English Majors may still with satisfactory competency in reading. *Please note: This data may be flawed as this was our first year of norming and we combined Inconsistent-but-Satisfactory and Inconsistent-and-Unsatisfactory. In subsequent years, we acknowledged that Satisfactory-but-Inconsistent belonged in the Satisfactory category and sorted the data to reflect that.*

In *Critical Writing* (2013-2014), English Majors are able to write well, with 99% showing competency at or above the Satisfactory level. The data collected here represented literature, composition, and rhetoric/linguistics. While the large majority (83%) are at the Satisfactory or More than Satisfactory levels, a significant number (26%) demonstrate Outstanding writing skills. It appears that only about 1% of English Majors are not demonstrating satisfactory competency with writing.

In *Scholarly Research* (2015-2016), English Majors are able to research and incorporate that material into their work. 93% of English Majors demonstrate competency at or above the Satisfactory level. At 61%, almost twice the number of students demonstrate competency at the Satisfactory or More than Satisfactory levels and 34% demonstrate an Outstanding level of proficiency. 6% of English Majors are not demonstrating satisfactory competency with this area.

In *Content Knowledge* (2014-2015), English Majors demonstrate knowledge appropriate for one or more disciplines. 83% of English Majors demonstrate competency at or above the Satisfactory level, with 44% demonstrating Outstanding competency and 38% at the Satisfactory or More than Satisfactory levels. 17% fall into the Unsatisfactory range.

## 2) **ASSESSMENT, 5-YEAR REVIEW: Open Discussion of Possible Future Directions**

In this section, we present a variety of possible directions for future assessment activities, in Section 3) Assessment, 5-Year Review: CAC Recommendation we present two options that seem to be important areas to cover before embarking on a new assessment cycle/plan. In the spirit of full disclosure and shared governance, however, here are the possibilities presented to CAC.

- a. *Portfolio-Based Assessment and Reconfigure 198T into a Portfolio-Based course*  
ENGL 198T could be reconfigured from a topics-based research course into a Portfolio compilation course.

b. *ENGL 120A/ENGL 198T Assessment*

Since these are the only two courses that English Majors are required to take, they could be a means to track how our students are doing from one course ostensibly in the middle of their course work to the final culminating experience.

c. *Exit Exam Assessment*

Administer a required Exit Exam for all Seniors before being approved for graduation. The GRE and concomitant Subject Tests could be required of all graduating seniors.

d. *Writing Intensive Assessment*

Use the WI courses as the site for assessment.

**3) Assessment, 5-Year Review: CAC Recommendation for Future Assessment**

After examining all the options presented to CAC at the open meeting on Friday, February 3, 2017, CAC suggests that we move in two possible directions for future assessment cycles/plans.

a. *Study how our native First-Year students compare to our Junior-Transfer students.*

A possible important piece of information that we lack is how our native First-Year and our Junior-Transfer students perform as separate groups. Since a significant portion of our Majors are Junior Transfers, are we doing the best we can to serve their needs? Do we also serve our First-Year students well? Do we need to revisit our curriculum and advising to serve both populations equitably and well?

This could be a long-range plan (5 years) that allows us to collect new information and compare that to data from the Office of Institutional Research for the previous 5 years. This kind of longitudinal study would allow us to evaluate our major and make any adjustments in terms of the kinds of courses and frequency along with advising that would help our students be more successful in coverage of materials and skills and in time to graduation.

*b. Examine and adjust how we assess Content Knowledge.*

It is very difficult to assess how our students learn and retain Content Knowledge in the various areas of our major since our students self-select into courses based on their interests and needs.

In three of our Learning Outcomes areas, our students are demonstrating competency at or above Satisfactory levels (Reading 95%, Writing, 99%, and Research 93%), but we noticed a lower number of students demonstrating competency at Satisfactory (or above) with the outcomes for Content Knowledge (a very high 83%, but still a noticeable difference).

We discussed possible reasons for the difference:

- i. With little to no required prerequisites for many of our upper-division courses, students are sometimes being introduced to and involved in deeper learning in the materials and skills simultaneously;
- ii. Not all areas were represented (only linguistics, creative writing, and ENGL 198T submitted data) and the sample size was the smallest of the four years under review, so we have incomplete data.

What became clear from the discussion is that we need better means to assess Content Knowledge in our Majors.

###

### Program Information (**Required**)

**Program:**

(If you typed your program name at the beginning, please skip to Q10)

**Q9.**

Program/Concentration Name: [skip if program name appears above]

BA English

**Q10.**

Report Author(s):

Profs Lee, Fanetti, Gieger, Macklin, Rice, Seo

**Q10.1.**

Department Chair/Program Director:

Prof Toise

**Q10.2.**

Assessment Coordinator:



Prof Lee

**Q11.**

Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit

English

**Q12.**

College:

College of Arts & Letters

**Q13.**

Total enrollment for Academic Unit during assessment semester (see Departmental Fact Book):

approx 450

**Q14.**

Program Type:

1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
2. Credential
3. Master's Degree
4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)
5. Other, specify:

**Q15.** Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

2

**Q15.1.** List all the names:

English

English (pre-credential)

**Q15.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

0

**Q16.** Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

2

**Q16.1.** List all the names:

English MA

Tesol MA

**Q16.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

3

**Q17.** Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

0

**Q17.1.** List all the names:

**Q18.** Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

**Q18.1.** List all the names:

When was your <b>assessment plan...</b>	1. Before 2011-12	2. 2012-13	3. 2013-14	4. 2014-15	5. 2015-16	6. 2016-17	7. No Plan	8. Don't know
<b>Q19.</b> developed?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Q19.1.</b> last updated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q19.2. (REQUIRED)**

Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **assessment plan**:

 No file attached

**Q20.**

Has your program developed a **curriculum map**?

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

**Q20.1.**

Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **curriculum map**:

 No file attached

**Q21.**

Has your program indicated in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

- 1. Yes

- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Q22.**

Does your program have a capstone class?

- 1. Yes, indicate:
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Q22.1.**

Does your program have **any** capstone project?

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

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

ver. 5.15/17