



**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW
ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT**

College	CLASS
Department	English
Program Unit	
Reporting for Academic Year	2014-2015
Department Chair	Sarah Nielsen
Date Submitted	6/30/2015

1. SELF-STUDY (about 1 page)

A. Five-year Review Planning Goals

English completed its most recent five-year review in the 2012-2013 academic year. The goals from that review listed below.

A. Curriculum

1. Re-establish the Secondary Education – English/Language arts option within the major
2. Re-initiate efforts to develop UWSR satisfying writing courses within each major as described in Appendix B
3. Close the assessment loop on recently piloted remedial coursework described in Appendix B by incorporating suggestions and making curricular or procedural revisions.
4. Create graduate-level course equivalent to ENGL 3000 to run in self-support.
5. Create more courses at the junior and senior level focusing on global literature in line with the course requirements of the revised (2010) major
6. Expand the number of online course offerings in the aim of developing an entirely on-line minor
7. Develop a service-learning/internship component to the major.
8. Explore possibility of low-residency MFA

B. Students

1. Develop more effective communication strategies with students as an effort to build greater community and identification among majors
2. Enhance recruitment efforts of students at local community colleges
3. Further develop advising practices in order to keep students better informed about their progress toward major completion and possibilities for after graduation

C. Faculty

1. Conduct faculty searches in the areas designated in our 5-year plan.
2. Establish regular forums for lecturers and tenure track faculty to share current academic research

D. Resources

1. The Department will investigate the development of courses and programs that would be appropriate for offerings in the university's department of Continuing Education (DCIE).

B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress

Progress made in 2014-5 year described below.

A. Curriculum

1. Re-establish the Secondary Education – English/Language arts option within the major
[Progress in 2014-5: As part of the semester conversion process, English requested and was granted transformation funds to invigorate our smallest regular option in the BA program, language and discourse, by revising it to align with state requirements to become an approved English subject matter preparation program. The department held its first retreat on 6/29/15 to begin this process.]

2. Re-initiate efforts to develop UWSR satisfying writing courses within each major
[Progress in 2014-5: English faculty participated in Academic Senate and GE Subcommittee discussions of this topic. In addition, Dr. Margaret Rustick, Composition Coordinator, chaired the Writing Skills Subcommittee, which continues to work on this issue. At the graduate level, three programs now have approval to offer UWSR satisfying writing courses. No undergraduate programs have sought approval to offer this type of class.]

3. Close the assessment loop on recently piloted remedial coursework
[Progress in 2014-5: All English GTAs, the composition coordinator, four lecturers, and the department chair participated in a winter quarter portfolio reading of student work from the English 800 and English 700 developmental writing series. After piloting this process over the last three years, this three-day evaluation session is now an established practice in the department, provides a professional development opportunity for our graduate student GTAs, and provides the department with information about students' writing development in the remedial program. For the first time this year, students whose portfolios received the top rubric score from four readers and a recommendation from their teacher were waived from the third quarter of the remedial series (English 730 or English 803). The winter 2015 portfolio evaluation also revealed that the majority of students in the developmental writing series could state a thesis and organize the development of that thesis adequately. However, the majority of students had difficulty with analysis and using that analysis to develop their thesis. To address this issue, faculty workshops were developed and included in the regular weekly composition workshop series the department has offered for the last decade.]

4. Create graduate-level course equivalent to ENGL 3000 to run in self-support.
[No progress made in 2014-5. This goal should be reevaluated in light of the semester conversion. We may no longer need to develop a course like this as more departments create UWSR courses within their disciplines.]

5. Create more courses at the junior and senior level focusing on global literature in line with the course requirements of the revised (2010) major

[Dr. James Murphy developed and has now taught English 4845, The Short Story: A Global Perspective, twice. Dr. Deborah Barrett-Graves has developed and will teach a world mythology class covering the 11th-17th centuries as an English 3999 course. With the moratorium on new quarter courses, the department plans to add more courses with a global focus during the conversion to semesters.]

6. Expand the number of online course offerings in the aim of developing an entirely online minor

[Progress in 2014-5: The number of online major/minor course offerings decreased this year in large part because the faculty who have been most active in developing and offering online classes have been working in other capacities across campus. Although there are now two lecturers in the department who can teach online major/minor courses and have an interest in doing so, it is unrealistic to expand offerings for next year. This goal will be re-examined as part of the conversion process.]

7. Develop a service-learning/internship component to the major.

[Progress in 2014-5: The MA in English and the MA in English/TESOL Option each have a well-established internship course and a GTA program. No progress was made on adding a service learning/internship component to the undergraduate major this year. This goal will be re-examined as part of the conversion process.]

8. Explore possibility of low-residency MFA

[Progress in 2014-5: The department chair and Professor Susan Gubernat had several informal discussions about this possibility, and Associate Dean Hernandez expressed support for this idea. However, no formal study of this possibility was conducted this year. Because there are a dizzying number of required change initiatives happening right now, it is likely that a formal study of this possibility will not come until 2017.]

B. Students

1. Develop more effective communication strategies with students as an effort to build greater community and identification among majors

[Progress in 2014-5: The department website was updated to include more information about department events, scholarships, and literary contests. The department hosted two socials for faculty, students and staff, one in January and one in June. The department has also begun ever so slowly to re-do its messy bulletin boards to create a more welcoming and information rich environment around the department office. Efforts to improve the website, expand department social and co-curricular events, and improve bulletin boards will continue over the summer.]

2. Enhance recruitment efforts of students at local community colleges

[Progress in 2014-5: No progress was made on this goal.]

3. Further develop advising practices in order to keep students better informed about their progress toward major completion and possibilities for after graduation

[Progress in 2014-5: Department coordinator developed and distributed a half-sheet flyer with advisors' options and office hours each quarter. Moving forward this information will also be included on the department website and on a bulletin board dedicated to advising.]

C. Faculty

1. Conduct faculty searches in the areas designated in our 5-year plan.

[Progress in 2014-5: For the first time in 11 years, English has been granted two tenure-track searches. We are super grateful and happy about this.]

2. Establish regular forums for lecturers and tenure track faculty to share current academic research

[Progress in 2014-5: At the winter social in the department, current graduate students presented papers to lecturer and TT faculty and other students about their vision of what the English department might become in the future given current trends in research and theory in the field of English studies. If people aren't too exhausted next year, the department chair wants to establish a Tuesday Talk series for faculty and student presentations about their research or creative work. The department already has a weekly composition workshop series each quarter, which focuses mainly on pedagogy and largely serves GTAs and new lecturers.

D. Resources

3. The Department will investigate the development of courses and programs that would be appropriate for offerings in the university's department of Continuing Education (DCIE).
[No progress on this goal in 2014-5 other than the informal discussions about a self-support MFA.]

C. Program Changes and Needs

1. In order to make progress on the goal to develop a single subject waiver program in English, the department will submit a request for TT hire in English education during the next hiring cycle.
2. As a department with a large number of service courses in composition, we taught 2,869 students in fall 2013, 2,558 in winter 2013, and 2,533 spring 2013 (source: CSU Academic Planning Data Base (APDB); Section Master File (BKPD SMF) and Faculty Master File (BKPD FMF) Planning and Institutional Research). Meeting the needs of this number of students and the faculty who serve them with only one full-time staff member and no part-time staff is challenging. Looking ahead to 2015-6, the department could use some additional administrative support, even if just on a short term basis, to help with work related to two TT searches and conversion efforts.
3. The department has started the conversion process and has already identified areas in our curriculum that need to be revised to better connect with our ILOs and meet our students' needs.

2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (about 1 page)

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.

Curriculum maps with ILO alignment can be found at the following URL:

<http://www20.csueastbay.edu/class/assessment/index.html>

B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

B.A. # 1: analyze and interpret various kinds of texts.

B.A. # 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;

M.A. # 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

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 exam and a final exam, 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.

3. STATISTICAL DATA (about 1 page)

Institutional Research, Analysis and Decision Support (IRAD) produces program statistics annually in standard format. These statistics (available on their page [here](#)) will be attached to the Annual Report of the Program Unit. This statistical document is expected to be approximately one page long and will contain the same data as required for the five-year review including student demographics of majors, student level of majors (e.g. Juniors, Seniors), faculty and academic allocation, and course data.

The Annual Report may include one or two pages of supplemental information, as appendices, in the form of graphical presentation (e.g., line graphs), tables, and pertinent discussion which summarize the data of the last several (3-5) years to make changes and trends more apparent.

1. Student demographics of English majors are available at the following URL.

<https://public.tableau.com/profile/publish/EthnicitySummarybyDepartmentMajorwSpreadsheet/EthnicityGenderSummarybyDepartment#!/publish-confirm>

2. Degrees conferred 2013 (source Office of Institutional Research, Analysis & Decision Support | Cal State East Bay)

BA: 44

MA: 36

3. Course History (source: Office of Institutional Research, Analysis & Decision Support | Cal State East Bay)

Term	Number of Sections	Enrollment	Average Course Size
Summer 2013	13	287	25.9
Fall 2014	129	2900	23.4
Winter 2015	124	2794	23.4
Spring 2014	112	2474	22.9

4. Standard program review data are available at the following URL.

<http://www20.csueastbay.edu/ir/files/pdf/academic-program-review/summary-2009-13/APR-Summary-Data-CLASS-Fall%202009-13.pdf>