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Part A
There have been no changes in Items 1, 2, 3 & 5. The change in item 4 is noted below.

1. List of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)
2. Map of PLOs to University Learning Goals (ULGs)
3. Alignment – Matrix of PLOs to Courses
4. Planning – Assessment Schedule
The current Assessment Schedule ends this year (AY 2015-2015). The department intends to put the following schedule, revised to align with Program Planning, into effect from next year (AY 2015-2016):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLOs</th>
<th>BA Assessment Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2015-2016; 2017-2018; 2022-2023 (program planning years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2016-2017; 2018-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2021-2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Student Experience
Part B

6. Graduation Rates for Total, Non URM and URM students (per program and degree)

Graduation Rates by Entering Cohorts: English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Cohort Size</th>
<th>Program Grad Rate</th>
<th>College Average Grad Rate - All Students Who Entered This College</th>
<th>University Average Grad Rate - All Students Who Entered the University</th>
<th>Program Cohort Size</th>
<th>Program Grad Rate</th>
<th>College Average Grad Rate - All Students Who Entered This College</th>
<th>University Average Grad Rate - All Students Who Entered the University</th>
<th>Program Cohort Size</th>
<th>Program Grad Rate</th>
<th>College Average Grad Rate - All Students Who Entered This College</th>
<th>University Average Grad Rate - All Students Who Entered the University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008 Cohort: 6-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Fall 2011 Cohort: 3-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Fall 2011 Cohort: 3-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Fall 2011 Cohort: 3-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Fall 2011 Cohort: 3-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>/0</td>
<td>/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>/0</td>
<td>/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-URM</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>/0</td>
<td>/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>/0</td>
<td>/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Headcounts of program majors and new students (per program and degree)

Headcount of Program Majors by Degree: English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Students</th>
<th>Continuing Students</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT Admit</td>
<td>New Transf</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. SFR and average section size (per program)

Student-Faculty Ratio (SFR) and Average Headcount per Section: ENGL - English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject SFR</td>
<td>College SFR</td>
<td>University SFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Division</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Percentage of tenured/tenure-track instructional faculty (per department)

Percentage of Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department FTEF #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Tenure-track</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not tenure-track</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part C

10. Closing the Loop/Recommended Actions

Closing the Loop:
The Department gained greatly from three senior faculty newly appointed this year in leadership positions. Under Chair Shannon Miller’s leadership the department has successfully taken on several initiatives and completed major projects, including development and recertification of programs. Richard McNabb, Writing Program Director, led the effort to overhaul the first year composition program. As a result, a new composition course (English 2) has been created for GE Area A3, a new version of 1B has been designed for students with A3 waivers, and a STRETCH model has been piloted. Tom Moriarty, Writing Across the Curriculum Coordinator, led the effort focused on 100W. Faculty-training seminars for 100W coordinators across campus
were developed. Seminar participants documented and described their 100W courses and
developed assessment systems for assessing and improving their programs. A Writing Fellows
program was also piloted. The program paired nine undergraduate and graduate student Fellows
with twelve instructors of Stretch English. Working collaboratively with their instructors and the
Writing Fellows program, these Fellows provided nearly 1,500 hours of supplemental writing
instruction to nearly 300 students. Next year, both the Seminar Series and the Writing Fellows
program will be expanded. Professor Mark Thompson led the effort to develop the Professional
and Technical Writing program by designing a new course in digital document design and
getting recertification for the certificate program. The Curriculum & Assessment Committee,
chaired by Revathi Krishnaswamy, led the effort to update and streamline the B.A. English
curriculum. This included eliminating outdated courses, combining contiguous courses, as well
as designing new courses to reflect changes in the field and in faculty expertise. A number of
new lower division GE courses in Area C2 were also developed and approval has been obtained
from BOGS/GUP. In addition to curricular matters, the committee also worked to simplify and
improve the assessment process throughout the program.

Other areas still need attention:

**Staffing:** The department has gained leadership and extensive expertise in the area of writing
with the addition of two new Assistant WPAs who will join Richard McNabb and Thomas
Moriarty in the on-going efforts to improve first year writing and writing across the
curriculum. Unfortunately, these gains have been offset by significant and growing departmental
needs in other areas of our undergraduate curriculum. Two faculty members have retired this
year, another has begun FERPing, and two others are leaving for other institutions. While we
have authorization to search for one greatly needed position in English Education next year, we
will have significant unmet need in our undergraduate creative writing program and our MFA
program. In certain areas of literature as well we are significantly understaffed as a result of
retirements and faculty members FERPing. In particular, areas in American literature will need
to be built up to address these growing needs.

**Advising:** While assigned faculty members have done their best to juggle advising duties
alongside teaching responsibilities, retirements and reductions in release time, are making it
increasingly difficult for the department to provide the kind of advising necessary to ensure
student success and enhance retention and graduation rates. Students, especially seniors who
have completed exit interviews, indicate that they would value not only more advising, but also
more required advising which our current staffing and assigned time for advising cannot
accommodate.

**Assessment:** Further improvements to data collection and data analysis are needed. For
instance, comparing and correlating student performance data collected in 100W (the entry point
into the major) and 193 (exit point from major), would make it possible to trace and measure
individual student progress with far greater accuracy and efficacy. But reduction in release time
for faculty assigned to these duties and lack of expert assistance in statistical data analysis make
it extremely difficult for the department to undertake such projects.
**Pedagogy/Technology:** Many of the newly designed courses in the program are interdisciplinary, involving significant creative/research projects and increased use of technology, and requiring collaborative teaching within the department as well as across the college/university. As such, additional resources would be required to launch these courses successfully.

11. **Assessment Data**

As per the program’s assessment schedule, the following PLO was assessed this year:

PLO #5: Students will demonstrate the ability
to articulate the relations among culture, history, and texts.

Data was gathered from the following core courses: two sections Engl 68A (American Lit survey) and one section of 56B (British Lit survey). In both sections of 68A, a midterm essay exam was used to assess the PLO. In 56B, a final project consisting of a written essay plus a PPT presentation was used to assess the PLO. The assignments required students to examine and analyze specific literary texts by placing them within a larger historical and cultural context. Instructor developed guidelines/rubrics containing PLO specific criteria were used to gather data.

See Appendix 1 for data and sample instruments.

12. **Analysis**

The data shows that an overwhelming majority of students in the major demonstrate satisfactory (or higher) achievement of PLO#5. Only 4 out of a total of 83 students in three classes failed to achieve the PLO.

13. **Proposed changes and goals (if any)**

Further streamlining of assessment and restructuring of curriculum, including development of new courses, will continue next year. As per the revised assessment plan, PLO #1 (Students will demonstrate the ability to articulate the relations among culture, history, and texts) will be assessed next year.