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## A. Program Student Learning Outcomes

### B.A. degree in English:
Students graduating with a B.A. in English from Cal State East Bay will be able to:

1. analyze and interpret various kinds of texts;
2. express their understandings and interpretations in clear and cogent prose;
3. discuss at least one theoretical perspective about language and/or literature;
4. demonstrate knowledge of key English language texts in their options: Literature, Creative Writing, Language & Discourse, and Interdisciplinary Language, Literature, and Writing Studies;
5. demonstrate facility with conducting research in traditional/nontraditional ways, including library research, the Internet, and data collection and analysis.

### M.A. degree in English:
Students graduating with an M.A. in English from Cal State East Bay will be able to:

1. analyze and interpret various kinds of texts in clear and cogent prose;
2. discuss several theoretical perspectives about literature or about applied linguistics (e.g., pedagogy, second language learning);
3. demonstrate facility with conducting research in traditional/nontraditional ways, including library research, the Internet, and data collection and analysis;
4. demonstrate the ability to learn independently.

### M.A. degree in English with the TESOL Option:
Students graduating with an M.A. degree in TESOL from Cal State East Bay will be able to:

1. communicate effectively in the profession both orally and in writing;
2. apply information literacy principles in their work as TESOL professionals;
3. draw on knowledge of language ability to shape their instructional choices;
4. use pedagogical content knowledge appropriate for a particular group of language learners;
5. integrate principles of diversity and inclusiveness in their classrooms;
6. select life-long learning strategies to stay current in the profession.
B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

| B.A. | #1: analyze and interpret various kinds of texts; |
|      | #2: express their understandings and interpretations in clear and cogent prose. |
| M.A. | #1: analyze and interpret various kinds of texts in clear and cogent prose; |
|      | #3: demonstrate facility with conducting research in traditional/nontraditional ways, including library research, the Internet, and data collection and analysis. |
| M.A. | #1: communicate effectively in the profession both orally and in writing; |
| TESOL | #4: use pedagogical content knowledge appropriate for a particular group of language Learners. |

C. Summary of Assessment Process

**FOR B.A.:**
Prof. Eve Lynch did an assessment of her English 4412, *British Literature in the 19th Century*, a survey course taught in the Spring Quarter that covers several literary genres, including poetry, prose fiction, non-fiction prose essays, and drama in the second half of the 19th century. This course is designed as a senior-level course for English majors. There were 23 students enrolled in the class.

In order to assess SLOs #1 and #2, Prof. Lynch administered two major exams, a midterm and a final, with each exam counting as 40% of the student’s grade. Each exam consisted of two parts: 1) six textual passages, from which the students were to select five and explain the significance of the passage to thematic, historical or aesthetic concerns; and 2) two essay prompts, from which the students were to select one and respond with a written essay of 3-4 pages. The students did not know ahead of time what the prompts for either section would be. However, because of the large volume of texts assigned for the quarter (57 individual texts), the students were allowed to have the syllabus during the exam. Each of the two portions of the exam was expected to take approximately one hour.

At the final exam, the students were again allowed to have the course syllabus, but, in addition, they were also allowed to write an outline of their selected essay prompt response on the inside back cover of their test bluebook. They could also have a working thesis statement, but not a fully written essay, which was to take place in the exam period. This plan was to give the students a chance to think about their essay ahead of time, so that they would presumably be able to devote more time during the exam to writing out their ideas clearly and supporting them with deliberation. It would also allow them extra time to reread their essay, making editing decisions to improve their prose. The students expressed considerable appreciation for this final exam plan.

**FOR M.A.:**
Prof. Debra Barrett-Graves assessed her English 6215 *Seminar in Renaissance Literature*, a course taught in the Winter Quarter, for the skills presented in SLOs #1 and #3. For the purpose of assessment, essay
rankings were determined by closely analyzing focus, clarity, development, organization, inter-textuality (research and use of sources), argument (complete with counterargument), rhetorical facility, and originality. There were 12 actively participating students in the class.

The 12 students submitted both research reports and research-based essays with focused content on the following Shakespearean and Jonsonian Renaissance comedies: The Taming of the Shrew, As You Like It, Much Ado About Nothing, Twelfth Night, Measure for Measure, Volpone, Epicoene, and The Alchemist. Of the 12 students, one failed to follow guidelines for the research-based essay assignment, and that data will not be included (considered as an outlier). The writing guidelines stated an essay length of between 10-12 pages, with a minimum of 6 to 8 outside sources used as support.

Prof. Debra Barrett-Graves also assessed the Senior Seminar exit exams given to 20 students.

FOR M.A. (TESOL):

Prof. Ke Zou conducted an assessment of his English 6510 Pedagogical Grammar, a course taught in the Winter Quarter, which focuses on the study of English grammar from the perspectives of second language acquisition, linguistics, and their implications for teaching grammar to ESL learners. After the students complete this course, they are expected to have a conscious knowledge of English grammar, to understand how English grammar is acquired by ESL learners, to apply various approaches, strategies or methods to grammar teaching, to create and implement lesson plans for grammar instruction, and to develop materials and activities for grammar teaching. There were 17 enrolled students in this class.

To assess SLOs #1 and #4, Prof. Zou asked each of the 17 students to do two major course assignments: 1) teaching a demo-lesson to the class about a particular area of English grammar of his or her choice, based on his or her lesson plan that describes target ESL learners, lesson objectives, teaching activities, and teaching materials; and 2) writing a term paper on how to teach an area of English grammar of his or her choice to ESL learners. The students’ performances in the demo-lessons were assessed according to a 4-grades scale: A-range grade, B-range grade, C-range grade, and D-range grade. The indicators or rubrics used for assessing the students’ demo-lessons in accordance with SLOs #1 and #4 are presented below:

a. clearly state the objective or purpose of the demon lesson;
b. define and explain terms and concepts by using concrete examples;
c. use blackboard, handouts, PowerPoint slides, etc. to emphasize and reinforce key points;
d. class activities center on important ideas and relate them to relevant student experiences;
e. check with ESL learners to ascertain whether they can follow the demo lesson;
f. answer questions appropriately to clarify or interpret terms or concepts;
g. speak clearly and loudly, and the pace of teaching is neither too fast nor too slow;
h. maintain eye contact with ESL learners, with proper facial expressions and hand gestures;
i. engage and stimulate ESL learners to a better understanding of teaching materials;
j. summarize major points or key ideas at the conclusion of the demo lesson.
The students’ term papers were also accessed according to a 4-grades scale: A-range grade, B-range grade, C-range grade, and D-range grade. The indicators or rubrics used for assessing the term papers in accordance with SLOs #1 and #4 are presented as follows:

a. analyze errors typically made by ESL learners in an area of English grammar;
b. present approaches, strategies, or methods for teaching this area of English grammar to ESL learners, and for helping ESL learners to correct their grammar errors in this area effectively;
c. display how to implement teaching approaches, strategies or methods in the ESL classroom;
d. evaluate the results of implementing instructional methodology in the ESL classroom;
e. attach a complete list of bibliographical references and a lesson plan.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

**FOR B.A.:**
The results of the midterm exam reveal a wide range of student achievement:

- 4 A’s (includes plus and minus) = 17%
- 8 B’s (includes plus and minus) = 35%
- 8 C’s (includes plus and minus) = 35%
- 2 D’s (includes plus and minus) = 9%
- 1 F = 4%

Because of this wide range of outcomes for the midterm exam, Prof. Lynch determined to implement an early decision to “close the loop” and seek to offer the students a greater chance at achieving success with this large survey of materials. As a result, she altered the plan for the final exam, which would take the same form as the midterm exam but with one change: for the essay portion of the final exam, she consulted with the students during the last class meeting to coordinate essay prompt choices that would offer them topics that they felt confident about. Instead of two prompts, Prof. Lynch and her students found agreement in five prompts, all of which remained pedagogically sound but gave a wider choice to the students. She typed up these five prompts and sent them out to the class via Blackboard the next day, so that the students would have the weekend before the final exam to plan their responses.

The results of the final exam are very rewarding, as shown below:

- 11 A’s (includes plus and minus) = 48%
- 7 B’s (includes plus and minus) = 30%
- 4 C’s (includes plus and minus) = 17%
- 1 F = 4% (this student missed 10 class meetings, including the final exam)

Eight of these 23 students saw an improvement of one or more full grade-levels on the final exam, with additional four students achieving a grade improvement of one or two grade-level increases. Reviewing
the outlines that the students had brought with them to the final exam, I found that most of them had used their opportunity to plan ahead very profitably, with sound outlines indicating good management of their logic and ideas.

Prof. Lynch plans to adopt this process for future classes, with student input on the final exam essay prompts remaining a high priority. It seems to give students a greater sense of control over the material as well as an opportunity to write on a topic that they are enthusiastic about, which is no small feat in an historical period so remote to today’s students.

FOR M.A.:
Both research reports and research-based essays yielded the following results (with regard to the level of difficulty posed by the two comedic dramatists, no discernible difference affected the final grade):

A) Research Reports: 6 A’s (includes plus and minus) = 50%
   6 B’s (includes plus and minus) = 50%

B) Research-Based Essays (percentages are based on 11 students, as one student did not follow the essay guidelines, and is considered as an outlier; this student received C):
   5 A’s (includes plus and minus) = 45%
   6 B’s (includes plus) = 55%

The results of the Senior Seminar exit exams given to 20 students are presented below (of these exit exams, the highest grade is 99%, while the lowest grade is 90%):

13 A’s = 65%
7 A-s = 35%

FOR M.A. (TESOL):
The results of the students’ demo-lessons and term papers are presented below:

A) Demo-lessons: 12 A’s (includes minus) = 71%;
   5 B’s (includes plus and minus) = 29%

B) Term papers: 9 A’s (includes minus) = 53%
   8 B’s (includes plus and minus) = 47%

The analysis of the results above suggests the following areas for improvement, in order for students of this class to achieve SLOs #1 and #4 in the future: 1) in teaching demo-lessons, students need to define and explain terms and concepts of English grammar by using concrete examples, to maintain eye contact with ESL learners, with proper facial expressions and hand gestures, and to summarize
important points or key ideas at the end of demo lessons; and 2) in writing term papers, students need to present their teaching approaches, strategies or methods by relating them to current theories of second language acquisition, so as to provide theoretical rationale for their teaching effectiveness; to show how to implement their teaching approaches, strategies or methods in the ESL classroom, and how to help ESL learners to correct grammatical errors; to evaluate the results of implementing their teaching approaches, strategies or methods, both pros and cons, with implications for improving their English grammar teaching in the future; and to include full-fledged exercises and interactive learning activities in their lesson plans.

E. Suggestions and Recommendations for the CLASS FACT Project in the Future

None at this time.

Thank you for your hard work for the past year, and have a Great Summer!