

Proposal:

The English department is putting forth an ambitious proposal to assess every element in our curriculum, from English 10 to our three graduate programs. ((We have already completed, under the guidance of Kirsten Saxton, the closed loop assessment of our General Education English 1 program and are halfway through a closed loop assessment of English 10 and the graduate 250 MA thesis project under the direction of Juliana Spahr and Stephanie Young).

Because so many of our different undergraduate major courses are linked both curricularly and via staffing models to our graduate programs, we want to propose this assessment plan in its entirety, giving us a chance to systematically assess each component of our quite large curriculum; we are calling these components “rubrics” and each rubric represents a common genre/level of course serving a particular student population (see below). Along with the requisite reasons why doing thorough curricular assessment projects is important, the English department has another reason why doing this work can assist our program. Because we have over 40% of courses taught by visiting adjuncts, it is more than imperative that we have clear course outcomes to assist the smooth integration of adjunct teaching in the department. And of course, implementing such a plan sooner rather than later also allows us to participate more fully in the WASC accreditation reporting process.

We do want to suggest that because of the sheer scope of both our undergraduate and graduate programs, serving over 80 majors, 100 graduate students as well as GE courses, program emphases in CW and Literature, and four distinct graduate degrees) that doing a full scale assessment without institutional support funds would be virtually impossible for us. As it is, this plan proposes most faculty will need to work for possibly 30 hours over each summer for the next 3 years; directors will have the job of planning, coordinating faculty in formalizing course outcomes for each rubric, crafting assessment rubrics, overseeing artifact assessment, creating curricular guidelines, and writing progress and final assessment report documents over the next three years.—probably something more worthy of a course release each year for three years. Given the scope of the work the English department has to do, and given the size of our program, and given that we hope to enact effective assessment protocols and implement the subsequent revision of the program that our assessment suggests, we think this is actually quite a modest proposal. The proposal draws strength by including participation of full time and visiting faculty input across all teaching units in the department.

This current proposal is an extension of the English Department’s already approved four phase assessment plan (see attachment), which covered English 1, English 10, English 250 (Graduate Capstone) and English Senior Capstone (undergraduate). This proposal simply extends that work, assuming that the remaining phases of this earlier plan, the English Senior Capstone, and MA Capstone would fall into Group 1 of the new plan’s schedule.

Course Rubrics and faculty teams:

Literature

Literature Assessment Coordinator (LAC), Dr. Kirsten Saxton

English 10 (Goals, Rubric, First Artifact Assessment and Curricular Guide completed; second artifact assessment scheduled for Summer 09 under already approved budget and proposal).

Kirsten Saxton

Diane Cady

Ajuan Mance

1) Lower division Surveys

Kara Wittman

Tom Strychacz

Diane Cady

2) Literature—Upper division literature courses (Inc Shakespeare and Bible) (

Stephen Ratcliffe

Ajuan Mance

Bula Maddison

3) Literature—Graduate only literature

Diane Cady

Tom Strychacz

Kim Magowan

4) Sr. Thesis Capstone

Cynthia Scheinberg

Ruth Saxton

Diane Cady

5) Teaching courses:

Cynthia Scheinberg

Ruth Saxton

Elmaz Abinader

6) MA Thesis Class:

Tom Strychacz

Kirsten Saxton

Diane Cady

Course Rubrics and faculty teams:

Creative Writing

Creative Writing Assessment Coordinator (CWAC), Dr. Juliana Spahr

7) Senior thesis Capstone: Creative Writing:

Cornelia Nixon

Elmaz Abinader

Micheline Marcom

8) Lower division CW

Stephanie Young

Truong Tran

Cornelia Nixon

9) CW upper division

Elmaz Abinader

Juliana Spahr

New hire

10) Graduate Workshops:

Stephen Ratcliffe

Cornelia Nixon

New hire

11) Graduate Craft:

Juliana Spahr

Elmaz Abinader

Micheline Marcom

12) Graduate Thesis Class (Completed)

Juliana Spahr

Stephanie Young

Stephen Ratcliffe

Cornelia Nixon-

Elmaz Abinader

Tentative Schedule (pending Directors' approval)

Spring 2009

- Budget allocation procured
- Faculty committees finalized
- 4 Rubrics (group 1) chosen for assessment in 2009-10;
- Procedures established
- Assessment Data (papers, exams, etc.) collected from spring semester courses for Group 1 rubrics
- Initial desired course outcomes created (or in some cases revised) and circulated for group 1

Summer 2009:

- Group 1 Data analyzed by faculty teams
- Additional data needs established (focus group/surveys)
- Faculty Teams establish curricular guidelines and Director organizes and formalizes
- Directors write up first stage analysis for group 1

Academic Year 2009-10:

- Courses from Group 1 taught with new course outcomes and curricular guidelines and data graded according to new rubrics
- 4 Rubrics (group 2) chosen for assessment in 2010-2011
- Procedures established
- Assessment Data (papers, exams, etc.) collected from spring semester courses for Group 2 rubrics
- Initial desired course outcomes created (or in some cases revised) and circulated for group 2

Summer 2010:

- Group 2 Data analyzed by faculty teams
- Additional data needs established (focus group/surveys)
- Directors write up first stage analysis for group 2
- Faculty Teams establish curricular guidelines and Director organizes and formalizes for Group 1
- Final Group 1 data collected over year analyzed, final report on Group 1

Academic Year 2010-11

- Courses from Group 2 taught with new course outcomes and data graded according to new guidelines
- 3 Rubrics (group 3) chosen for assessment in 2010-2011
- Procedures established
- Assessment Data (papers, exams, etc.) collected from spring semester courses for Group 3 rubrics
- Initial desired course outcomes created (or in some cases revised) and circulated for group 3

Summer 2011:

- Group 3 Data analyzed by faculty teams
- Additional data needs established (focus group/surveys)
- Directors write up first stage analysis for group 3
- Faculty Teams establish curricular guidelines and Director organizes and formalizes for Group 3
- Final Group 2 data collected over year analyzed, final report on Group 2

Academic Year 2011-12

- Courses from Group 3 taught with new course outcomes and data graded according to new guidelines
- Initial desired course outcomes created (or in some cases revised) and circulated for group 2

Summer 2012

- Final Group 3 data collected over year analyzed, final report on Group 3
- Department Retreat for final analysis of program and assessment outcomes
- Final assessment report assembled

Academic year 2012-13:

- Program Review Scheduled for Department to incorporate assessment recommendations into larger review of curricular offerings.
- Implementation of changes to program as recommended through assessment process.

Budget Required:

11 individual rubrics need assessment over three years

Linked Program review and curricular assessment

- Directors get \$3000 per rubric/project x 11= **33,000**
Directing includes organizing and formalizing course goals and rubrics, crafting curricular guidelines, includes organizing faculty team, collecting data, writing up final assessment report, most work to happen over the summer, each rubric takes a two year cycle.
- Team of three faculty members for each rubric
Must meet at least 10 hours in summer per rubric
\$750 per faculty member, \$2250 per rubric X 11= **24,750**
- Materials: \$1000
- Office support (student workers) \$3000
Dept Retreat for compilation of final department report/response to assessment work: \$4000

Total budget for t assessment of complete graduate and undergraduate English department curriculum, graduate and undergraduate over three years: **\$65,750**

2009-10 request: \$22,250

(four rubrics, \$1000 office support, \$250 materials)

2010-11 request: \$22,250

(four rubrics, \$1000 office support, \$250 materials)

2011-12 request \$21,250

(three rubrics, \$1000 office support, \$250 materials, department retreat)

I believe the Provost office has some thoughts regarding external funds for this project; I will also submit each yearly request as part of the annual budget process.