

**The Department of English, Comparative Literature and
Linguistics
2011 Program Performance Review
Department Self Study**



**submitted by
Dr. Sheryl I. Fontaine, Chair**

Table of Contents

Narrative	3
Appendix I: Undergraduate Degree Programs	22
Table 1-A, 1-B Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments	22
Table 2-A Enrollment in FTES	24
Table 2-B Enrollment Headcount	25
Table 3-A, 3-B Graduation Rates	26
Table 4 Degrees Awarded	29
Appendix II: Graduate Degree Programs	30
Table 5 Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments	30
Table 6-A Enrollment in FTES	31
Table 6-B Enrollment Headcount	32
Table 7 Graduation Rates	33
Appendix III: Documenting Academic Achievement	35
Appendix IV: Faculty	36
Appendix V: Resources	37
Appendix VI: Department Long-term Planning	38
Appendix VII: Assessment	40
ENGL 99 Portfolio Scoring Rubric	40
Analysis of Writing Anxiety, ENGL 100/100W	41
Assessment of Senior English Majors' Writing Skills	42
M.A. Exam Scoring Rubric	43
SLO for G.E. 2A and Scoring rubric	45

The Department of English, Comparative Literature and Linguistics¹

I. Department Mission, Goals, and Environment

A. Department Mission within the University: Our department mission has not changed appreciably since our last program review. We continue to build and support a community of researchers and educators who care intensely about the study of literature and writing and who value the learning. The department seeks to sustain and support faculty who have completed advanced study in literature from a variety of cultural and historical traditions, including literary studies, literary theory, creative writing, rhetorical studies, and English education.

Our undergraduate and graduate programs emphasize the production of academic, professional, and creative writing and the study of the literatures of England and America, and intersecting countries across the globe. We create various and varied pedagogical opportunities to challenge students to examine the diverse ways in which writing and literature let us see the past, understand advanced rhetorical and linguistic techniques, and make sense of the world through narrative.

We seek to offer our majors the chance develop leadership skills in English service organizations and academic programs and to hone advanced research and communication techniques through collaborative research with fellow students and with faculty.

The major in English prepares students for any of the wide range of professions that expect excellence in reading and writing—including education, creative and professional writing, public service and preparation for further study in literature, law, medicine, or business. In particular, we prepare students for careers in elementary and secondary school teaching and provide an academic foundation for students who intend to pursue advanced degrees in preparation for teaching at the college level.

The University's own mission, goals, and strategies provide an appropriate framework for our department mission, reflecting the University's attention to improving student learning through appropriate curricula and pedagogy; creating and supporting high quality academic programs; supporting the scholarly and creative activity of faculty and students; creating advising, curricular, and pedagogical means for helping all students to succeed; developing internship, outreach, and alumni partnerships beyond the campus; and serving the Department, College and University communities.

B. Responding to changes in the discipline: Most recently, the discipline of English Studies has moved away from a field-coverage model curriculum toward a more expansive and flexible paradigm based on learning outcomes that combine rigorous scholarly inquiry with practical career preparation. The Department has been responsive to these developments in several ways: hiring faculty whose own academic preparation has occurred within this new paradigm; revising our own graduate program with a similar paradigmatic structure; creating a professional certificate for graduate students; reviewing our undergraduate curriculum so as to determine the need to make revisions parallel to those in the graduate program. In the field of composition, there has been growing evidence of the benefits for basic writing students of intensive, focused instruction and for advanced writing students of instruction in the use of disciplinary conventions. In light of this evidence, we have piloted a new lower-division writing course, revised our upper division major and non-major writing courses, and redesigned our graduate study plan and culminating experience.

¹ This PPR does not include reports from the English Education or Linguistics programs. Both programs are assigned their own PPR report schedules.

C. Future Priorities: For students' success, our most immediate priorities are to provide helpful mentoring and advising opportunities and to assess the changes we have made in the curriculum so as to be certain that students achieve the desired learning outcomes. For faculty success, our priority is to provide new hires as well as established colleagues with a supportive intellectual environment and adequate time for them to become successful teachers and scholars.

II. Department Description and Analysis

A. Curricular Changes

Developing a Comparatist Approach: Since the last program review in 2004, after much discussion per the recommendation of the reviewers, the Department chose to discontinue the M.A. degree in Comparative Literature. Because of faculty retirements, the Department was unable to offer sufficient course work to sustain a viable program. When the Comparative Literature M.A. program was discontinued in May 2006, only 4 degrees had been granted in the previous 5 years. In the undergraduate program, the number of CPLT majors averages at around 10 students.

Nonetheless, the Department's commitment to the study of comparative literatures and cultures remains strong. Enrollments in CPLT courses are good, particularly the world literature survey courses (324, 325), which satisfy general education requirements, requirements in the secondary teaching credential program and in the English major. In an attempt to attract more CPLT majors and increase enrollment in CPLT courses, in 2009 we hired a tenure-track Comparatist specializing in Latin American literature and culture, replaced courses in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Russian Literature that we had been able to staff in nearly a decade with courses from the areas of European and Latin American Studies, and added a comparative studies requirement to the English major. Students must take at least one of the major's courses from those designated as "comparative." These courses include our existing surveys of world literature and courses in African Literature, Asian Literature, Classical Mythology, Literature of the Vietnam War, the Bible as Literature, Renaissance Literature and Medieval Literature as well as the European Novel (fall 2012) and Literature of the Americas (spring 2011.)

Developing a Linguistics Presence in the English Department: We are currently conducting a tenure-track search for a Linguist who will become the second full-time Linguist in the Department. Since the death of one full professor and the departure of another full professor to serve as Dean of the College, the Linguistics program has relied upon one fulltime faculty member, one full time lecturer, and help from faculty from other departments and part-time lecturers. While we hope to bring coherence and strength to the Linguistics Program with the new hire, we also intend to find better ways of combining English literary and linguistics studies within the Department.

Changes in writing courses: The Department has successfully phased in two advanced composition courses that will better meet the needs of English majors and majors seeking the secondary teaching credential. ENGL 307, Advanced Composition in English Studies, replaces ENGL 301 as the upper-division writing requirement for majors. This new course trains students in the writing styles of the discipline of English Studies, including literature analysis and theory, composition and rhetoric, creative writing, textual, and comparative studies. ENGL 302, Advanced Composition for the Secondary Teacher, introduces students to the various modes of writing in the high school curriculum and encourages students to develop strategies for teaching these modes and conducting literary analysis in the high school classroom. ENGL 301, Advanced Composition, continues to be offered for non-English majors and provides an excellent "writing in the disciplines" course for students whose home departments do not offer a specialized writing course.

In Summer 2010, we piloted ENGL 100/100W, an intensive, 10 hour/week writing course and workshop that is designed for students with “remedial” EPT scores and that meets both the remediation and the lower-division writing requirement. The purpose of ENGL 100 (three units), Analytic College Writing, is to improve students’ ability to compose analytic college essays that include appropriate thesis development, support, and rhetorical strategies and that are conventionally and grammatically correct. ENGL 100W (one unit), Analytic College Writing Workshop, serves as the co-requisite of English 100 and requires that each week of the semester students complete two hours of assigned tutorial, group, and/or computer activities for practicing and improving their writing. In order to receive a passing grade in ENGL 100, students must also complete the assigned activities for ENGL 100W. Section III.B includes a description of the program assessment that was employed.

Besides maintaining a focus on disciplinary and conventional writing in English Studies, the English Department has expanded its creative writing offerings beyond traditional poetry and prose genres to include creative non-fiction, alternative genres (science and fantasy fiction), and autobiographical writing. A course in playwriting/screenplay writing in the Theater Department has satisfied student requests for this genre, but in the near future, a current faculty member will be able to offer a playwriting course in a two-year rotation with other genre-writing courses. Finally, in this spring semester of 2011, the English Department has revived ENGL 360, Scientific and Technical Writing, which has not been taught for five years, since a faculty member’s retirement. The lecturer teaching the course has an undergraduate degree in biology and a Ph.D. in literature. If the class goes well, we plan to offer at least one section per semester, particularly for students in the sciences or social sciences who wish to strengthen their writing skills and for our majors who wish to develop writing skills for the work force. We will also be looking for part time faculty qualified to teach our long-dormant upper division writing course on Legal Writing. As department budgets are strained, we anticipate the need to provide additional sections of upper division writing courses to help out our colleagues across campus that may not have the resources to provide an adequate number of sections for their majors.

New and Revised Courses: On the recommendation of the reviewers in 2004, the Department has created a series of elective courses with broad appeal to attract students from outside the discipline as well as to provide elective courses for majors. The first of these is the revival and revision of ENGL 200: Introduction to Literature. Its offering in fall 2010, after at least a six-year hiatus, was titled *From the Beats to the Boss*, and it examined the connections between the music and literature of the 1950s to 1980s (focusing on the Beat poets and the music of Bruce Springsteen). In the spring version, the course focuses on Literature and Science and is entitled *From Grave-Robbing to Gene Splicing*. We anticipate that this course, which grants GE credit, will now regularly draw 60 students.

With the hiring of additional faculty since 2005, the Department has also designed a number of courses in alternative genres and popular culture that also appeal to the broader campus population: *Harry Potter*; *The Graphic Novel*; *Images of Women*; as well as *Detective*, *Science*, and *Fantasy Fiction* courses.

Changes in the Graduate Program: As we explain more fully in section B below, our graduate program has recently been revised, shifting the distribution of units within the program into four areas of concentration: Creative Writing, Literature, Theory/Cultural Studies, and Language, Composition and Rhetoric. Students will be required to take at least one course from three of the four areas and have the option to focus five electives in fields of their choice. In addition, we have replaced the M.A. exam with a portfolio that reflects students’ anticipated professional direction: pedagogy, creative writing, advanced graduate study. Together, these changes are intended to reflect the current dynamics of the discipline and to prepare our students for the future they intend to pursue upon completion of their

degrees.

We have also initiated the Professional Certificate Program in Writing and Teaching which offers M.A. English candidates additional opportunities for professional development that further enhance their preparation for careers in teaching, publishing, or advanced graduate study. The certificate program seeks to fulfill three interrelated needs: (1) to update the M.A. curriculum so that it better reflects recent intellectual and scholarly developments in the field of English studies and to ensure that it remains competitive with programs at other, comparable universities; (2) to offer graduate students a systematic course of study that enables them to develop their writing and teaching skills; (3) to provide M.A. candidates with training attuned to the demands of the current job market.

B. Structure of Degree Programs

Structure of the Undergraduate Major: The requirements for the major have remained unchanged: the core courses of Analysis of Literary Forms (300), Advanced Composition (302 or 307), and Shakespeare (316); two literature surveys drawn from world literature, British, or American literature; a course in either Chaucer (315) or Milton (317); three courses drawn from 400-level courses comprising specialized study in a period, genre, or criticism; the Structure of Modern English requirement (303 or 305), and 4 elective courses.

As mentioned above, to demonstrate the value that we place on the study of diverse literatures, we determined that beginning in fall 2011 one of the courses taken in the major must fulfill the Comparatist Studies requirement. This course may “double count”: for example, an African Literature course completes the Comparatist Studies requirement and may also count as an elective.

Although our courses have no hard and fast prerequisites, students are encouraged by Department advisors to begin with the core courses, take the survey courses early in their major program, and gain some experience before attempting the 400-level courses. Advisers are available to guide students to course work that will best prepare them for their career paths.

The total number of units required in the major is still 42. The major is designed to support the achievement of the student learning outcomes that we have identified:

- Discipline-specific courses (300, 307) “train students in the critical reading, writing, and research skills conventional to English Studies.”
- Survey classes (211, 212, 221 222, 324, 325) “introduce students to knowledge of major literary works (315, 316, 317) and “traditions, genres and periods” (423, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 491, 492) that may be pursued in more depth in upper division courses.
- Elective courses and topics courses (324, 326, 328, 341, 342, 355, 370, 371, 372, 373, 381, 416, 434, 442, 381), and several levels of creative and professional writing courses (306, 404, 401, 402) “provide students with a working knowledge of non-canonical literary works.”
- Required courses (303, 305, 360) “provide students a working knowledge of the English language and language acquisition.”

Structure of the Current and New Graduate Degree Programs: The current M.A. Program (through Spring 2011) consists of a thirty-unit study plan, as well as a two-part comprehensive examination and a culminating project. In addition, students must satisfy a language requirement in one of the following ways: (1) by two years of college-level study of a foreign language; (2) by taking a 400-level course in a foreign language or literature; (3) by taking a 400-level Linguistics course. Students may satisfy the

language requirement either before or after enrolling in the program. The thirty-unit curriculum has the following distribution requirements:

Core Courses	Introduction to Graduate Studies (3 units)
	Analysis of Discourse or approved theory course (3 units)
Proseminars	Courses on broadly focused topics (12 units)
Seminars	Courses on specialized topics (9 units)
Project Writing	Course supporting the writing of the culminating project (3 units)

The program is designed to be certain that students balance the breadth of study appropriate to the M.A. level with opportunities for more specialized work that characterizes the most advanced study in the academy. The Introduction to Graduate Studies, which students must take during their first or second semester, provides an overview of the discipline, including the branches of English Studies and research methods. The Analysis of Discourse requirement ensures that students learn to reflect further on the nature of their work and methodologies. The proseminar requirement enforces breadth of learning, while the seminars allow students to pursue specific topics in greater depth. The lack of specific requirements within these categories allows students to fashion a curriculum suite to their particular needs and interests. The goal of the comprehensive examinations is to reinforce the breadth of learning achieved in course work and to assess the students' ability to synthesize their learning and to analyze texts extemporaneously.

Nearly five years of discussion among faculty in ad hoc and standing committees and work during several Department retreats have produced a new M.A. program that is structured in response to three major goals and their related outcomes:

- Goal 1: Students will complete a course in Introduction to Graduate Studies and be required to take at least one course from three of four discipline areas and five elective courses chosen from these areas.

Learning Outcome: Students will become familiar with the breadth of study that defines the discipline of English Studies.

- Goal 2: Students will regularly read and analyze primary and secondary texts; conduct independent research; engage in analytic, didactic, and informed oral and written discussions with peers, faculty, and disciplinary experts; and write multiple extensively researched and analytically structured essays and/or generically appropriate creative texts.

Learning Outcome: Students will develop the ability to evaluate current knowledge in the field and to deepen and extend their own and others' understanding of this knowledge.

- Goal 3: Students will develop a portfolio that is consistent with the professional direction they intend to take upon graduation.

Learning Outcome: Students will devote sustained time to preparing for and understanding the professional options available to graduates with a master's degree in English.

- Goal 4: Students will write a project paper of their own design, supervised by a faculty member, and approved by the supervisor and a project-writing instructor.

Learning Outcome: Students will demonstrate the ability to complete one extensive, independently designed research or creative project.

The M.A. in English 30-unit Course of Study will now require the following three-unit courses:

Introduction to Graduate Studies (ENGL 500)

One course each from three of the four areas:

1. Language, Composition and Rhetoric
2. Creative Writing
3. Cultural Studies/Theory
4. Literature

Five elective courses selected from the four designated areas

Project Writing Course (ENGL 595)

In addition, students must satisfy a language requirement as described in the old program and, as before, with adviser approval, students may include up to 6 units of 400 level courses on their study plan and up to 3 units of study from a discipline other than English.

The new program has a two-part culminating experience: (1) students are required to create a portfolio from among three options: Academic Professional Development, Pedagogical Development, or Creative/Professional Writing Development; each student will include various materials from graduate courses, internships, work experience as a tutor or teacher, conference presentations, a resume, a statement of teaching philosophy, creative and scholarly work, depending on which option they choose. (2) students will submit a Project, which might include a chapbook of poems, a formal research paper, or a syllabus, reading materials, assignments, and ancillary materials for a course they have designed.

The program has been unanimously approved by the English Department and approved by the Graduate School. It will be piloted in spring 2011 and will be officially inaugurated in fall 2011.

C. Student Demand, Retention, Graduation Rates (See Appendices I and II)

Applications and Enrollment: Our applications from first-time freshmen for the undergraduate program steadily increased from 2004-2009: 377, 415, 450, 504, 547 applications. As did the College, we experienced a decrease in applications in 2009-10 as a result of enrollment restrictions from the Chancellor's office. The enrollment rates for native freshmen students are nearly identical to those of the college. We have ranges from a low 22% enrollment rate of all admitted students in AY 2009-10, and a high 30% enrollment rate of all admitted students in AY 2004-05.

Upper division transfer majors had been holding steady in the 430-450s from AY 2005-08, but in 2009 only 342 students applied; 142 were admitted; and only 65 (46%) enrolled. While the University's budget cuts shortened the application time and accounts for the lower number, our decrease of 17% in applications received was, in fact, slightly lower than the College's 19% reduction. From 2004 to 2010, the Department's enrollment rates for admitted upper division undergraduate transfer students have held fairly closely to a mean of 58%, ranging from a low 46% enrollment rate of all upper-division transfer students admitted in AY 2009-10, to a high of 63% enrollment in AY 2004-05.

Similarly, applications to the M.A. program peaked in 2007 with 109 received; the steady growth we

had been seeing was affected, like undergraduate enrollments, by restrictions placed on us from the Chancellor's office. Nonetheless, close to 78% of accepted students enroll in the program. In this regard we are well above the HSS College average of 66% and are confident that the number of enrolled students is more than sufficient to constitute and sustain a community of scholars.

Graduation Rates: The number of B.A. degrees awarded in English grew from 130, 174, 184, 186 from 2002-06. The drop to 154 degrees awarded in 2009-10 is most likely the result of budgetary cuts that reduced the numbers of accepted transfer students in the past two years. Nonetheless, approximately 26% of our enrolled majors graduate each year. This number has fluctuated only slightly between 2002 and the present. There has been a small growth in the average number of undergraduate degrees awarded in English since the last program review, resulting in an average annual increase of +3.629% in B.A. degrees awarded from 2002-10, and a net increase of +25.4%.

The program's graduation rates for upper-division transfer students have improved during the period under review (fall 1998-fall 2003), resulting in an average annual increase of +2.8% in the rate of graduation in the major in six years or fewer, and a net increase of +14% graduation rate in the major in six years or fewer.

The number of M.A. degrees awarded per academic year has ranged from 19 to 40. Though the raw numbers of degrees may vary, the percent of enrolled M.A. students who graduate has steadily increased from the low 20s to the mid-30s. This percentage reflects a significant growth in graduate degrees awarded in English since the last program review, resulting in an average annual growth of +10.86% in M.A. degrees awarded from 2002-10, and a net increase of +76%.

Retention: Nearly 56% of our full-time first-time Freshmen English majors graduate in 6 years or less. This percentage is slightly above the College average for the same time period of 54%. Equal to the College, an average of 77% of our upper division transfers into the English major graduate in 6 years or less. Nearly on par with the College, an average of 60% of our new M.A. students are graduating during the 6 year or less time frame.

D. Enrollment Trends (See Appendices I and II)

Changes in FTES and Meeting Target: The Department's FTES target since AY 2007-8, when it was 1151, was reduced to 1128 in 2008-9 and to 1031 in 2009-10; at the same time, our number of fulltime faculty has shrunk from 16 tenured and 8 tenure-track in 2007-8 to 14 tenured and 6 tenure-track in 2009-10. Enrollment trends stay consistently at or above 100% for the service writing courses (99, 99M, 101, and 301). The literature classes demonstrate more variation in enrollments, but the FTEF allocation numbers provided by Institutional Research combine composition and literature courses, so the fluctuation is not apparent. These numbers suggest that with the exception of 2005-06, when target was 1175 and we realized only 1128, the Department has met or nearly met target each semester since the last review. From 2003-10, excluding 2006-07, we failed (by .3) to meet target in only one year, 2009-10. Target was 1032. We realized 1031.7.

In order to be more confident in our ability to meet target, we have become particularly cautious in our class scheduling—increasing some class sizes, offering enough but not too many courses in the major, offering revised and more appealing GE courses, and making better projections about the number of graduate seminars needed. Although the Department makes every effort to hit target, we are also committed to offering a diverse curriculum, which means that even though courses such as Asian-American Literature or African-American literature do not attract high enrollments, we still believe these should be offered. The Department has instituted a Comparative Studies requirement effective fall

2011 that will encourage enrollment in these and other comparative, culturally diverse courses.

While in some ways, the undergraduate curriculum has become more set, the new M.A. graduate program offers greater flexibility for students to develop a competency in one field of English Studies and to build a program based on fewer core requirements and more (five) elective courses. The Chair and the Director of Graduate Studies are working with faculty to develop a two-year plan of what types of courses will be offered so that students will have advance information about course offerings in order to develop their study plans.

It is worth noting that our lower division academic year FTES is significantly higher than average in the College (due to the lower division writing requirement that we must offer) and, similarly, the ratio of graduate to undergraduate academic year FTES is significantly higher than that of the College (about 23% vs. about .03%). Given the complexity of our department—English Education, writing classes for the major and the University, a graduate program, and a robust major—it is certainly worth noting that we were never less than 96% of enrollment target, and achieved 100% of target or better for 5 out of the 7 years under review. That we continue to meet target and still maintain a significant portion of FTES in low-enrollment classes (writing and seminars) is a testament to our balanced scheduling.

Comparative Literature Enrollments: While the enrollment in our Comparative Literature courses is steady, we note that the number of students enrolled in our B.A. program in Comparative Literature has not increased in the past seven years. Similarly, the six-year graduation rate for this cohort—both first-time freshman and upper-division transfer—is highly irregular. As we will explain below, one of our department goals is to increase enrollments in the program and advise those students more consistently.

Readjusting Course Load and Meeting Target: In 2009-10, for the first time, the Department readjusted its course load for tenured and tenure-track faculty such that each one teaches the same number of students as in previous years, but in three rather than four courses each semester. One year's data are insufficient for any determination, but it appears that we were able to meet target despite the reduction of teaching load. Fall 2010 enrollments, close to 100%, bear out this interpretation.

Class scheduling is now planned for the entire academic year, coordinated by the Vice Chair and Chairs of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies. We have developed a fall/spring and one-year, two-year sequence for most courses that provides a certain percentage of majors, elective, and GE courses to be offered each semester. Most survey and elective courses (as well as the Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Milton courses [315, 316, 317]) are capped at 60; the majors' courses are capped at 40-46; and the writing courses are capped at 27. Ideally, each faculty member teaches one elective course at 60; one majors' course at 40, and one writing or graduate course at 18-27. In addition to creating a curriculum rotation that allows us to meet target, we also hope that the regular class schedule patterns will allow students to plan more efficiently and so may also shorten the average time to graduation.

Staffing Concerns: In a Department the size of ours, staffing is critically important for us. Our Academic Support Staff (AS) and Academic Support Coordinator (ASC) provide us with outstanding professional support. However, we are currently depending on a temporary employee position to complete the work that needs to be done. Our ASC has had to add the responsibility of scheduling to her long list of duties; the temporary employee has been invaluable in the two faculty searches that we are conducting; and the third AS staff member assistant continues to be responsible for time keeping, travel, and payroll. The tasks of creating schedules, finding classrooms, and attaching faculty to the schedule is monumental and cannot be simply “tacked on” to another list of responsibilities. We have submitted a job description to the Dean's office and eagerly await its posting.

E. Plans for Curricular Change.

Three-year Plan

- Comparative Literature:
 - Increase enrollments in our Comparative Literature B.A. and, in a related goal, develop a set of goals and outcomes for the Comparative Literature component of the curriculum and the B.A. in particular:
 - Expand the focus of “comparative” beyond other cultures to other disciplines-- develop/propose a 200-level Topics course that would include interdisciplinary topics such as Literature and Philosophy, Literature and Business, etc
 - Develop plans for subsequent Comparative Literature courses
 - Reorganize/Recategorize Comparative Literature and English courses
- As we have rethought the graduate program, we have begun discussions of the undergraduate curriculum and will consider changes that will make the major more responsive to the areas of Composition/Rhetoric, Comparative Studies, and Literary/Cultural Theory.
- Expand options and/or regularly offer current Professional Writing courses: ENGL 360 and 365
- Create learning outcomes for our creative writing courses; assess our courses in relation to these outcomes and assess the set of courses available in relation to programmatic outcomes.
- Work with HSS Advancement to find support for a Visiting Writer in Residence whose presence in the Department would expand the Creative Writing curriculum and provide students with access to additional mentoring and advising.
- Evaluate the newly established Comparative Studies requirement to determine whether we have enough courses and whether students are finding out about and taking those courses.
- Continue to develop 60-student classes at the 200 and 300 level that serve as introductory-level courses with wide appeal that both draw students into the major and help us to meet target; develop learning outcomes specific to such courses and assess how well students are achieving the outcomes.
- M.A. Program:
 - Fall 2011 will inaugurate the new M.A. program curriculum. Students currently enrolled in the program will have the opportunity to shift to the new program or stay with the old. In three years, we will be able to assess and modify, as needed, the revised M.A. program. Implement an e-portfolio.
- Continue assigning faculty a 3/3 teaching load while also closely monitoring how successfully we reach our enrollment targets and provide a robust major and non-major curriculum.

Seven-year Plan

- Implement Comparative Literature changes in three-year plan
- Revisit possibility of a Capstone requirement/course/experience
- Assess undergraduate interest in and disciplinary appropriateness of developing an undergraduate Certificate in Digital Rhetoric
 - The Department recently began a Graduate Professional Writing and Teaching Credential Program (which can be completed in tandem with the M.A. program), and has been well subscribed. The Department is considering creating something similar in the undergraduate curriculum, by reviving Scientific and Technical Writing (ENGL 360), by developing specialized writing internships for English majors in the University and in the local area, by opening up certain positions in the editorial and production areas of *DASH*, the Department’s national literary journal, to undergraduates, and in general by creating courses that emphasize professional writing, editing, and perhaps web

page design or computer graphics that will make our students more adaptable to the work force.

E. Special Sessions:

During the review period, we regularly offered writing courses during Intersessions and Summer sessions. In particular, students have come to expect to find available sections of ENGL 199, Intensive Writing Review and ENGL 301, Advanced College Writing. Teaching these sections during special sessions has helped us to meet the demand for courses that students must complete prior to graduation. When possible, we have also offered similarly high demand courses such as ENGL 341, Children's Literature and ENGL 303, Structure of Modern English.

III. Documentation of Student Academic Achievement and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

A. Student Learning Outcomes, Methods of Assessment, and Evidence of Learning.

SLO Alignment in the Curriculum: Our Student Learning Outcomes as delineated in the catalog are aligned with our major requirements:

- “Train students in the critical reading, writing, and research skills conventional to English Studies”:

ENGL 300: Analysis of Literary Forms

Learning Outcomes

- Identify literary characteristics and several major authors of three major genres
- Identify and illustrate poetic devices and literary forms
- Describe and distinguish among Formal/New Critical and Genre theory
- Read wide-ranging instances of Modern and Postmodern literature of each genre
- Recognize and implement the qualities of good analytic writing using a case analysis approach

Methods of Assessment

- Produce competent essays: short exercises that demonstrate knowledge of literary devices and longer essays that demonstrate analytic skills applied to texts not studied in class

ENGL 307: Advanced Writing in English Studies

Learning Outcomes

- Identify disciplinary characteristics of the four areas of English Studies: Creative Writing, Literary Theory, English Education, Rhetorical Analysis/Composition Theory
- Understand and apply writing conventions of these areas
- Apply skills of scholarly research
- Read and explain history/development of English studies in the university
- Implement peer review and drafting, revising processes

Methods of Assessment

- Write several successful essays that demonstrate the appropriate rhetorical and literary conventions, and the use and integration of

appropriate scholarly research.

- Introduce students to knowledge of major literary works, tradition, genres, and periods:
ENGL 211, 212, 221 222, 324, 325

Learning Outcomes

- Identify the major genres of the period
- Describe the rudimentary cultural and literary backgrounds for the period
- Describe the significant historical moments of the period
- Understand and apply critical research strategies

Methods of Assessment

- Analyze texts in the genre or period
- Write one final examination that demonstrates understanding of significant moments in the period, characteristics of the genre, and qualities of major literary works.

ENGL 315, 316

ENGL 423, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 462, 463,
464, 465, 466, 467, 491, 492

Learning Outcomes

- Demonstrate ability to work with primary source material as well as secondary critical sources
- Demonstrate ability to write competent research papers
- Demonstrate how the period or genre is defined, how it changes over time
- Analyze in terms of cultural context a focused number of full-length texts
- Identify cultural/historical and major critical schools important to an understanding of a period
- Understand and apply advanced research techniques

Methods of Assessment

- Regularly read and analyze primary and secondary texts; conduct research; engage in informed and oral discussions with peers and faculty, and successfully write multiple appropriately researched and analytically structured essays and/or generically appropriate creative texts.

- Provide students with a working knowledge of non-canonical literary works:
ENGL 324, 326, 328, 341, 342, 355, 370, 371, 372, 373, 381,
416, 434, 442, 381, 451; ENGL 306, 404, 401, 402

Learning Outcomes

- Analyze in terms of cultural context a focused number of full-length texts
- Identify cultural/historical and major critical schools important to an understanding of a period
- Understand and apply advanced research techniques
Demonstrate ability to work with primary source material as well as secondary critical sources

- Demonstrate ability to write competent research papers
- Demonstrate how the period or genre is defined, how it changes over time

Methods of Assessment

- Regularly read and analyze primary and secondary texts; conduct research; engage in informed and oral discussions with peers and faculty, and successfully write multiple appropriately researched and analytically structured essays and/or generically appropriate creative texts.

- Provide students a working knowledge of the English language and language acquisition:
ENGL 303, 305

Learning Outcomes

- Understand how English language is structured
- Master vocabulary necessary for labeling these structures
- Recognize grammatical errors, explain and correct them
- Understand the origins, regional and social dialects of American English

Methods of Assessment

- Describe in writing standard English language structures using correct vocabulary
- Identify grammatical errors, explain, and correct them
- Analyze the role of American English in institutions such as schools, corporations, government, and media

B. Direct and systematic assessment (see Appendix VII)

Programmatic assessments:

- ENGL 99
All students in ENGL 99 must submit a final portfolio of three essays that are read and scored by faculty (not the students' own) against a commonly agreed-upon rubric.
- ENGL 100/100W
Students' paired essays written on the first and last day of class on common topics were ranked; in 65% of the pairings, the essay written on the last day was judged as being of better quality
An assessment of writing anxiety was administered on the first and last day of class; students reported a nearly 10% decreased level of anxiety and increased level of self confidence
- Assessment of senior writing skills
A committee of faculty evaluated with a common rubric essays written by a randomly selected group of graduating seniors; essays all received good or excellent scores in each analytic category.
- M.A. exams are read by a calibrated scoring committee
All M.A. exams are holistically scored using a shared rubric by a committee of faculty who first complete a calibration session.
- Writing rubric (101-301)
Working with the University General Assessment Committee, a group of faculty recently developed a writing assessment rubric evaluating lower division writing;

the rubric is being used in select sections of ENGL 101 and has been distributed among all sections of ENGL 101 and 301.

C. Changes in assessment strategies/measures.

Changes currently in progress:

- E-portfolio of majors'
 - We have begun to develop an e-portfolio that will provide longitudinal information about the writing development of our majors
- Survey current and alumni students on regular basis
 - We are in the process of conducting two surveys: one of current majors and M.A. students, one of alumni
- We are conducting a self-assessment of the ENGL 301 curricula, goals, and outcomes,

D. Impact of assessment findings on teaching and learning and proposed modifications to enhance student learning.

Curricular and pedagogical changes:

- Major revision of our M.A. program and culminating experience
- Development and use of common writing rubric in scoring of the graduate exam and in English 101
- Development of ENGL 100/100W

E. Other quality indicators.²

- Number of graduate students teaching in community colleges
- Number of students who enter Ph.D. programs
- Number of B.A. students who enter our M.A. program
- Number of B.A. students who enter our credential program
- Number of students who present papers at local and regional conferences

IV. Faculty

A. Changes in FTEF since the last review (See Appendix IV):

There has been an irregular but significant decline in tenured and tenure-track faculty since the last program review, falling from a high of 27 tenured and tenure-track faculty members in AY 2003-04 to a current low of 20 tenured and tenure-track faculty members in AY 2009-10. The number of full-time lecturers has averaged at 2 per academic year. On average, we employ about 50 part time faculty per semester.

B. Priorities in Additional Faculty Hires

The Department will continue to hire diverse faculty that not only meet needs in particular areas of specialization but also demonstrate an ability to adapt to demographic, economic, and disciplinary changes. For the past fifteen years, the discipline of English has been moving away from a literary field coverage model and toward a more expansive and flexible paradigm based on desired learning outcomes that combine rigorous scholarly inquiry with practical career preparation. Our Department has committed itself to this trajectory by redesigning curricula so that it increases students' critical literacy and rhetorical fluency while striking a sustainable balance between traditions of scholarly research and articulated community needs. In practical terms, this commitment requires current and future faculty

² Currently, we have only informally collected data on these indicators. A future goal is to begin collecting this in a more systematic fashion.

members to offer classes that thoroughly integrate reading and researching with rhetoric and writing, and through this integration provide focused training for prospective teachers, writers, and publishing industry professionals who face an increasingly competitive job market.

These priorities are perhaps most clearly exemplified by the Department's newly-designed and approved Professional Certificate Program in Writing and Teaching, which has quickly gained national scholarly attention. In the December 2010 issue of *College Composition and Communication*, the foremost composition-rhetoric journal in the U.S., Peter Vanderberg and Jennifer Clary-Lemon state the following:

California State Fullerton has just modified its M.A. by the addition of the Professional Certificate in Writing and Teaching, which was designed to add an intradisciplinary facet to their traditional English M.A. By giving students facility in a range of writing types, introducing them to the scholarship of teaching and learning through writing theory and practice, as well as requiring participation in a Workshop Series in Professional Development, the program is creating a much more adaptable and situated degree, one that [...] responds to the changing nature of English. (274-275)³

In order to maintain our commitment to “adaptable” and “situated” learning, the Department seeks to hire faculty who, regardless of specialty, have a demonstrated ability to teach writing, rhetoric, and discursive analysis, and who may have particular expertise in experiential community learning. It is increasingly important that we hire faculty who can share administrative responsibility in the department. The tenure-track faculty member who is heading the English Education program has only part-time lecturers assisting her and cannot carry the administrative burden alone. The Composition Program, Developmental Writing Program, and Writing Center Program are each being managed by two faculty members as uncompensated overload. This cannot continue.

The Department is responsible for providing the courses to complete the remedial writing requirement, the GE writing requirement, and much of the upper-division writing requirement. And yet, the University provides us with no budgetary support for administering the programs in which these courses are housed. Recently, the C.O. has added an Early Start Requirement to the system, placing yet another layer of administration—this time in the summer—on the back of the already-overburdened disciplinary specialists in Composition and Rhetoric.

In the next three years, up to five tenure-track faculty members will stand for tenure, and there is good reason to expect that they will all be successful. That will nearly “tenure-up” the Department, but with upcoming retirements, we will be able to hold spots for new faculty and the curricular enhancements they will bring. In particular, within the next seven years we will face retirements in at least 3 fields: medieval/early modern; comparative literature/contemporary fiction, and History/Structure of Modern English. In the coming years the Department will assess what fields need coverage and how the new positions will be configured.

C. The Role of Full-Time, Part Time Faculty, Student Assistants, and Teaching Assistants.

The Writing Programs: Graduate and undergraduate students have the opportunity to apply for

³ Vanderberg, Peter and Jennifer Clary-Lemon. “Advancing by Degree: Placing the MA in Writing Studies.” *College Composition and Communication* 62.2 (2010): 257-282. Print

positions as Student Assistants in the Department Writing Center. After selection by a Department committee, the student assists an ENGL 99 instructor and tutors in the Writing Center. During the first semester, the student assistant must enroll in an upper division, three-unit course, Theories of Response to Written Composition. Though the Writing Center, located on the first floor of Pollak Library, serves an average of 7000 students per year, the number of tutoring hours available (and funded) continues to be less than the number of hours needed to fulfill student demand. Several years ago, the Vice President for Academic Affairs recognized the value of the Writing Center by providing it a designated budget. Unfortunately, as demand for tutoring has increased, the budget has not.

Graduate students who have worked for one year as Student Assistants in the Writing Center may apply to be Teaching Associates. After selection by a Department committee, the graduate student may be hired as a Teaching Associate for one academic year to teach one section of writing each semester under faculty supervision. During the first semester, the TA must enroll in ENGL 590, Writing Theory and Practice, a graded, three-unit course. Following the advice offered in our last review, we have increased the average number of student assistants in the Writing Center to about 30 and the average number of Teaching Associates to about eight per semester.

We hire about 50 part time faculty each semester. A specially-selected group teaches most of our ENGL 99 and 101 courses and many of the sections of ENGL 301. These faculty must have earned at least a Master's degree in literature or in composition, have academic preparation in the teaching of writing, and have at least one year of supervised experience.

Part Time Faculty in the Major: For the most part, except for sub positions (We have had an impressive number of maternity and paternity leaves in the recent years.), we seldom hire part time faculty to cover courses in the undergraduate major. All disciplinary courses in literature, literary theory, and Composition/Rhetoric, are designed and offered by tenured and tenure track faculty.

D. International Programs Participation.

During the period under review, five faculty have been selected to participate in our study abroad programs, and 19 of our majors have participated (NSSE #14)⁴

V. Student Support and Advising

A. Advising

Graduate Advising: The Director of Graduate Studies handles the advising of all M.A. students and also answers questions about the M.A. program on both email and through "walk in" and advising appointments. During their first semester in the program, graduate students develop a study plan in consultation with the Director, which is then filed with the Graduate School. The Director oversees approximately 80-100 graduate students in various stages of the M.A. program. For the past five years, the Director, along with members of the Graduate Studies Committee, has met with graduate students at the beginning of the year to review the program requirements, particularly the requirements of the M.A. project. Each semester, members of the committee, along with graduate students who have passed the exam, offer a study session for test takers.

We will inaugurate new degree requirements for the M.A. program in fall 2011; students presently in the program may complete the former program or choose the new program if they desire. Information sessions at the beginning of fall and spring semesters are planned to ease the transition process.

⁴ Places in our curricula or department services that respond to issues raised by the 2009 NSSE are indicated by parenthetical references to the related item numbers in the survey.

Information is also available through the English Department and on the website, which is regularly updated.

Undergraduate Advising: In 2009 the English Department inaugurated a new way of undergraduate advising, designating four faculty members to whom all students in need of advising were referred (NSSE Item #1 and #2). Advisors reserved one hour a week for drop in advising and also answered questions through email. The four faculty see approximately 80-100 students apiece during the course of the semester, some of them multiple times. One of the advisors is the Coordinator of the English Education program; she sees at least 50-60 students each year who apply to the secondary teaching credential program. These advisors received special training about the general education requirements and all were trained in managing the new CMS system where student records are managed, so that the advisors can readily access and evaluate a student's Titan Degree Audit (TDA). The advisors also regularly confer with one another in matters of awarding transfer credit and granting exceptions to ensure that the advising information is uniform. The advisors have been instrumental in correcting errors on the TDA forms and in the reporting process. Additionally, one of the faculty advisors conducts information sessions at the 14 orientation sessions offered through the summer for first-year and transfer students, and the January orientation session for transfer students. A faculty advisor is also available one or two days a week during the summer for advising.

In AY 2009-10 the Department experimented with the use of peer advisors, senior undergraduates and graduate students who would answer questions for undergraduate majors who would drop in during open hours at the English Department Student Resource Center. Although few students took advantage of the peer advising system, an increasing number are now regularly visiting or emailing the faculty advisors.

In addition to advising students, the English Department in 2009-10 inaugurated open houses in fall and spring semesters, where students could drop in to learn about new courses, review information about the major or minor, and meet faculty. Declared undergraduate majors and minors are notified by email "blasts" of new courses the Department is offering. We are also advertising general education courses to all first year students in the College of HSS. We are also targeting other student cohorts when we are offering classes of particular interest to them. For example, we sent notices about courses focusing on technical writing and on science and literature for spring 2011 to students and faculty advisors in kinesiology and the health sciences.

Under Consideration: Based on conversations with students, the faculty advisors will bring to the Department, the following changes for consideration:

- inaugurating pre-requisites (or strongly encouraging them)
- adding additional comparative literature requirement to our core major (already inaugurated)
- encouraging or requiring more composition or literary theory for our majors
- developing a list of collateral courses (recommended in the social sciences, history, and the arts) that would encourage students to study the cultural context of the literature they read with an emphasis on gaining writing experience through various internships
- requiring a mandatory advising session when the English major is declared (typically in the junior year), where more discussions about "what to do with an English major" might guide students to more timely completion of their degrees and a clearer sense of what options the major opens for them

B. Opportunities for Student Research/ Professional Development.

While the English Department does not have an honors program, it provides opportunities for

undergraduates and graduates to participate in para-professional activities (NSSE #6, #10). The ACACIA Group, a student club composed of graduate and undergraduate students, sponsors a yearly conference that attracts participants from throughout the United States and occasionally from Canada or Europe. Students in ACACIA also present to their peers workshops on a variety of topics, including advice on applying to Ph.D. programs, teaching in community colleges, and taking the GRE.

Many of our graduate students have taken advantage of conference funding opportunities provided by ICC (Inter-Club Council). As the requirements indicate on the syllabi, undergraduate students are expected to present research papers (and sometimes oral reports) in upper division English classes. In ENGL 500 graduate students are expected to produce research papers that meets the requirements for a regional or national conference (NSSE #10, #15). Several faculty, including Dr. Chris Westgate, Dr. Sheryl Fontaine, and Dr. Ellen Caldwell have taken graduate students to present papers at national conferences. Dr. Irena Praitis has collaborated with one graduate student on plans for a creative writing textbook and with another on the development of an online creative writing workshop.

Undergraduates also enjoy possibilities for collaborative research (NSSE #1, #10). Dr. Stephen Mexal received funding to work with an undergraduate student on research for his book on the American frontier; Dr. David Kelman conducted an independent study with a student in which they co-developed a course on the theory and practice of the short story. Dr. Caldwell and Dr. Hollis have worked with interns who developed materials for the department's website, served as peer advisors, and helped to put on the Department's open house. Dr. Hollis has also mentored graduate student discussion leaders in several of her large courses, having students lead discussions and also present one lecture during the semester, which she helps them prepare, and then critiques.

Three years ago, a member of the Department created *DASH*, a literary journal run by English graduate students and undergraduate assistants. In a graduate seminar, under supervision, students solicit and evaluate submissions, as well as edit, format, and promote the literary journal. For the past seven years, the As You Like Shakespeare Society and ACACIA Group have assisted in the organization of the Shakespeare Symposium each May. Over the past 10 years, the AYL Shakespeare Association has published undergraduate and graduate student papers were submitted, reviewed by a committee of faculty and students. The English National Honorary Society, Sigma Tau Delta, offers fund raising opportunities for scholarships and awards and often sponsors local and regional guest speakers.

VI. Resources and Facilities

A. State Support and Non State Support Resources.
See Appendix V.

B. Special Facilities/Equipment Used by the Department.

Classroom Size: In fall 2010 the English Department inaugurated a 3/3 teaching load (instead of 4/4) for all tenure-track and tenured faculty, increasing the size of a number of elective and some required courses from 40 to 60 (some, initially, to 90) in an effort to meet target while also requiring fewer teaching preparations. We came within 2% of reaching target in fall 2010 and should be close to that in spring 2011, but not without considerable difficulty in finding rooms to accommodate 60-70 students. Our larger classes must often sit "unhoused" until the first week of classes. With more classrooms available in Langsdorf (since the opening of Mihaylo Hall), we had hoped to be able to find rooms with greater ease. This has not been the case. We are hesitant to offer large classes when classrooms are available (i.e., 7:00 a.m.) since these also tend to be times that are not popular with student.

Classrooms typically assigned to the Department in McCarthy Hall with capacities of 40-42 have been renovated or have lost chairs so that some of our classrooms now hold 35-39 students. A number of composition classrooms in University Hall hold only 23 students (the cap for ENGL 99 is 25; the cap for ENGL 101 is 27). We often see attrition in those classes, but the seating even at 23 is tight, making it difficult for group work or for students to have an unobstructed view of power point presentations or film clips. Configuring the smaller UH rooms by removing the long tables and using small desks might be helpful, as would the replacement of chairs in classrooms where there is sufficient room for students, just not enough furniture.

Computer Classrooms: Currently, the Department has the use of one computer classroom in the Humanities Bldg and has it scheduled for courses through most of the hours of the week. More Composition teachers are interested in using a computer classroom, but we do not have access to additional computer classrooms. The need for computer classrooms is even greater in the summer when we are offering the ENGL 100/100W. The “W” component of this course requires that students complete online activities and engage in peer review that is most effectively accomplished on networked computers.

Finally, although IT tries to keep all the “smart classrooms” functioning, breakdowns of equipment that occur during the class period generally cannot be addressed. Phones in the classroom work, but often the IT specialist is away from the desk assisting someone and cannot answer a question. Here are some examples of other problems:

- Some classrooms (e.g., PA 125, where classes of 60 students were taught last spring and fall) are not IBM/PC compatible
- It took nearly two months to repair the computer in the UH 317 classroom (now the English Department Student Resource Center), which made it impossible to use the equipment for three meetings in October 2010 where power point presentations were planned
- Faculty needing technical assistance in Mihaylo Hall must contact an IT specifically assigned to Mihaylo. Other classrooms are served by IT specialists at the Help Desk, but the classrooms in UH are served by Mitch Pautz in the Humanities division. Perhaps better coordination of effort would create the potential for better service. The IT technicians are generally extremely helpful and patient, but they are overworked.

Over the past five years, more faculty are using film (usually film clips) in their courses. Sections of Shakespeare (316), Images of Women (355), Harry Potter (341), and Shakespeare on Film (331) are taught at least 1-2 times a year and depend on functioning equipment. Regular maintenance and updating of the “smart classrooms” (and perhaps additional training for faculty) would be helpful. Since students are now regularly using power point, flash drives, CDs and other devices to give reports and presentations, it is all the more crucial that the equipment is functioning and that the help desk is staffed during classroom hours to address classroom emergencies.

C. Library Resources. The Department maintains an ongoing relationship with the University library, giving advice on book, journal, and database selection. While the library is currently adequately meeting the Department’s needs, we have recently created a library in the Student Resource Center that includes a copy of the OED and an extensive array of literature as well as rhetorical and literary theory. Over the next five years, we hope to make the student library in the department a common resource for students.

VII. Final Reflections

As Appendix VI indicates, in completing this self study for our Program Performance Review, we have compiled a series of goals and plans that will easily take us through the next five years. The greatest success of our Department is found in the students we graduate and the faculty who choose to work with us. Our students work in community colleges in the region, attend graduate programs across the country, and teach in high schools up and down the state. A recent study found other graduates who are serving as executives in banking, entertainment, and law. Our faculty are widely published, nationally recognized scholars who could not be more committed to their disciplines and their students, enjoying the intellectual rewards earned by the integration of scholarship and teaching. Our faculty are also committed to the Department and the University. In fact, it is this shared commitment that has allowed us to do the work of a Department as large and complex as ours while still serving leadership positions across the campus. With inadequate assigned time for administration, unusually high SFR, high targets, insufficient graduate assistant funds, and minimal office staff, we still manage to meet the goals we set for our students and ourselves.

APPENDIX I: UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

Table 1-A, 1-B: Undergraduate Program Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments

ENGL-CPLT

CPLT

BA

First-time Freshman Regular Admit

	Applied	Admitted	% Admitted	Enrolled	% Enrolled
2004-2005	5	4	80%	2	50%
2005-2006	6	5	83%	1	20%
2006-2007	9	7	78%	2	29%
2007-2008	7	7	100%	2	29%
2008-2009	7	5	71%	3	60%
2009-2010	13	8	62%	2	25%

ENGL-CPLT

CPLT

BA

Upper Division Transfer

	Applied	Admitted	% Admitted	Enrolled	% Enrolled
2004-2005	12	7	58%	3	43%
2005-2006	14	7	50%	5	71%
2006-2007	12	4	33%	3	75%
2007-2008	3	3	100%	1	33%
2008-2009	9	4	44%	1	25%
2009-2010	4	0	0%	0	

ENGL-CPLT

ENGLISH

BA

First-time Freshman Special Admit

	Applied	Admitted	% Admitted	Enrolled	% Enrolled
2004-2005	4	4	100%	3	75%
2005-2006	5	5	100%	2	40%
2006-2007	1	1	100%	1	100%
2007-2008	1	1	100%	1	100%
2009-2010	1	1	100%	0	0%

APPENDIX I: UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS (continued)

ENGL-CPLT

ENGLISH

BA

First-time Freshman Regular Admit

	Applied	Admitted	% Admitted	Enrolled	% Enrolled
2004-2005	377	226	60%	67	30%
2005-2006	415	266	64%	66	25%
2006-2007	450	269	60%	61	23%
2007-2008	504	326	65%	83	25%
2008-2009	547	331	61%	78	24%
2009-2010	493	280	57%	62	22%

ENGL-CPLT

ENGLISH

BA

Upper Division Transfer

	Applied	Admitted	% Admitted	Enrolled	% Enrolled
2004-2005	417	248	59%	156	63%
2005-2006	435	242	56%	131	54%
2006-2007	456	245	54%	146	60%
2007-2008	431	232	54%	137	59%
2008-2009	413	217	53%	122	56%
2009-2010	342	142	42%	65	46%

APPENDIX I: UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS (continued)

Table 2-A Undergraduate Enrollment in FTES

ENGLISH & COMPARATIVE LITERATURE ----- CPLT

	LD AY FTES	UD AY FTES	UG AY FTES	GRAD AY FTES	Total AY FTES
2003-2004	2.7	51.1	53.8	1.0	54.8
2004-2005	0.0	45.9	45.9	0.4	46.3
2005-2006	0.0	34.6	34.6	0.7	35.3
2006-2007	0.0	30.2	30.2	0.8	31.0
2007-2008	0.0	28.0	28.0	0.4	28.4
2008-2009	0.0	26.4	26.4	1.7	28.1
2009-2010	0.0	32.4	32.4	0.1	32.5

ENGLISH & COMPARATIVE LITERATURE ----ENGL

	LD AY FTES	UD AY FTES	UG AY FTES	GRAD AY FTES	Total AY FTES
2003-2004	500.3	440.0	940.3	25.0	965.3
2004-2005	549.3	444.3	993.6	23.2	1,016.8
2005-2006	587.1	452.0	1,039.1	28.2	1,067.2
2006-2007	581.1	440.5	1,021.6	34.3	1,055.9
2007-2008	613.7	435.5	1,049.2	35.6	1,084.8
2008-2009	636.3	394.6	1,030.9	36.3	1,067.2
2009-2010	559.9	374.8	934.7	32.5	967.2

APPENDIX I: UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS (continued)

Department Major
 ENGL-CPLT
 CPLT
 BA

	Lower Division		Upper Division		Post Bacc (2nd Bacc, PBU, Cred intent)		Total	
	Annualized Headcount	AY FTES	Annualized Headcount	AY FTES	Annualized Headcount	AY FTES	Annualized Headcount	AY FTES
2003-2004	4.0	3.6	5.0	3.7	0.5	0.3	9.5	7.6
2004-2005	3.5	3.1	5.0	3.6			8.5	6.7
2005-2006	3.0	2.8	8.5	6.8			11.5	9.6
2006-2007	2.0	1.9	10.0	7.6			12.0	9.5
2007-2008	3.5	3.1	5.0	3.8			8.5	6.9
2008-2009	4.5	4.0	7.5	5.5			12.0	9.5
2009-2010	3.0	2.7	4.5	3.4			7.5	6.1

Department Major
 ENGL-CPLT
 ENGLISH
 BA

	Lower Division		Upper Division		Post Bacc (2nd Bacc, PBU, Cred intent)		Credential Seeking
	Annualized Headcount	AY FTES	Annualized Headcount	AY FTES	Annualized Headcount	AY FTES	Annualized Headcount
2003-2004	127.5	108.3	445.0	342.3	3.0	1.7	1.0
2004-2005	126.0	113.9	460.5	363.2	3.0	1.7	0.5
2005-2006	141.5	129.6	461.5	356.7	2.0	1.3	
2006-2007	135.5	122.9	490.5	379.8			
2007-2008	153.5	137.8	488.0	379.9	1.0	0.2	
2008-2009	170.5	152.9	445.5	351.7	1.0	0.4	
2009-2010	162.0	141.5	408.0	323.2	0.5	0.1	

APPENDIX I: UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS (continued)

Tables 3-A; 3-B First-time Freshmen and Transfer Student Graduation Rates for Majors

CPLT

ENGL-CPLT

BA

First-time Full-time Freshmen

	Initial Cohort	Graduated 3 yrs or less in major	Graduated 3 yrs or less in other major	Graduated 4 yrs or less in major	Graduated 4 yrs or less in other major	Graduated 5 yrs or less in major	Graduated in 5 yrs or less in other major	Graduated in 6 yrs or less in major	Graduated in 6 yrs or less in other major	Total graduated in 6 yrs or less
fall 1998	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.
fall 1999	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2.
fall 2000	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1.
fall 2001	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.
fall 2003	4	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	2.

Headcount

	Initial Cohort	% Graduated 3 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 3 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 4 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 4 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 5 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 5 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 6 yrs or less in major	% graduated in 6 yrs or less in other major	Total graduated in 6 yrs or less
fall 1998	2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.
fall 1999	2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	2.
fall 2000	3	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	1.
fall 2001	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.
fall 2003	4	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	2.

Percent

ENGLISH

ENGL-CPLT

BA

First-time Full-time Freshmen

	Initial Cohort	Graduated 3 yrs or less in major	Graduated 3 yrs or less in other major	Graduated 4 yrs or less in major	Graduated 4 yrs or less in other major	Graduated 5 yrs or less in major	Graduated in 5 yrs or less in other major	Graduated in 6 yrs or less in major	Graduated in 6 yrs or less in other major	Total graduated in 6 yrs or less
fall 1998	37	0	0	5	6	9	10	11	11	22.
fall 1999	48	0	0	1	8	7	14	8	18	26.
fall 2000	49	1	0	6	7	9	12	9	14	23.
fall 2001	49	0	0	4	3	13	11	16	16	32.
fall 2002	69	0	1	5	9	12	20	13	23	36.
fall 2003	40	1	0	7	3	10	10	10	12	22.

Headcount

APPENDIX I: UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS (continued)

	Initial Cohort	% Graduated 3 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 3 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 4 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 4 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 5 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 5 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 6 yrs or less in major	% graduated in 6 yrs or less in other major	Total graduated in 6 yrs or less
fall 1998	37	0.0%	0.0%	13.5%	16.2%	24.3%	27.0%	29.7%	29.7%	22.
fall 1999	48	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	16.7%	14.6%	29.2%	16.7%	37.5%	26.
fall 2000	49	2.0%	0.0%	12.2%	14.3%	18.4%	24.5%	18.4%	28.6%	23.
fall 2001	49	0.0%	0.0%	8.2%	6.1%	26.5%	22.4%	32.7%	32.7%	32.
fall 2002	69	0.0%	1.4%	7.2%	13.0%	17.4%	29.0%	18.8%	33.3%	36.
fall 2003	40	2.5%	0.0%	17.5%	7.5%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	30.0%	22.

Percent

CPLT

ENGL-CPLT

BA

New Upper Division Transfers

	Initial Cohort	Graduated 3 yrs or less in major	Graduated 3 yrs or less in other major	Graduated 4 yrs or less in major	Graduated 4 yrs or less in other major	Graduated 5 yrs or less in major	Graduated in 5 yrs or less in other major	Graduated in 6 yrs or less in major	Graduated in 6 yrs or less in other major	Total graduated in 6 yrs or less
fall 1998	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.
fall 1999	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1.
fall 2000	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.
fall 2001	3	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	3.
fall 2002	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1.
fall 2003	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1.

Headcount

	Initial Cohort	% Graduated 3 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 3 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 4 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 4 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 5 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 5 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 6 yrs or less in major	% graduated in 6 yrs or less in other major	Total graduated in 6 yrs or less
fall 1998	2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.
fall 1999	2	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	1.
fall 2000	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.
fall 2001	3	66.7%	33.3%	66.7%	33.3%	66.7%	33.3%	66.7%	33.3%	3.
fall 2002	1	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	1.
fall 2003	2	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	1.

Percent

APPENDIX I: UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS (continued)

ENGLISH

ENG-CPLT

BA

New Upper Division Transfers

	Initial Cohort	Graduated 3 yrs or less in major	Graduated 3 yrs or less in other major	Graduated 4 yrs or less in major	Graduated 4 yrs or less in other major	Graduated 5 yrs or less in major	Graduated in 5 yrs or less in other major	Graduated in 6 yrs or less in major	Graduated in 6 yrs or less in other major	Total graduated in 6 yrs or less
fall 1998	67	34	8	37	11	40	11	40	11	51.
fall 1999	63	29	4	33	4	35	4	37	7	44.
fall 2000	56	26	6	32	7	35	8	37	8	45.
fall 2001	73	42	11	44	12	45	12	46	13	59.
fall 2002	99	58	5	65	8	68	10	71	10	81.
fall 2003	69	40	3	47	5	47	5	48	5	53.

Headcount

	Initial Cohort	% Graduated 3 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 3 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 4 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 4 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 5 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 5 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 6 yrs or less in major	% graduated in 6 yrs or less in other major	Total graduated in 6 yrs or less
fall 1998	67	50.7%	11.9%	55.2%	16.4%	59.7%	16.4%	59.7%	16.4%	51.
fall 1999	63	46.0%	6.3%	52.4%	6.3%	55.6%	6.3%	58.7%	11.1%	44.
fall 2000	56	46.4%	10.7%	57.1%	12.5%	62.5%	14.3%	66.1%	14.3%	45.
fall 2001	73	57.5%	15.1%	60.3%	16.4%	61.6%	16.4%	63.0%	17.8%	59.
fall 2002	99	58.6%	5.1%	65.7%	8.1%	68.7%	10.1%	71.7%	10.1%	81.
fall 2003	69	58.0%	4.3%	68.1%	7.2%	68.1%	7.2%	69.6%	7.2%	53.

APPENDIX I: UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS (continued)

Table 4 Degrees Awarded

ENGL-CPLT

CPLT

	BA
2002-2003	2
2003-2004	2
2005-2006	1
2006-2007	
2007-2008	
2008-2009	2

ENGL-CPLT

ENGLISH

	BA
2002-2003	130
2003-2004	146
2004-2005	174
2005-2006	159
2006-2007	184
2007-2008	158
2008-2009	186
2009-2010	154

APPENDIX II: GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

Table 5: Graduate Program Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments

ENGL-CPLT

CPLT

MA

First-time or Transfer Masters

	Applied	Admitted	% Admitted	Enrolled	% Enrolled
2004-2005	10	5	50%	3	60%
2005-2006	10	2	20%	1	50%
2006-2007	6	0	0%	0	
2007-2008	1	0	0%	0	
2008-2009	1	0	0%	0	

ENGL-CPLT

ENGLISH

MA

First-time or Transfer Masters

	Applied	Admitted	% Admitted	Enrolled	% Enrolled
2004-2005	73	40	55%	25	63%
2005-2006	82	38	46%	33	87%
2006-2007	78	55	71%	42	76%
2007-2008	109	63	58%	47	75%
2008-2009	93	51	55%	37	73%
2009-2010	71	32	45%	22	69%

APPENDIX II: GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS (continued)

Table 6-A Graduate Program Enrollment in FTES

ENGLISH &
COMPARATIVE
LITERATURE ----- CPLT

	GRAD AY FTES
2003-2004	1.0
2004-2005	0.4
2005-2006	0.7
2006-2007	0.8
2007-2008	0.4
2008-2009	1.7
2009-2010	0.1

ENGLISH &
COMPARATIVE
LITERATURE ----- ENGL

	GRAD AY FTES
2003-2004	25.0
2004-2005	23.2
2005-2006	28.2
2006-2007	34.3
2007-2008	35.6
2008-2009	36.3
2009-2010	32.5

APPENDIX II: GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS (continued)

	Masters		Total	
	Annualized Headcount	AY FTES	Annualized Headcount	AY FTES
2003-2004	2.0	0.6	2.0	0.6
2004-2005	4.0	2.0	4.0	2.0
2005-2006	2.0	0.7	2.0	0.7
2006-2007	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0
2007-2008	2.0	0.7	2.0	0.7

	Masters		Total	
	Annualized Headcount	AY FTES	Annualized Headcount	AY FTES
2003-2004	74.5	31.5	74.5	31.5
2004-2005	75.5	29.8	75.5	29.8
2005-2006	86.5	36.9	86.5	36.9
2006-2007	100.5	41.8	100.5	41.8
2007-2008	104.5	45.2	104.5	45.2
2008-2009	108.0	48.7	108.0	48.7
2009-2010	80.5	36.8	80.5	36.8

APPENDIX II: GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS (continued)

Table 7 Graduation Rates for Master's Seeking Students

CPLT

ENGL-CPLT

MA

New Masters

	Initial Cohort	Graduated 3 yrs or less in major	Graduated 3 yrs or less in other major	Graduated 4 yrs or less in major	Graduated 4 yrs or less in other major	Graduated 5 yrs or less in major	Graduated in 5 yrs or less in other major	Graduated in 6 yrs or less in major	Graduated in 6 yrs or less in other major	Total graduated in 6 yrs or less
fall 1998	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1.
fall 2000	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.

Headcount

	Initial Cohort	% Graduated 3 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 3 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 4 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 4 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 5 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 5 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 6 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 6 yrs or less in other major	Total graduated in 6 yrs or less
fall 1998	2	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	1.
fall 2000	3	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.

Percent

ENGLISH

ENGL-CPLT

MA

New Masters

	Initial Cohort	Graduated 3 yrs or less in major	Graduated 3 yrs or less in other major	Graduated 4 yrs or less in major	Graduated 4 yrs or less in other major	Graduated 5 yrs or less in major	Graduated in 5 yrs or less in other major	Graduated in 6 yrs or less in major	Graduated in 6 yrs or less in other major	Total graduated in 6 yrs or less
fall 1998	14	6	1	9	1	10	1	10	1	11.
fall 1999	25	9	0	13	0	15	0	16	0	16.
fall 2000	16	5	0	9	0	9	0	9	0	9.
fall 2001	17	6	0	8	0	8	0	9	0	9.
fall 2002	25	10	0	10	0	14	0	14	0	14.
fall 2003	17	4	0	8	0	8	0	8	0	8.

APPENDIX II: GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS (continued)

Table 7 Graduation Rates for Master's Seeking Students (continued)

Headcount

	Initial Cohort	% Graduated 3 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 3 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 4 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 4 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 5 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 5 yrs or less in other major	% Graduated in 6 yrs or less in major	% Graduated in 6 yrs or less in other major	Total graduated in 6 yrs or less
fall 1998	14	42.9%	7.1%	64.3%	7.1%	71.4%	7.1%	71.4%	7.1%	11.
fall 1999	25	36.0%	0.0%	52.0%	0.0%	60.0%	0.0%	64.0%	0.0%	16.
fall 2000	16	31.3%	0.0%	56.3%	0.0%	56.3%	0.0%	56.3%	0.0%	9.
fall 2001	17	35.3%	0.0%	47.1%	0.0%	47.1%	0.0%	52.9%	0.0%	9.
fall 2002	25	40.0%	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	56.0%	0.0%	56.0%	0.0%	14.
fall 2003	17	23.5%	0.0%	47.1%	0.0%	47.1%	0.0%	47.1%	0.0%	8.

Percent

Table 8 Master's Degrees Awarded

ENGL-CPLT

CPLT

	MA
2002-2003	1
2003-2004	
2005-2006	
2006-2007	1
2007-2008	2
2008-2009	

ENGL-CPLT

ENGLISH

	MA
2002-2003	24
2003-2004	15
2004-2005	20
2005-2006	19
2006-2007	28
2007-2008	29
2008-2009	35
2009-2010	40

APPENDIX III. DOCUMENTING ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

Plan for Documentation of Academic Achievement (Assessment of Student Learning)

Department/Program: English, Comparative Literature, and Linguistics

Date: Spring 2010

P = Planning E = Emerging D = Developed HD = Highly Developed		P	E	D	HD	Additional Comments
I	Achievement Plan Component					
	Mission Statement					
	a. Provide a concise and coherent statement of the goals and purposes of the department/program				x	Goals and purposes are clearly outlined on our website
	b. Provide a comprehensive framework for student learning outcomes				x	See website; self study pp. 5 and 6
	c. Describe department/program assessment structure, e.g. committee, coordinator			x		Integrated throughout curricular components
II	Student Learning Goals					
	a. Identify and describe knowledge, skills, or values expected of graduates			x		See website; self study pp. 5 and 6; 11-13
	b. Consistent with mission				x	
	c. Provide the foundation for more detailed descriptions of learning outcomes			x		Apparent on course syllabi and shared courses
III	Student Learning Outcomes					
	a. Aligned with learning goals				x	
	b. Use action verbs that describe knowledge, skills, or values students should develop				x	
	c. Specify performance, competencies, or behaviors that are observable and measurable				x	
IV	Assessment Strategies					
	a. Use specific multiple measures for assessment of learning outcomes other than grades			x		Self study pp. 11-14
	b. Use direct measures of student learning outcomes			x		
	c. Indirect measures may also be used but along with direct measures		x			Plans for more systematic data collection
	d. Measures are aligned with goals/ learning outcomes				x	
	e. Each goal/ outcome is measured			x		
V	Utilization for Improvement					
	a. Identify who interprets the evidence and detail the established process			x		Faculty involved in particular programs
	b. How are findings utilized? Provide examples			x		Self study p. 14

APPENDIX IV: FACULTY

Table 9 Full-Time Instructional Faculty, FTEF, FTES, SFR

YEAR	Tenured	Tenure Track	Sabbaticals at 0.5	FERP at 0.5	Lecturers	FTEF Allocation	FTES Target	Actual FTES	Budgt SFR
2003-2004	19	8		2	1	43.4	1084	1087.5	25.0
2004-2005	19	5		3	1	44.6	1112	1131.8	24.4
2005-2006	18	5		3	1	47.3	1187	1140.4	23.9
2006-2007	19	7		2	3	47.0	1175	1128.1	24.3
2007-2008	16	8		3	4	46.6	1151	1151.0	24.2
2008-2009	17	7		2	3	47.6	1128	1128.4	24.2
2009-2010	14	6		3	2	42.0	1032	1031.7	26.9

Tenured and tenure track totals Include faculty on leave and administrators with retreat rights.

APPENDIX V: RESOURCES

**ENGLISH, COMP LIT, AND LINGUISTICS
OPERATING EXPENSE BUDGET**

Fiscal Year	Baseline	Adjunct & YRO	Total
FY 09-10	\$ 19,481	\$ 43,021	\$62,502
FY 08-09	\$ -	\$ 66,024	\$66,024
FY 07-08	\$ 38,962	\$ 57,772	\$ 6,734
FY 06-07	\$ 38,962	\$ 51,366	\$ 0,328
FY 05-06	\$ 38,962	\$ 54,263	\$ 3,225

Note: In FY08-09 baseline OE was given up as a one-time budget reduction.

PHILANTHROPIC FOUNDATION ACCOUNTS (FUNDRAISING)										
Year	ENGL Dept Fund 36000	Bruner Endowd Schlr (Dist) 32040	Crouch Mem Fund 36002	Engl Excelnc Schlr (Dist) 36040	Wornhoud t Endowd Schlr (Dist) 36041	Powers Engl Ed Award 36042	Hollowy Endowd (Dist) 36045	JEVID Schlr Engl 36046	LING Prog Gen Disc 36003	Wrtr in Res 36060 (new)
2005-2006	\$2273.36	\$280.93	--	\$484.52	\$870.75	\$200.00	\$743.48	--	--	--
2006-2007	\$2933.36	\$573.60	--	\$1092.74	\$1030.12	\$200.00	\$977.30	--	--	--
2007-2008	\$1168.46	\$755.56	\$800.00	\$1488.00	\$1103.97	\$2200.00	\$817.32	\$0.00	--	--
2008-2009	\$1959.18	\$716.92	\$1050.00	\$1226.84	\$1128.87	\$200.00	\$431.98	\$0.00	--	--
2009-2010	\$2359.18	\$791.07	\$1050.00	\$1233.57	\$1199.55	\$200.00	\$325.44	\$0.00	\$25.00	--
As of 12/31/10	\$2369.18	\$791.07	\$1050.00	\$1233.57	\$1199.55	\$200.00	\$325.44	\$0.00	\$25.00	\$75.00

APPENDIX VI: LONG TERM PLANNING

DEPARTMENT GOALS

Compiled from the PPR

FACULTY/INSTRUCTIONAL-RELATED GOALS	INTENDED OUTCOME	ASSESSMENT	COST
Continue provide supportive intellectual environment and adequate time	Faculty retention, faculty RTP success, student retention and success; hire a full time Academic Support staff to work with faculty to coordinate course schedules	Review faculty hiring, retention, and promotion trends; Review student and course enrollment trends, graduation rates, surveys of student experience	Time; cost of regularly conducting and analyzing surveys of past and current students; cost of hiring a full time Academic Support staff member
Continue assigning a three/three teaching load	Faculty retention, faculty RTP success, student retention and success; meeting targets	Review faculty hiring, retention, and promotion trends; Review student and course enrollment trends, graduation rates, surveys of student experience.	Time; cost of regularly conducting and analyzing surveys
Continue to hire diverse faculty	To offer a curriculum appropriate to the changing discipline and to students' interests; to have intellectually and professionally successful faculty	Curricular developments; adequate faculty staffing; adequate enrollments; RTP success	Time; cost of conducting searches and regularly hiring faculty
Hire one or more faculty to assist in orchestrating the University/system writing requirements and administering the department/University writing courses.	To meet the growing demands for writing administration at all levels; a dedicated professional who works with faculty to align expectations, outcomes and assess successes	Continued developments in and expansion of writing courses; improved alignment of outcomes across campus; improved students' success; adequate faculty support	Cost to the Department,/College/University of hiring a tenure track specialist in composition/rhetoric who has at least a half time administrative appointment; Cost of providing the support structure for such a position
Expand the number of tutors in the Writing Center, number of TAs in the Writing Program, and develop additional instructional assistant opportunities	To provide graduate students with additional opportunities for applying their theoretical knowledge and engaging in professional opportunities	The number of positions available; student placement in PhD programs, community college instructional positions, teaching positions after graduation	Cost of additional supervision and GA/TA lines
Student learning	INTENDED OUTCOME	ASSESSMENT	COST
Continue to improve mentoring, advising, advertising, and outreach in the form of surveys and data collection.	Maintain and improve graduation rates; to improve students' experiences in the program; to be responsive to our students	Steady or improved graduation rates in undergraduate and graduate programs; regional recognition; increased alumni support	Cost of data collection, advertising, website development
Develop a two-year curricular plan	To improve graduation rates; to assist in keeping our curriculum aligned with the faculty's teaching assignments	To continue to meet target and maintain a robust major while allowing flexibility in scheduling	Time
Curricular	INTENDED OUTCOME	ASSESSMENT	COST
Find better ways of combining English literary and linguistics studies	To integrate more fully the components of our department	Programs and courses reflective of the interdisciplinarity of the department	Time for course development and program revisions
Increase enrollments in our Comparative Literature B.A.; develop learning outcomes specific to the major	To increase the size and coherence of the program and determine any staffing/hiring needs	Numbers of declared majors; size of courses; number of courses offered	Time
Continue to develop large lecture classes at the 200 and 300; develop learning outcomes specific to such courses and assess how well students are achieving the outcomes.	To grow the major and to assist in our attempts to meet target in a pedagogically sound manner	Numbers of declared majors; number of minors; course enrollments	Time
Expand options and/or regularly offer current professional writing courses	To improve writing in the discipline opportunities across campus	Number of courses offered; enrollments	Dedicating lecturer positions to these courses; in the future considering a TT line
Work with HSS Advancement create a Visiting Writer in Residence position	To expand the creative writing curriculum and provide students with access to additional mentoring and advising.	Course enrollments and program attendance	Cost not covered by fund raising for hiring a visiting writer

APPENDIX VI: LONG TERM PLANNING (continued)

DEPARTMENT GOALS
Compiled from the PPR (continued)

CURRICULAR	INTENDED OUTCOME	ASSESSMENT	COST
Create learning outcomes for our creative writing courses; assess our courses in relation to these outcomes and assess the set of courses available in relation to programmatic outcomes.	To review the coherence of the growing number of courses	Course enrollments; student success	Time
ASSESSMENT	INTENDED OUTCOME	ASSESSMENT	COST
Evaluate the newly-established comparative studies requirement	To assess how successfully we are meeting student demand	Course enrollments; students' success in meeting the requirement	Time
Assess undergraduate interest and disciplinary appropriateness of developing an undergraduate Certificate in Digital Rhetoric	To be responsive to our students interests and to the changing nature of English Studies	Development of a Certificate	Time, potential need for additional hiring
Revisit possibility of a capstone requirement/course/experience.	To determine whether changes in enrollments, target, SFR make this option feasible	Developing a requirement or not	Time

APPENDIX VII: ASSESSMENT

ENGLISH 99: PORTFOLIO SCORING RUBRIC

Student writer: _____ Instructor: _____

<p><i>To determine the writer's skill in accomplishing each of the following writing outcomes, please consider the writing performance displayed in the three portfolio essays collectively. For each essay, keep in mind the writing prompt, how much feedback the student received, and how much time the student had to revise. You may also consider the manner in which the writer is able (or not) to talk about his/her writing process and how he/she selected these particular essays.</i></p>	<i>Scale</i>				
UPON EVALUATION, READERS HAVE DETERMINED THE FOLLOWING ABOUT THE WRITING QUALITY OF THE PORTFOLIO AS A WHOLE.					
Focus					
1. Contains an identifiable thesis.	Always	More often than not	Sometimes	Never	
2. Maintains a strong focus on the thesis throughout the essay.	Always	More often than not	Sometimes	Never	
3. Meets the criteria of the assignment.	Always	More often than not	Sometimes	Never	
Development, Support, and Organization					
4. Demonstrates knowledge of the topic and reveals evidence of critical and creative thinking.	Always	More often than not	Sometimes	Never	
5. Supports the main idea through details and credible sources.	Always	More often than not	Sometimes	Never	
6. Presents ideas in a clear and logical order.	Always	More often than not	Sometimes	Never	
7. Uses transitions effectively to connect sentences and paragraphs.	Always	More often than not	Sometimes	Never	
Readability, Style, and Format					
8. Contains few spelling, syntax, word-usage or punctuation errors.	Always	More often than not	Sometimes	Never	
9. Uses a tone that is appropriate to the audience and to the writing task, and strives to have an original voice.	Always	More often than not	Sometimes	Never	
10. Uses MLA format consistently and accurately throughout the paper.	Always	More often than not	Sometimes	Never	

APPENDIX VII: ASSESSMENT (continued)

ANALYSIS OF WRITING ANXIETY: ENGLISH 100/100W

Students in ENGL 100/W were asked to respond to a series of 26 items by circling the number between 1 (Strongly Agree) and 5 (Strongly Disagree) that best represented their attitude toward that statement. The possible total test scores range from a low of 26 to a high of 130, with the higher score representing less anxiety toward writing. The standard deviation for this study was 15.38. Overall, the average score of the students who completed this writing anxiety survey improved 8.57—from a score of 81.74 on the pre-test to a 90.31 on the post-test. **This is a 10.49% improvement on the overall averages scores.**

Of the 26 items on the test, 24 statements demonstrated a significant improvement in the students' attitude toward a specific aspect of writing, 1 was a negligible difference, and 1 demonstrated a decrease in the students' attitude toward writing. These results are presented in the table below:

Statement	Pre-Average Score	Post-Average Score	Difference	Percentage Improvement
I have a terrible time organizing my ideas in a composition course	2.9135	3.5152	0.6017	20.65%
I don't think I write as well as most other people	2.4615	2.9697	0.5082	20.64%
I feel confident in my ability to clearly express my ideas in writing	2.8846	2.3434	0.5412	18.76%
Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience	3.0769	2.5960	0.4810	15.63%
My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on a composition	2.7788	3.2121	0.4333	15.59%
I like to have my friends read what I have written	2.9135	2.4747	0.4387	15.06%
I have no fear of my writing being evaluated	2.7692	2.3636	0.4056	14.65%
I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated	3.2692	3.7374	0.4681	14.32%
I'm no good at writing	3.2885	3.7576	0.4691	14.27%
I never seem to be able to clearly write down my ideas	2.7404	3.1313	0.3909	14.27%
People seem to enjoy what I write	3.0096	2.5859	0.4238	14.08%
I'm nervous about writing	3.0769	3.5051	0.4281	13.91%
I enjoy writing	2.9231	2.5758	0.3473	11.88%
Handing in a composition makes me feel good	2.7115	2.4141	0.2974	10.97%
Writing is a lot of fun	3.2019	2.9091	0.2928	9.15%
I don't like my compositions to be evaluated	3.2115	3.5051	0.2935	9.14%
I like to write my ideas down	2.5096	2.2828	0.2268	9.04%
Taking a composition course is a very intimidating experience	3.3269	3.6162	0.2892	8.69%
I like seeing my thoughts on paper	2.5865	2.3838	0.2027	7.84%
Enjoy submitting writing to magazines for evaluation/publication	3.5288	3.2525	0.2763	7.83%
When I hand in a composition I know I'm going to do poorly	3.6538	3.9293	0.2754	7.54%
I avoid writing	3.1346	3.3636	0.2290	7.31%
I look forward to writing down my ideas	2.6058	2.4545	0.1512	5.80%
It's easy for me to write good compositions	3.1635	3.0101	0.1534	4.85%
I expect to do poorly in composition classes even before I enter them	3.7308	3.7677	0.0369	0.99%
Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time	4.0385	3.9495	-0.0890	-2.20%
Overall Average	81.74	90.31	8.57	10.49%

APPENDIX VII: ASSESSMENT (continued)

Assessment of Senior English Majors' Writing Skills

Methodology

Four faculty readers reviewed a set of 13 randomly collected essays written by graduating senior English majors from two sections of ENGL 316, Shakespeare. The essays had been marked with an identifying letter to insure the anonymity of the student writers, and were each assessed by two independent readers using a scoring rubric. The rubric identified three areas of evaluation: 1) Content; 2) Development and Organization; and 3) Format, Style and Mechanics. Within these areas the essays were evaluated as Poor, Fair, Average, Very Good, or Excellent. Readers also provided written commentary for a more nuanced evaluation of each essay.

Findings

Overall the essays were all evaluated in all areas as Average, Very Good, or Excellent. No essays received an evaluation of Poor or Fair. Most essays did not receive uniform rankings in all three areas. Some essays deemed Excellent in one area might be deemed Average or Very Good in another.

Samples from Written Commentary

- While the essays “displayed varying levels of mastery” they did show “obvious knowledge of the texts they discuss.”
- The “[d]iscussion demonstrates thorough knowledge of the plays.”
- “Most of the authors are able to provide specific textual evidence to support their points and contextualize that evidence in a logical and concise way.”
- “The choice of critical material is for the most part strong, and its handling in the essay is skillful.”
- “[T]he authors seem reticent to critique secondary source material” and that they did not always seem “in dialogue with source material.”
- The essay “begins with a strong thesis and develops the argument with expert control of comparative organization.”

Conclusions

Overall, students do well with organization and the mechanics of writing. Skill with creating argument is related to the use of secondary. Recent revisions in the ENGL 300 curriculum should address directly the need for students to develop and apply research skills. Conducting this evaluation bi-annually will let us look for changes in student skills and make corresponding changes to the curriculum.

APPENDIX VII: ASSESSMENT (continued)

English Graduate Studies
MA EXAM SCORING RUBRIC

Critical (Formal) Analysis Scoring Criteria

High Pass

The essay that earns a “High Pass” will contain some or all of the listed characteristics:

The essay demonstrates all of the elements of the examination that passes plus the following: The essay clearly unifies a discussion of several formal features to develop a thorough critical reading. It demonstrates the writer’s knowledge of these formal features and a skillful ability to analyze the features in depth and use them in an interpretation. The essay demonstrates complexity of style and thought, individual creative thinking, and a distinct voice. Overall, the essay demonstrates an eloquent writing style and is free of egregious errors.

Pass

The essay that earns a “Pass” will contain some or all of the listed characteristics:

The essay presents a clear, well-reasoned argument and thesis. It has a clear introduction, body, and conclusion. The essay offers substantial development of the argument by providing evidence through close readings of formal features in the passage. The essay contains accurate textual details and addresses several formal features in the text, providing transitions or links among them. The essay contains few spelling, grammar, and/or syntax errors.

No Pass :

The essay that earns a “No Pass” will contain some or all of the listed characteristics:

The essay offers mostly paraphrase, does not include a clear thesis, and/or has an underdeveloped argument. The essay relies on generalizations, considers few formal features of the text, and contains textual inaccuracies and/or unsubstantiated assertions. The essay is poorly organized and/or contains numerous grammatical, spelling, and syntax errors.

APPENDIX VII: ASSESSMENT (continued)

*Synthesis Scoring Criteria***High Pass**

The essay that earns a “No Pass” will contain some or all of the listed characteristics:

The essay demonstrates all the elements of the examination that passes plus the following: The essay thoughtfully unifies a discussion of the issue(s) in all three works. The essay successfully applies a critical stance or methodology in the analysis of the works and may place the works within their historical context. The essay uses appropriate specific examples that are analyzed in depth. The essay demonstrates complexity of style and thought, creative thinking, and a distinct and informed voice. The essay demonstrates an eloquent writing style, free of egregious errors.

Pass

The essay that earns a “Pass” will contain some or all of the listed characteristics:

The essay presents a clear thesis, a well-reasoned argument, and effective organization. The essay unifies a discussion of the issue(s) in all three works. It contains accurate textual details and offers substantial development of the argument by providing evidence through clear and specific examples. The essay contains few spelling, grammatical, and/or syntax errors.

No Pass

The essay that earns a “No Pass” will contain some or all of the listed characteristics:

The essay does not consider the required number and range of texts. The essay offers mostly paraphrase, an absent or unclear thesis, and an undeveloped argument. It relies on generalizations, offers textual inaccuracies, and provides unsubstantiated assertions and few or ill-chosen examples. Stylistically, the essay offers poor organization and contains grammatical, spelling, and/or syntax errors.

APPENDIX VII: ASSESSMENT (continued)

**Student Learning Outcome for GE 2A:
Students can write using the conventions of college-level English.**

RUBRIC (Draft 1/11)

Writing outcome	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Focus	Thesis is missing or has no relation to the writing assignment.	Thesis is identifiable but may be vague, too broad, or unrelated to the essay.	Thesis matches the writing task, is clear and expresses a specific point of view.	Thesis matches the writing task, is clear, expresses a specific point of view that is legitimately debatable, and insightful.
Development and Organization	Ideas are undeveloped; no clear relationship between paragraphs or sentences; inadequate or inappropriate evidence.	Some signs of logical organization; may have abrupt or illogical shifts and ineffective sequence of ideas; may overuse quotations or under-analyze evidence.	Develops ideas logically within paragraphs and links them with effective transitions; supports the main idea with credible evidence.	Substantial, logical, and concrete development of ideas; sequence of ideas is effective and organic; supports the main idea with appropriate and thoroughly analyzed evidence that does not substitute for original thought.
Readability and Style	Spelling, syntax, word-usage, or punctuation errors impede readability; citation/style format is missing; tone suggests an absence of audience awareness.	Spelling, syntax, word-usage, or punctuation errors may impede readability; inconsistent citation/style format; tone is inconsistent or may suggest misreading of the audience.	Spelling, syntax, word-usage, or punctuation errors are few and do not distract from meaning; correctly uses appropriate style/citation format; uses tone appropriate to audience.	Outstanding control of language, including effective word choice and sentence variety; superior facility with the conventions of standard written English. Correctly uses appropriate style/citation format; uses tone with rhetorical sophistication.