

Self Study Document

OUTLINE:

A. Program Context and Curriculum

- Program Introduction and History
- Program Engagement with Sonoma State University's Core Values.
- Program Revision in 2015-16
- Impact of Executive Order 1100 on our GE Curriculum
- Current Challenges

B. Assessment

- Overview
- Alignment
- Experiential Learning.
- Assessment of Student Experiences and Learning in Single-Subject Concentration.
- Contributions to GE Program.

C. Faculty

- Faculty make up
- Faculty Specializations and alignment to program curriculum, program mission, and program quality.
 - Creative Writing
 - Literature
 - Single Subject Concentration
 - Composition and Adjunct Faculty

D. Program Resources

- Early Career Advising.
- Assigned Advisors.
- Campus Support Services
- Institutional Support/Student Research/Engagement.
- Library and information resources.
- Instructional spaces and facilities.
- Impact of Potential Changes.
- Ratio of Tenure-Track Faculty to Student and to Adjunct Faculty.
- Ability to recruit and retain a diverse faculty.
- Availability of faculty mentoring programs.

E. Student Success

- Student Involvement.
- Student Demographics
 - Numbers and percentages of underrepresented students
 - Gender balance
 - First Generation representation
 - Age
 - Numbers of first-time freshmen and transfer students
 - Graduation, Persistence, GPA:
- Trends in the English Major.
 - Salary earnings and employment fields
- Student Life Post-Graduation

F. Reflection and Plan of Action

- Review and response to 2015 Action Plan
- Plan of Action
 - Hire Faculty
 - Reflect on the nature and structure of our overall major and its courses
 - Limited residency Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing.
 - Assessment
 - Social Media and Communication.
- Action Plan Specific to our Composition Program
 - Closing equity gaps in first-year curriculum.
 - CSU Supportive Pathways for First-Year Students

G. Dissemination of this Program Review.

A. Program Introduction and History

Since even before the founding of Sonoma State University, the Department of English has been involved in the life and purpose of the university and its local communities. English Professor Dorothy Overly was one of ten founding faculty members of what was then the North Bay branch of San Francisco State. Dr. Overly went on to play a formative role in the development of the in the English Department's strong tradition of teaching, service and scholarship during her long tenure. She is one of several former faculty members for whom scholarships for current students has been named. Professor Robert-Coleman Senghor was a distinguished Faculty member here until he passed away in 2011, and he also served on the City Counsel and as Mayor of Cotati. Professor J.J. Wilson was an organizer and founder of the vibrant and crucial program that is today Women's and Gender Studies, and was an icon of

local feminist action and involvement within the local community both during and after her long career here, most notably with the establishment in 1981 of *The Sitting Room* a community space for women to meet and discuss literature and art. The Sitting Room remains in operation in the local community (Penngrove) today, 42 years later.

Faculty in recent years have continued to the English Department's central and involved role on campus. For instance, Professor Tim Wandling was a founding faculty and a former director of the interdisciplinary program Freshman Year Experience (2006). Dr. Kim Hester-Williams teaches and supports students in American Multi-Cultural Studies, and served their as Chair from 2015-18. Our most recent Chair, Professor Stephan Kiesbye, is currently serving as chair of Art and as the Chair and leader of the School of Arts and Humanities Curriculum Committee. Our most recent hires, Professors Theresa Burrell-Stone and Jennifer Johnson have been awarded Teagle Awards a to explore revision to the Single-Subject Concentration "to foster diversity and inclusion both within their program and in the future classrooms of the secondary educators they are preparing." Dr. Burrell-Stone has recently been selected as a fellow of the National Council of Teachers of English and Dr. Johnson has been appointed to leadership role in undergraduate and University-Wide studies through our Academic Programs. Many of our faculty, including Professors Wandling, Hostutler and Bozeman-Moss have worked with the campus Center for Community Engagement to bring innovated service-learning pedagogies and experiences to our courses and program.

The English Department continues as a popular major in the School of Arts and Humanities, with three concentrations serving students in Creative Writing, Literature and Single Subject Teaching Preparation. We also offer a minor as well as a Master of Arts program. Both our undergraduate and graduate programs continue to place our graduates into prestigious and supported doctoral work at places like UC Davis, Michigan, Ohio State and Indiana. Our Creative Writing students create published work while undergraduates here through the literary magazine *Zaum*, and our graduate students perform their creative works publicly as part of their graduate requirement. Many of our former students teach in high school classrooms in California, continuing the practice of the study of literature and language in these venues.

As of December 2022, the numbers of our students by track were:

Program	Number of Students
Masters	23
Creative Writing	82
Literature	53
Single Subject	41
Undeclared Concentration	19
Minor	21
TOTAL	239

Our goals as a department are described on our [web page](#)

Students who have majored in English work in business, public relations and advertising,

broadcasting, journalism, publishing, law and government service, as well as in elementary, secondary and college teaching. Those who go on to work in these varied fields will benefit from the skills of interpretation, argument, and human interaction that the study of English provides. Our graduates can express themselves clearly, rigorously, and passionately. They understand the relationship between language and authority, and they gain the tolerance for ambiguity, the sensitivity to nuance, and the knack for combining wit and hard work that all contribute to innovative and creative problem-solving.

Indeed, as the success of our graduates shows, they have taken these studies to heart and continue to reveal their talents and skills in the post-graduation lives and careers.

Program Engagement with Sonoma State University's Core Values

At all levels and in all tracks our program engages with the key values of our university. Central to our role on campus is our composition program, which serves all incoming first-year students. Our dedicated composition faculty introduce students to college-level writing, research and critical thinking. Former Program Director Megan McIntyre is a nationally renowned expert on anti-racist pedagogies, and brought her leadership in that area to how our instructors and bureaucratic structures can think better about how to practice anti-racism in all that we do. See the excellent and well documented report she wrote with support from a Teagle Grant, "An Equity-Based Approach to Retaking ENGL 101 at SSU" (Appendix A).

Our program gained from Dr. McIntyre's leadership. Interim Director of Composition Dr. Anthony Rizzuto is continuing her efforts in this area, notably by playing a central campus role in organize a "common read" book, *So You Want to Talk About Race* by Ijeoma Oluo. In addition to panning a spring 2023 even where the author will speak about her book and meet with students, he has also organized and participated in campus presentations on "Thinking about Race," (Dr Hester-Williams and Dr. Burrell-Stone). Critical thinking about race, gender and social justice remain at the heart of many of our instructor's approach to teaching composition. %

English 160A/B, our First-Year Learning Community, taught currently by Professor Wandling and recently by Professor Bryant, focuses on issues of sustainability, social justice, racism, and gender expression/identity through the allegorical lens of works of science fiction and o&the fantastic. See the "Signature Assignment" for this course (Appendix D). Another key part of this course is the inclusion of Peer Mentors, who relate one on one with students and who also present to diversity topics such as intersectionality in a peer to peer fashion, which can be highly effective.

Diversity (class, gender, and race) and concerns about the environment center much of our department's approach to teaching literature. The recent booked edited by Dr. Kim Hester-Williams, *Racial Ecologies* (2018), to which she also contributed, illuminates the interconnections between thinking about race and thinking about sustainability. Her scholarly work informs her literature courses for both the major and in General Education courses such as ENGL345, Women Writers. Dr. Bryant brings a focus on Ecocriticism to his courses on

Medieval Literature, and Professor Wandling has done the same in looking at “Green Romanticism” in his senior seminar (ENGL495). Professor Wo’s courses engage students in inter-disciplinary consideration of the ways that globalization and literature/rhetoric and situations that may be equally considered by students trained to do so. In terms of curricular changes, the department is very pleased to have designed and implemented a non-GE course in “Survey in a Distinct Ethnic/Cultural Tradition” required course for all majors in Creative Writing and Literature.

In the Single-Subject concentrations, both the scholarship and teaching of Professors Burrell-Stone and Johnson foreground issues such as settler colonialism and its continued presence in secondary school practice, and the need to “cultivate literacies of access and liberation.” Together, they applied for and received a Teagle grant to explore ways in which the Single-Subject Concentration could more effectively “foster diversity and inclusion both within their program and in the future classrooms of the secondary educators they are preparing.” In our Department retreat of February 2022 they shared their findings with their department colleagues, and initiated conversations about how the entire major, not just their concentration, might better address issues of diversity and inclusion. While the department continues to consider the larger questions, one key change that will come in the near future is the inclusion of ‘Survey in a Distinct Ethnic/Cultural Tradition’ as a required course for all Single-Subject students as well (most likely replacing “Classical Myth”).

While one might not think a creative writing course would address these concerns, we can look to Gillian Conoley’s amazing book *Peace* (2014) and consider Stefan Kiesbye’s current ENGL307 course on “Climate Fiction” to see that our Creative Writing faculty also guide their students in connection expressive writing to the issues are campus asked students to consider.

Major Curricular revision in implemented in 2017

The department undertook massive planning (that began in 2009) to significantly revise its curriculum in its Core, Literature, and Creative Writing Concentrations. After being brought through governance the preceding year, the revised program was implemented in 2017.

One goal was to bring the rest of the majors to 48 units (the Single-Subject students were already required 52). This change would allow more in-depth study of English topics, and allow more crossover between the concentrations at the junior and senior level.

Another important goal was to create a “four-year experience” for our majors. Before the turn of the century, the department had served mostly transfer students, many of who were returning to college at a later time in life. By 2010, the campus has completely transformed to be primarily four-year students who lived on our beautiful campus. We wanted to be able to reach those students in their early years here more effectively than we are doing with one GE course in composition and one required sophomore class (a requirement to take on for four literature surveys covering Early and Late British Literature and Early and Late American Literature).

The changes in the program included the following:

A requirement to take one introductory course at the first/second year level. We developed a large Humanities Learning Community (ENGL160A/B) to serve first-year students, allow them

to be supported by a Peer Mentor, and to study literature. Initially, the course was centered on Shakespeare before being revised to center Science Fiction, the Fantastic and Identity. We already had a GE course on “Introduction to Creative Writing (ENGL207) and we included that as an option as well.

A sophomore experience focused on breadth. The four surveys were combined into two and enrollment on the survey courses was raised from 40 to 80. The idea was to move quickly, cover lots of material in an introductory way, and to use Teaching Assistants (and later Instructional Student Assistants) to support small group discussion and student engagement with course readings. While we decided not to make these courses pre-requisites for other classes, we hoped (and it has proven the case) that many would take them in sequence and early in their careers, before moving on to junior and senior courses.

We shifted our “Introduction to Literary Analysis” course from the junior to sophomore year. This course serves for many students as an introduction to our department as well as to the study of literature. We did not want first-year student to have to wait two years before being advised to take this course.

The most important change we made to our core curriculum was the inclusion of a junior level class, “Survey in a Distinct Ethnic Tradition” (ENGL350). We worried that in combining the sophomore students, we would not be offering students enough exposure to 20th century ethnic literature. Thus, this new course became a requirement in the core. Dr. Chingling Wo developed a version focused on Chinese/Chinese American Literature, Dr. Anne Goldman offers a version on Chicano/a literature, while Dr. Kim Hester-Williams version focuses on African-American literature. Developed and taught in these three different areas, it has been very popular with students and a vital part of our major, reflecting our commitment to diverse voices and literature.

Overall, the core of the major increased from 20 units to 24, adding one sophomore survey and the course on ethnic literature. The concentrations also added four units, to make way for clearly defined senior capstone seminars, as well as an “experiential learning” requirement.

Current Challenges

Decline in faculty ranks:

During the last five years, Sonoma State has experienced a series of setbacks that have reduced student enrollment by more than a third in many programs, including the English Department. These setbacks included a series of devastating forest fires from 2017-2019 that at times shut the campus down due to hazardous smoke, and of course the Covid pandemic that forced all instruction to be done online starting in 2020. The campus has begun to return to face to face instruction, but it has been a slowly developing return to normal.

A major difficulty for this department is that this decline in student numbers comes at a time when our faculty are nearing or have entered retirement. Since our last program review in 2015, we have lost the following colleagues to retirement:

- Cathy Kroll (Composition),
- Greta Vollmer (Single Subject)
- Mira Katz (Single Subject)
- Noelle Oxenhandler (Creative Non-Fiction),

Thaine Stearns (British 20th Century) and Gillian Conoley (Poetry) will complete be fully retired at the end of AY 2022-23.

The following faculty have entered Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) and will be fully retired within the next two to three years:

Anne Goldman (Creative Non-Fiction)

Affiliated Professor Scott Miller (Writing Center)

Our Renaissance scholar, John Kunat, is beginning his FERP in fall of 2023.

We have done some hiring during this time. We hired two faculty to replace Professors Kroll and Vollmer, Megan McIntyre and Josefa Pace; however, we were unable to retain these new faculty members, with Pace leaving after one year and McIntyre after four. Dr. McIntyre brought much need energy, vision and expertise to our composition program, and we miss her dearly. We have since hired two new faculty with Single Subject expertise, Dr Thresa Burrell-Stone and Dr. Jennifer Johnson and are excited about their leadership and expertise in our Single-Subject Concentration and, indeed, across campus.

Our 2015 reviewed gave welcome to Dr. Mercy Romero, our new colleague in the Hutchins Program, stating,

The department is pleased to welcome Professor Mercy Romero, who was hired by the Hutchins School of Liberal Studies in Fall 2014. Dr. Romero was hired with the understanding that she would be able to teach one course per semester for the English department,

English faculty members (Goldman, Hester-Williams) were involved in the search committee that brought Dr. Romero to Sonoma State as it was planned that she could offer her expertise in American Studies and Culture to student in our department, to help fill the void left by the tragic death of Professor Robert Coleman-Senghor in 2011. Unfortunately, this logistics of this arrangement have not worked out as Dr. Romero's excellent work and teaching has been done in the service of the particular demands of the Hutchins program.

Our offerings in American Literature, for a variety of reasons, have been most impacted. Upon Professor Oxenhandler's retirement, Dr. Goldman moved full time into teaching Creative Non-Fiction, filling one void while leaving another. Dr. Hester-Williams was Chair of American Multicultural Studies but has now returned to our department full time, although she still offers one course per semester in that department.

Fallout from implementation of Chancellor's Office Executive Order 1100, pertaining to General Education.

While seeing a common and consistent GE pattern across the state may be a salutatory thing for some, the top-down implementation of Executive Order 1100 was seen and felt by those teaching in our department as calamitous. We were the only campus body to issue a resolution clearly opposing its implementation on our campus (Appendix G). The concerns we had have about it have caused workload and curricular issues, as we had well foreseen. Two points we made in our resolution:

Our current curriculum, although not perfect, is thoughtful, well-designed and working for our students. It represents years of hard work and collaboration across the school of Arts and Humanities.

The timelines for implementation cannot do justice to the complexity of learning outcomes and objectives for the various courses (ENGL101, ENGL160, ENGL100A/B) that would be impacted by these top-down changes.

In terms of the impact of this EO on our department, the main issues were that we had to revised every one of our courses back from 4 units to 3. We had spend the era from 2007-2010 working with our colleagues in the school to create a "GE Package" in areas A and C that reduced student units from the prior 21 to 20, all in five 4-unit courses. This revision to our traditional GE areas was incredibly successful, and crucial to both faculty and student workloads.

All of this was wiped out by EO 1100, and this Program Review must take note of it.

The effects were particularly deleterious to our adjunct faculty, who had to return to teaching three 4-unit classes to four 3-unit classes in order to earn 12 units. While this comprised the same pay and same hours, it also of course added an additional 25 students to the teaching load. Prior to the EO, we has been teaching some Oral Communication skills in our composition courses, and we did remove those learning outcomes from composition as the campus returned to stand alone courses in A1 (Oral Communication).

The other bad effect of EO 1100 is that it makes it difficult for tenure-track faculty teaching general education course to come to a full teaching load of 12 WTUs. Thus far, we have taught just 11 units in those cases, but the university administration has flagged that as a budgetary issue that is as yet unresolved.

B. Assessment

Overview

Alignment

Experiential Learning.

Assessment of Student Experiences and Learning in Single-Subject Concentration.

Contributions to GE Program.

Overview

Since the adoption of its initial learning outcomes in the early 2000s, the Department has struggled with finding the means and person power to adequately assess its student learning outcomes. It can be said of our department that we walk the walk but don't yet talk the talk of talk of examining and reflecting upon our student work. We have fed those reflections back into our curricular changes over the years. The Department does continue to work to align our syllabi with our published learning outcomes

Current Approved Learning Goals Outcomes

In the early 2000s, Professors Coleman-Senghor and Wandling represented the Department at a systemwide conference wherein each of the ten largest majors in the CSU system would work to develop a common set of learning outcomes for all English majors in the system. English was the only discipline that decided not to participate in that process. Our discipline and our department have always worried that the things we care about most are the things least easy to measure in terms of student learning *per se*. Nonetheless, the department did develop its own goals and outcomes during that era, and they remain our existing outcomes. One thing we hoped to emphasize in our approach is that "measurable" skills are but one part of the importance of the learning experience for our students, with knowledge, expression, and experiences being equally important. The department has continued to wrestle with this over the years, and, while we have made some efforts, we remain a work in progress when it comes to creating data to feedback into our curricular and programmatic planning. Over the years we have done assessment to align learning outcomes and expectations in our core "Introduction to Literary Analysis" course, and have participated in the campus efforts to develop and align learning outcomes in our General Education offerings. We have devised and implemented "Signature Assignments" in our GE offerings (see Appendices A and D). Our current approved Learning Goals and Objectives are, that students will develop and demonstrate:

Skills

- The ability to read texts closely and to articulate the value of close reading in the study of literature and rhetoric.
- The ability to explicate texts written in a wide variety of forms, styles, structures, and modes.
- The ability to recognize and appreciate the importance of major literary genres, subgenres, and periods.

- The ability to respond imaginatively to the content and style of texts.
- The ability to write clearly, effectively, and imaginatively, and to accommodate writing style to the content and nature of the subject.
- The ability to develop and carry out research projects and to articulate them within appropriate conceptual and methodological frameworks.

Knowledge

- An understanding of the historical development of the English language and of literature written in English from Old English to the present.
- An understanding of the relations between culture, history, and texts.
- An understanding of the twofold nature of textual analysis:
 1. objective study from varied analytical perspectives
 2. subjective experience of the text's aesthetic.
- Familiarity with a wide range of British and American literary works, as well as with selected authors and works of other literatures, including folk and popular forms.
- Familiarity with a wide range of literary terms and categories within literary history, theory, and criticism.
- Familiarity with the nature of literary canons and of canon-formation.
- Familiarity with basic practices of literary research and documentation, including electronic forms of information retrieval and communication.

Experiences

- The exchange of ideas with faculty and students in classroom settings and office visits.
- The ability to complete cooperative projects with other students in discussion groups, writing activities, and study sessions.
- Involvement in the cultural life of the University.

Values

- A sustained interest in language and literature.
- An awareness of the literary past.
- An enriched understanding of the complexities and nuances of the human experience across time and culture.
- Interest and involvement in intellectual, aesthetic, cultural, and sociopolitical issues.
- Increased critical awareness and intellectual independence.

New Learning Objectives proposed in 2020-21

In 2021, the Department's Assessment Committee worked collaboratively with the rest of the Department's faculty to draft and propose the following learning objectives, to replace or enhance our existing learning outcomes.

By the end of their time in the English department at SSU, students will demonstrate the ability to:

1. Read texts closely and articulate the value of close reading in the study of literature, teaching, and rhetoric.
2. The ability to explicate texts written in a wide variety of forms, styles, structures, and modes.
3. Identify diverse perspectives and engage with the ambiguity and complexity that comes with multiple perspectives.
4. Apply technologies relevant to the study of English with an awareness of how to do so with respect for students with disabilities as well as for those who come from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds.
5. Recognize, analyze, and write about the importance of major literary genres, subgenres, historical periods, and literary traditions.
6. Think historically about topics, works, methods, curricula, and/or pedagogies in English studies, in order to critically engage with the complex relationships of pasts, presents, and futures with which they connect.
7. Respond imaginatively to the content and style of texts.
8. Write clearly, effectively, and imaginatively, and to accommodate writing style to the content and nature of the writing task.
9. Develop and carry out research projects and to articulate them within appropriate conceptual and methodological frameworks, including the variety of specialized methods and approaches used for the study of literatures from the past.
10. Think metacognitively about English studies, including reflecting on one's learning and/or thinking metacognitively about English Language Arts pedagogy.

Several factors have stalled progress on implementing these new learning objectives. The effort to rethink them was led by one of our new faculty members, Dr. Megan McIntyre, who has subsequently left our university to take a leadership role as a faculty member in the Rhetoric Program at the University of Arkansas. Secondly, the pandemic and its aftermath have not been conducive to progress and meaningful dialogue around our assessment practices.

That being said, in fall 2022 current Chair Wandling led a discussion around these proposed learning objectives and a curriculum mapping exercise to see how they mapped onto our current

curriculum. The Faculty had an interesting conversation about the language of the proposed objectives. Appendix F includes the results of this mapping exercise, which showed the curriculum mapped pretty well onto the proposed language.

However, after consulting during the fall semester of 2022 with the Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, campus assessment expert Matthew Callahan, the Assessment committee decided to work to further refine the language of learning outcomes to make them less academic and more student friendly. At present, further revision is on hold due to personnel shortages. In fall 2022, the Assessment Committee prepared a direct assessment of student work exercise through the program Qualtrics, but the project ran into technical difficulty for which there was not adequate campus support for that implementation in Qualtrics. The Committee will revisit an attempt to use technology to get student work before faculty in the fall of 2023.

Alignment

The mapping exercise referred to in the prior section was done at a faculty retreat in September 2022. Faculty present were asked to reflect upon how the student learning in their courses might map on to the newly proposed learning objectives. We mapped onto courses by Core major courses, and each of the tracks (Creative Writing, Literature, Single Subject).

Instructions: Place any courses that you teach in the box to the right of each learning objective drafted by the Assessment Committee last year. For core, include only the courses indicated. In concentrations, indicate only courses that you personally teach.

For the most part, the objectives were spread evenly throughout the program, with one notable exception being fewer objectives being listed in the early parts of the literature track. The department will revisit the language of its learning outcomes in 2023-24 and redo this mapping exercise with the revised language.

Experiential Learning.

In its program revision of 2017, the Department created an “Experiential” requirement as part of its revised programs in Creative Writing and Literature. Single Subject students already do classroom visits and observations as part of their curriculum. The single best experiential experience for our students is to take ENGLISH 368 and participate in the creation, editing, publication and publicity in our annual student publication, *Zaum*. Students from all tracks participate in this course, and the process has been ably led by our talented adjunct instructor Miah Jeffra, who has stepped into the shoes of Gillian Conoley’s leadership role with our periodical. Several students also arranged internships through the school’s internship coordinator, Hillary Homzie. This is a relatively new requirement in the program and no assessment efforts have yet begun in this area.

Assessment of Student Experiences and Learning in Single-Subject Concentration

With the support of a Teagle grant, Dr. Johnson and Dr. Burrell-Stone crafted a redesign proposal to better support preparation as future teachers in California. Their proposal includes feedback from students in the form of Plática:

Recognizing that antiracist teaching requires a genuine and sustained commitment to working in solidarity with the students, families, and communities we serve, we centered the voices of English education scholars (current and alumni), who shared their stories, desires, and imaginations of an English education program that honored and affirmed their lives, literacies, and desired futures.

Ten current and former students were invited to share their experiences and ideas for reshaping the program via video-recorded, Zoom focus groups/pláticas (de la Torre, 2008;

Aviña, 2016). Additionally, we asked students to complete a demographic survey. We sought in particular the input of students who are first generation, BIPOC, and/or Pell Grant-eligible, as well as transfer students, in order to better understand their experiences of the program as it exists, and how to better serve their needs for success in the future.

Student comments, demographics and lines of findings are included in the report appended (C) to this review. These findings are helping to shape conversations as the second action item listed at the end of this review: Reflect on the nature and structure of our overall major and its courses, especially with respect to our commitments to increasing diversity of the student body in our programs

Contributions to GE Program.

Overview. English is a strong contributor to the University's General Education Program. We teach all of the students in GE area A2 (Written Communication). As our campus enrollments have declined, so have our numbers in that area, but we still offered instruction to around 900 students in either stretch course (100A/B over two semesters) or English 101 in one semester in AY 2022-23. We also typically teach 2-3 40-seat upper division courses in GE Area C2, Humanities, including World Literature (ENGL314), California Ethnic Literature (ENGL315), and Women Writers (ENGL345). We offer a first-year Learning Community (ENGL160A/B, areas A3 and C2 – Critical Thinking and Humanities) that has served as many as 125 students per semester, but is currently enrolled at 25. We anticipate returning to a larger format as first-year enrollments increase in the coming years. Finally, we offer a course in area C1 (Fine Arts), English 207, usually once per semester on the topic of "Introduction to Creative Writing."

Each of these courses has clearly defined learning outcomes, and each of them has identified three learning outcomes that align with the University General Education Learning outcomes. The report will briefly highlight an example of our alignment, and then an extended report of our assessment efforts in composition.

Sample Signature Assignment/Mapping to Learning Outcomes in ENGL160B.

Signature Assignments at Sonoma State. According to our Curricular Guide and approved processes, all General Education classes must be aligned with program learning outcomes in the following way:

GE Course Requirements

- Every GE course should map to at least 3 GE learning outcomes (GELOs). Current learning outcomes assigned in the GE Program are listed at <http://ge.sonoma.edu/resources>.
- The GELOs identified in the course must include the specific GELOs listed for the particular distribution area that houses the course (as shown on the Application Cover Sheet).
- Every faculty member teaching a GE course must participate in a GE professional development workshop prior to or during the first semester in which they are teaching GE.
- Every GE course must include a signature assignment

The “Book Exploration and Artifact” assignment from ENGL160B serves as an example of how our department has responded to these significant changes in how GE learning outcomes are assessed here. Each of our instructors submits student work in the form of these signature assignments for all of our GE courses to the office of Academic Programs, which centralizes assessment efforts at the campus level.

Book Exploration and Artifact. This assignment for the course written by and aligned with GE outcomes by Dr. Brantley Bryant, and is described to students as such:

This assignment is designed to provide an opportunity to reflect back on what you’ve learned this year in English 160A&B. More specifically, this assignment invites you to demonstrate your engagement with the specific general education outcomes of this course, most directly the skills of argument and critical reading as well as key parts of our discussion about the transition into college. This assignment asks you to practice the skills of **argument** (A3 GE) we have been working on during the year, showing your ability to “advance cogent and ethical arguments in a variety of genres with rigor and critical inquiry.” The assignment combines this with the task of **critical reading** (C2 GE), your ability to “analyze texts in a variety of forms, genres, and disciplines.” As part of this, you will also practice the **integration** of academic disciplines, where you will “synthesize and apply theoretical and practical perspectives from multiple disciplines to develop an understanding of complex issues.” The assignment will also engage with our transitional learning outcomes this year, **demonstrating skills necessary to be successful and actively engaged in college**, which will be a core part of this assignment’s independent and self-paced approach. It will also build towards the creation of your choice of an artifact (written, visual, artistic) which you can look back

on as a meaningful souvenir or record of your work in the course.

This paragraph addresses (in bold) the three GE learning outcomes with which this course is aligned. The full text of the assignment is included as Appendix A and discussed in Appendix B.

Composition assessment. Our assessment efforts in composition have been stronger than in the major, and this report will here include the assessment narrative written by our recently departed Composition Director, Dr. Megan McIntyre. This report details direct reflection upon student work and the way that work demonstrated achievement of approved learning outcomes for the Composition Program.

ENGL 101 Assessment Narrative for Self-Study Student Work as Evidence of Course Goals

Note: See full list of learning outcomes and alignment to GE program in the last part of this section.

For the purposes of this department-wide self-study, this analysis will focus on two related course outcomes (and one specific element of the course description):

- From our program-wide course outcomes, “Critically read, analyze, and evaluate a variety of non-fiction and academic texts from a variety of disciplines, focusing on rhetorical strategies and an understanding of audience, purpose, and context.”
- From the required, university-wide A2 outcomes, “Critical Reading: Actively analyze texts in a variety of forms, genres, and disciplines.”
- From the course description, “Study and practice in reading...with emphasis on ...analytical reading.”

In general, ENGL 101 courses require students to read across genres and disciplines and learn to use what they read to shape and eventually support their own writing. In many ENGL 101 classes, students will keep reading journals, write reading reflections, compose annotated bibliographies, and write research-supported, thesis driven papers or projects.

Though faculty teaching ENGL 101 courses are welcome to use any type of assignment for their “Signature Assignment,” many faculty elect to assign a research-based, thesis driven argument. All 54 of the student artifacts examined for this assessment report fall into this category. The assignment descriptions for the student work examined here include a central focus on reading and analysis; for example, one of the assignment descriptions asks students to, “address one research question from your research proposal, and apply the knowledge you attained writing your annotated bibliography. This assignment is a culmination of your previous assignments, and allows you to hone in on a specific subject, illuminating that subject through research and analysis.”

For research-based, thesis driven projects, evidence of critical reading most often shows up as citations and source-based support. As students synthesize sources' ideas with their own, they make critical decisions about how to interpret, evaluate, and present what they've read. Beyond reading for content knowledge, analytical (or "critical") reading requires students to make connections between sources and between those sources and their own ideas, to select quotes or to paraphrase sections of the source material that are specifically applicable to their own argument, and to demonstrate their familiarity with the source material they incorporate.

More specifically, students demonstrate their critical understanding of the sources they use in at least three ways:

1. Through introductions to the author or source that highlight information relevant to the students' argument:

- "Frances Kamm, who is an American philosopher and currently a professor at Harvard University, says in fact that they would create an unfair advantage to those who work hard to get where they are rather than just taking a drug to make them better (Kamm). Micheal Sandel, who is also an American philosopher and professor at Harvard University, disagrees with Kamm and states that athletes are 'eager to avail themselves of genetic enhancement' and does not want to see 'athletes lifting SUVs or hitting 650-foot home runs or running a three-minute mile'(Sandel)."
- "Linda Naiman, founder of Creativity at Work, also argues that creativity is crucial for innovation. 'Some people say creativity has nothing to do with innovation—that innovation is a discipline, implying that creativity is not.'"

2. Through carefully chosen and clearly contextualized and/or well-connected quotations:

- "The National Football League (NFL), National Basketball Association (NBA), National Hockey League (NHL), and Major League Baseball (MLB) are the most watched live sports in America. It could be because people enjoy watching them, or because it's the only game that's showing. Just '40% of ALL athletes are female,' and 'they receive just 4% of media coverage'('Media Coverage and Female Athletes')."
- "In the source Mickey Mouse Monopoly, Fordham quotes, 'And this is a movie that is saying to our children, 'overlook the abuse, overlook the violence, there is a tender prince lurking within, and it's your job to kiss that prince and bring it out, or to kiss that beast and bring the prince out.' That's a dangerous message.' As a woman, they are telling us that it is our duty to always please the guy and make them feel loved. As a young girl, this is what you thought to be a healthy relationship, but in reality it is toxic."
- "This causes deep and irreversible trauma because 'gay, lesbian and trans people are told that God condemns them' and if a person is queer and religious they can feel forced to choose religion or their sexuality but not both for many cases (Schiffman 4)."

3. Through paraphrasing important ideas and connecting them to the student-author's own ideas

- “Former superstar Mark McGwire spoke in front of the House Government Reform Committee on steroids and how they are affecting the game of baseball as a whole. He says that no one should use them and that he is sorry to any parents who had to deal with their child who used performance-enhancing drugs. He offers to be a spokesperson for the MLB to warn young children of performance-enhancing drugs (McGwire). This is important because many young athletes look up to professional athletes like McGwire so I believe more current athletes should join McGwire in an effort to educate the youth on the harmful effects of PEDs.”
- “To get technical, simple touch can lower blood pressure and cortisol levels. A daily twenty second hug increases oxytocin levels in the brain. Heart disease risk lowers, [according to] Matthew Hertenstein, PhD, director of the Touch and Emotion Lab at DePauw University.”
- “In ‘The Beauty of Human Skin in Every Color,’ Angélica Dass speaks about her art campaign ‘Humanae,’ a photography project which was used to show people and beauty in different skin tones, and how it was molded by the world around her and the effects it’s had since. This is a great source for my essay because it shows perspectives of people who never thought of skin color as thing that truly separates people, when it was introduced to them, people who have grown up with the effects of racism, and how her project challenged that, things that will be very useful when further developing not only my argument but my curriculum for the program.”

Course Description

Study and practice in reading, written communication, and information literacy, with emphasis on writing as a process and analytical reading. ENGL 101 is a writing-intensive course that asks students to read and respond to a variety of texts (using a range of reading strategies) from a variety of disciplines and develop and revise their own writing in response to feedback. Satisfies GE Area A2 (Fundamentals of Communication). Grade only.

Course Requirements

- Students should write at least 4,500 words total; these words may include reflective and in-class writing as well as revised writing.
- Students should complete at least 4 major projects.
- Per the GE content criteria, at least 60% of the course assignments should be revision-based assignments.
- Per the GE content criteria, major assignments should include multiple drafts with clear opportunities for students to revise.

Alignment with GE Program and CSU Composition Requirements:

Per the GE content criteria, ENGL 101 should include at least one signature assignment that demonstrates two or more of the GE content criteria covered by the course (communication, critical reading, and information literacy).

Per the CSU-wide breadth requirements, all ENGL 101 course must also

- Aid students in developing proficiency in written English, as required by CSU E.O. 1100.
- Explore non-discipline specific rhetorical principles, including audience, context, and purpose, genre conventions, and rhetorical appeals.
- Enable students to learn to use a variety of rhetorical effects in order to address an audience appropriately and to enhance cogency and clarity.
- Help students understand the ethical uses of sources of all types and use appropriate documentation format in writing and multimedia presentations.

Program-wide Course Outcomes

1. Critically read, analyze, and evaluate a variety of non-fiction and academic texts from a variety of disciplines, focusing on rhetorical strategies and an understanding of audience, purpose, and context.
2. Write well-developed, well-organized texts in multiple genres and media, including thesis-driven arguments; address an audience appropriately and use a variety of rhetorical effects to enhance cogency and clarity.
3. Develop research skills: find, select, analyze, and evaluate outside sources; integrate the ideas of others into texts that express the writer's own position. Understand the ethical uses of sources of all types, and use appropriate documentation format in writing and in multimedia presentations.
4. Employ a variety of sentence structures and organizational patterns to illustrate clearly the logic of ideas. Revise and edit written assignments.

GE Learning Outcomes

1. Communication: Communicate clearly in written, oral, and/or performative forms in a variety of genres and disciplines,
2. Critical Reading: Actively analyze texts in a variety of forms, genres, and disciplines
3. Information Literacy: Iteratively formulate questions for research by gathering diverse types of information; identifying gaps, correlations, and contradictions; and using sources ethically toward a creative, informed synthesis of ideas

C. Faculty

As indicated in the "Current Challenges" section of the introduction to this review, our faculty members are spread too thinly across our curriculum at present. However, we continue to offer instruction and mentoring in all fields of study within Creative Writing, Rhetoric, English Pedagogy and Literature.

Faculty Make-Up

As of AY 2022-23, the Department's comprise eight full-time tenure track faculty and four faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP). In the full-time ranks, We have five Full Professors, one Associate Professor and two Assistant Professors. 50% of our

faculty, both full-time and overall, are female. 37.5% of our fulltime faculty members identify as women of color. Twelve (12) adjunct faculty teach in the department. 75% of them are women. 8% (1/12) identify as a woman of color.

While in AY 2006-7 the Department had 15 tenure-track faculty, as of fall 2023 it will have seven (7) full-time faculty left, plus three who are in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP). We have not replaced Professor Coleman-Senghor, who tragically passed away while actively teaching here in 2011. We have not hired a literature faculty member since 2007, and our ability to offer course in American Literature have been stretched thin, particularly since Professor Hester-Williams also teaches in American Multicultural Studies and Professor Goldman has focused primarily on Creative Non-Fiction in her teaching in recent years. Experts in British Literature, Professors Wo, Bryant and Wandling, have taught American Literature in the combined survey we implemented in 2017. As outlined in the section on faculty, we need to hire three-four faculty, at minimum, to maintain coverage, advising, and mentoring in our established programs.

Faculty Specializations and alignment to program curriculum, program mission, and program quality.

The Department's faculty remain active teacher-scholars and creative writers.

Creative Writing:

Professor Gillian Conoley, our Poet in Residence, continues her amazing work as a poet as nears the end of her thirty-year tenure with our department. Her most recent collection, *A Little More Red Sun on the Human*, was published in 2020, the eight volume of poetry she has published amongst numerous other works. Her poetry has been included in the influential *Postmodern American Poetry: A Norton Anthology* (second edition, 2013). In recognition of her longstanding excellence as a poet, Professor Conoley received the Percy Shelley Memorial Award from the Poetry Society of America in recognition of a body of work at mid-career, on March 29, 2017

Dr. Anne Goldman is a dual threat in the department having come to our program in 1998 as a scholar in American and Chicana/o literature. She won the prestigious Bernie Goldstein campus award for her excellent in scholarship. Since then, she has migrated to the teaching of Creative non-fiction. Her fiction and nonfiction have appeared in such venues as the *Gettysburg Review*, *Southwest Review*, *Tin House* and *The Georgia Review*. Goldman's essays have been cited as notable in the *Best American Essays* and the *Best American Travel Writing* and have received honorable mention in the Pushcart Prize; Her essay "Stargazing in the Atomic Age" from the collection *Stargazing in the Atomic Age* was nominated for a National Magazine Award.

Professor Stefan Kiesbye continues his prolific and distinguished work in fiction, publishing novels, novellas and stories throughout his career and since joining the faculty at Sonoma State in 2015. In recent years, his cyber-punk novel *Berlingelees* appeared in 2018. *No Sound to Break, No Moment Clear* (2022) was the winner of the 2020 Brighthorse Prize for the Novel. His latest book, *But I Don't Know You* is a meditation on belonging, identity, memory, and on the stories

we tell ourselves and others about who we were and who we have become. His stories, essays, and reviews have appeared in the *Wall Street Journal*, *Publishers Weekly*, and the *Los Angeles Times*, among others. His first book, *Next Door Lived a Girl*, won the Low Fidelity Press Novella Award, and has been translated into German, Dutch, and Spanish

The expertise and dedication of our Creative Writing Faculty is well-aligned with our program curriculum and program. As two of our colleagues in this track have entered the FERP program, two excellent adjunct instructors, Kathleen Winter (Poetry) and Miah Jaffra (Fiction and instruction in small press editing – Zaum) have stepped in. Professor Winter has been offering a GE class, ENGL207 (Introduction to Creative Writing) that serves general students as well as those who go on to major in English. In the major, initial courses such as ENG352 (Personal Essay), ENGL307 (Intro to Fiction Writing) and ENGL318 (Intro to Poetry Writing) are followed by advanced courses at the senior-level (400+) in those respective genres. Finally, students are offered the chance for one-on-one mentoring in ENGL435 (Directed Writing). A special version of this course (ENGL435-SC) services as the capstone for students in this concentration.

Literature:

Dr. Brantley Bryant's research and teaching interests include later medieval literature, Geoffrey Chaucer and his contemporaries, interdisciplinary approaches to literature and history, women's writing, the history of sexuality, intersections of medieval literature and popular culture, public outreach on behalf of literary studies, and recent developments in "posthuman" approaches to literature. His current long-term project is a book on representations of water in late medieval literature. Recent publications & scholarly work include "Accounting for Affect in the *Reeve's Tale*," in *Medieval Affect, Feeling, and Emotion*. Ed. Glenn D. Burger and Holly A. Crocker. Cambridge University Press, 2019. 118-137; and Founder, editorial collective, with Candace Barrington, Richard H. Godden, Daniel T. Kline, and Myra Seaman. *The Open Access Companion to the Canterbury Tales*. 2017.

Professor Kim Hester Williams' scholarly research concerns racial representation in nineteenth-century literature and contemporary popular culture and visual representations of race in film and new media. Dr. Hester Williams is co-editor of a collection of interdisciplinary essays on race and environment, *Racial Ecologies* (2018). The book collection includes a chapter she authored titled, "Earthseeds of Change: Post-Apocalyptic Mythmaking, Race, and Ecology in *The Book of Eli* and Octavia Butler's Womanist Parables." She has also published essays on the representation of race, gender and economy in new media, popular culture, and film.

Professor John Kunat's research areas lie in Renaissance and Cultural Studies, focusing on issues of race, gender and cultural interaction in the Early Modern Period. He has recently published articles on Shakespeare in influential journals, first "Play me false": Rape, Race, and Conquest in "The Tempest" in the *Shakespeare Quarterly*, (Fall 2014); and then "Rape and Republicanism in Shakespeare's 'Lucrece,'" *Studies in English literature, 1500-1900*, (2015).

Professor Tim Wandling has presented or published papers on Lord Byron, Thomas Hardy, J.S. Mill, and the teaching of Social Protest literature. In 2019, he presented the paper “‘Fierce Loves’ and Romantic Ironies: Joni Mitchell and Lord Byron” at the International Conference on Romanticism in Manchester England. His current book project, *Living Romanticism*, address connections between 19th C. Romantic Poets and 1970s Singer Songwriters.

Dr. Chingling Wo’s recent research focuses on the intersection between capitalism as an economic system and the colonial structure of feeling. She is currently working on the formation of sentimentality in 18th century literature of Britain and Qing China. She is also interested in using the invasive apple snail in Asian rice paddies to develop new ways of theorizing global space, and has published an article on this topic, "In What Form Does Global Capital Flow Leave Behind Memories? The Story of the Apple Snail Caught Between the Green Revolution and the Organic Food Movement." *ASIA Network Exchange: A Journal for Asian Studies in the Liberal Arts* 22.2 (2015). Dr. Wo is also an expert in Universal Curriculum Design for accessibility and serves as a mentor to campus faculty in that area.

Single Subject Concentration:

Dr. Theresa Burrell-Stone’s research emphasizes the histories, narratives, and politics of place in order to underscore connections between social practices and material relations. Her recent work examines the intersection between schooling, ideologies of educational uplift, Latinx racialization and vulnerability to racialized violence, settler colonialism, and landscapes of racial violence in the United State. She has presented her scholarship at the conferences of the American Educational Research Association, American Anthropological Association’s Council on Anthropology and Education, Critical Race Studies in Education Association, Latinx Studies Association, and International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry. They are the recipient of the AERA Latinx Research Issues SIG’s 2020 Dissertation Award and the International Association of Qualitative Inquiry's 2021 Illinois Qualitative Dissertation Award. Dr. Burruel Stone was selected as a 2021 CAE Concha Delgado Gaitán Presidential Fellow. She is honored to be part of the National Council of Teachers of English Research Foundation’s Cultivating New Voices among Scholars of Color 2022-2024 cohort.

Dr. Jennifer Johnson’s work is dedicated to leveraging culturally-sustaining-responsive and critical pedagogies, new literacies, debate, and Hip-Hop culture, to cultivate literacies of access and liberation in secondary schools, teaching preparation programs, and college courses in rhetoric, linguistics, and composition. This work grounds their research and creative activity, which has been featured in domestic and international publications. Papers on collaborative curricular redesign (with Dr. Burrell-Stone) have recently been accepted for publication in *Research in the Teaching of English* *Designing majors* and *A DIY guide to faculty-led, student-focused curricular reform* (forthcoming).

Composition and Adjunct Faculty. This review calls attention to the stellar and tireless work done by our composition faculty members, who are all adjuncts, many of whom teach at multiple

universities. This report cannot list all of their achievements, but here is a summary of some of them:

Professor Sakina Bryant won the campus Excellence in Teaching Award in 2018, a rare accomplishment for an adjunct faculty member and the third member of our current faculty to have won this award (Professors Kim Hester-Williams and Brantley Bryant having preceded her in prior years). Sakina Bryant is known as a passionate advisor and connector with students, and taught successfully in our inter-disciplinary programs that serve diverse GE populations (First-Year Learning Communities, ENGL 160A/B and Second Year Research and Creative Experience, ENGL273). Dr. Anthony Rizzuto has published a book on Raymond Chandler, Romantic Ideology, and the Cultural Politics of Chivalry (2021) – work that is informed by and informs the frequent general education courses and is currently serving as the Program Director of our Composition program. Dr. Rim Zahra has published two well-received books translating the work of the Lebanese poet Ghada Samman, and regularly brings that expertise to her teaching of our general education course on World Literature (ENGL314). Professor Emily Hostutler has received multiple campus and off-campus grants and awards for her innovative and cutting edge to teaching student of this generation. Professor Sheila Shupe's excellent syllabi and course materials provide exemplars in the Teagle report written by Dr. Megan McIntyre found as an appendix (A) to this review. Distinguished writers, poet Kathleen Winter and fiction writer Miah Jeffra have contributed importantly to the continued success of our Creative Writing Program during the last few years, as teachers and as writers.

D. Program Resources

Early Career Advising. The university's adviser center appoints a dedicated general education advisor, Nicole Stein, to all declared majors in Arts and Humanities. Early-career students are well served by this dedicated advisor, and all advising recommendations are recorded in the "Advisor Notes" function in the PeopleSoft advising program. We also utilize experienced peer mentors in our First-Year Learning Community (ENGL160A/B), with a ratio of one Peer Mentor to 25 first-year students.

Dr. Jennifer Johnson has regularly held orientation meetings for those interested in the Department's teaching preparation track, both in person before the pandemic and via zoom in the last few years. Professor Johnson is the Department's dedicated Single Subject Advisor.

Assigned Advisors. Beginning in AY 2021022, the Department began assigning students advisors by alphabet, with students encouraged to drop in on faculty. In fall 2022, we implemented assigning students to advisors through the people soft system, making it much clearer for students to know who to contact for advising. Assigning advisors was part of our goal of "Creating a four-year experience" for our majors during our last program review, and we are glad to see this implemented. In 2022-23, given how few tenure-track faculty we currently have actively teaching in our Creative Writing Program, we decided to assign most of the creative majors to literature faculty. Creative Writing students make up about 40% of our current majors, while only one Creative Writing Faculty is currently full time, Stefan Kiesbye, and he is also serving as Chair of the Art Department.

The current system of advising is serving students well in terms of identifying proper courses to follow the advising tracks in PeopleSoft to ensure graduation. However, most advising is being done via email or zoom, and this might not be best in terms of mentoring and career advising. This will be a matter to evaluate as we return more fully to in-person campus life in the coming years.

Campus Support Services Campus services are currently effective for most of our majors. Our Chair receives regular reports to identify students on probation or at risk of being placed on probation, and the Registrar's office regularly sends reports to ensure and support time to degree. The one area where students probably need more help is with mental health issues, which have been particularly acute since the pandemic.

It is in our first-year composition program that students do need more support. Thus, in AY 2022-23, Composition Director Anthony Rizzuto and Chair Wandling worked with Academic Programs to brainstorm an application for a Chancellor Office's "CSU Supportive Pathways for First-Year Students" grant to support improved student success and retention in the first year. The University did receive funding for this grant and we hope to collaborate with Academic Programs in its implementation next year (more on that in final section).

Institutional Support/Student Research/Engagement. There is support at the institutional level for student research and engagement; some English majors and courses take advantage of this. For instance, in AY 2022-23, Professor Wandling partnered with the Center for Community Engagement (CCE) to bring his first-year students into Discovery Day and Shadow Day experiences with local students from Roseland University Prep, a high school that serves students underrepresented in college campus. Adjunct Professor Emily Hostutler worked with CCE on a Koret Scholars project, "Writing Partners Village Elementary Multicultural Charter School Reciprocity Mural. Our newer colleagues, Dr. Burrell-Stone and Dr. Johnson have both received RSCAP support for their research (as indicated in section on Tenure Track faculty). The School of Arts and Humanities has provided limited but vital support for faculty to travel for conference presentations. Two years ago, our undergraduate student Michelle Jones received the Sally Casanova scholarship to support her research, and she has subsequently entered our Master's Program. Our faculty actively mentor and support such students in applying for and implementing campus support from McNair and Casanova scholarships designed to serve students who are underrepresented in post-graduate work. In this category must also be mentioned our strong support for students who study abroad, which enriches their educational experience and broadens their perspectives. The Campus Global Engagement Center, led by Hope Ortiz, provides excellent support for those students, and we advise "creatively" to ensure alignment of courses abroad with our program requirements, as fostering a global perspective is something we encourage and recommend in our program.

Library and information resources. The campus library has always worked closely with English Department Faculty to meet the needs of our students and faculty. While we do not have access to the kinds of scholarly volumes found at a research university, we have a strong inter-library loan program. Laura Krier, the liaison to our school, is terrific with getting books for the library needed for our classes, and she and the rest of the library staff make their limited human

resources stretch in order to provide library instruction to our first-year composition students, and to some of our majors as well.

Are there adequate technology resources in support of pedagogy, student learning and research/scholarship for faculty and students? (For example, support for developing online courses, support for discipline-specific software, classroom technology, etc.)

Instructional spaces and facilities. In general, English Department does not have a high requirement for its instructional spaces. Many of us prefer rooms set up for discussion, so the small classrooms filled with desks in rows can sometimes create challenges for the small-group work and discussion-based pedagogy we prize. We currently have adequate space and facilities for our faculty and staff.

Staff Support. Our clerical staff is represented by our amazing Administrative Analyst, Kate Sims, who is also looking after that Philosophy Department. Formerly, we had one AC for our department, and a half-time assistant and a student assistant as well. It does seem our staff is stretched thinly, especially since so much of the work (a third of the classes) derives from the composition program, which could have a dedicated staff person in its own right. The university is in a personnel crunch right now, but it would be great to see more direct staff support for students in our multiple programs (and in Philosophy). Some of the administrative work formerly done by ACs has shifted to faculty members or the Chair. This is an area the Chair and AA will continue to consider in the coming years.

Impact of Potential Changes. Our program, like the rest of the campus, awaits the results of Sonoma State's new recruiting strategies as it is vital to our health for student enrollment to return to our typical figure of around 300 majors. Without that rebound in student numbers, we might need to rethink our curricular programs and mapping, as we may not be able to hire faculty with the expertise in all of the fields and literary periods we cover. The campus is engaging currently in the Academic Master Planning process to provide consultative venues for thinking our way forward given the budget crisis caused by our decline in student enrollment. This review has already highlighted the crises we are experiencing in terms of faculty retention and retirement in the "challenges" section of the overview.

Ratio of Tenure-Track Faculty to Student and to Adjust Faculty. Serving over 200 majors, we currently have eight full-time faculty, with one of those set to begin the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) in fall of 2023. We also have four faculty in the FERP program, with two retiring completely at the end of AY 2022-23. We have 13 or more lecturer faculty, main teaching composition, but some also teaching literature and creative writing. Each of these lecturer faculty members need support and evaluation. The Department has had extremely limited ability to replace and replenish our ranks in the years since the prior review, especially in the ranks of literature professors.

Ability to recruit and retain a diverse faculty. Three of the seven faculty we will have as full-time faculty in fall of 2023 will be women of color. The study of literature and culture draws scholars of diverse backgrounds, and we are fortunate to have these outstanding teacher/scholars in our department. With the notable exception of Dr. Lisa Nakamura, who left for a R1

university at the beginning of this century, we have had a strong record of retaining our faculty of color. We would like to increase the diversity of our faculty in the coming years. The excellent reputation and teaching traditions of this Department have been draws for excellent faculty through the last few decades, but the cost of living, disruption of teaching and learning due to forest fires, and the stress of institutional uncertainties surrounding budget and enrollment make retaining faculty a difficult task. We want to ensure support for both life and work for our newest colleagues as they make their way through the tenure and promotion processes here.

Availability of faculty mentoring programs. We do not currently have an official program of this sort and the pandemic years have made it difficult for faculty of newer and older generations to have those impromptu “hallway” conversations that help so much in making departmental and university culture understandable to newer faculty. We hope this will improve, particularly if we are allowed to made new hires in the coming years.

E. Student Success

Student Involvement. Despite the changes in campus climate we are still living through in the post-pandemic era, the English Department’s student live remains thriving. This review will reflect upon three main areas where student life remains vibrant.

- **Zaum.** The production of the literary magazine *Zaum*, centered in the course ENGLISH 368, Small Press Editing, remains a vital of student engagement and culture, highlighted by the annual spring release of that year’s volume.
<https://zaum.sonoma.edu/>
- **The Writing Center**, now located as part of LARC (Learning and Academic Resources Center), is a hub for the culture and work of many of our English majors who find professional development, work experience and friendship while working as tutors.
<https://larc.sonoma.edu/programs/writing-center>
- **English Student Association**, the student club run by students through the campus club network. Students schedule presentation, social nights, movie nights, book readings and other activities to build community.
<https://involve.sonoma.edu/organization/englishstudentassociation>

Student Demographics.

Note that this data is from self-reported information collected by the CSU.

<https://csusuccess.dashboards.calstate.edu/public/faculty-dashboard/who-are-my-students>

Numbers and percentages of underrepresented students

Beginning in fall 2019, white student began to represent less than half of English Majors. This aligns with our purpose to actively participate with our campus’ commitment to diversity and to its still recent status as a Hispanic Serving Institution. We would very much like to improve on the overall diversity of our student body, especially in attracting and retaining more African-American student to our program. This data shows that the percentage of Latinx students has risen in our program, while levels for African American

student and Asian students have not improved since 2011 or since our last program review in 2015.

Year	White	Asian	Latinx	Black/AA	Other	
2011 Fall	68%	3%	11%	n<10	15%	
2015 Fall	58%	n<10	20%	n<10	16%	
2022 Fall	49%	n<10	30%	n<10	n<10	

Gender balance. Currently, the gender split is 66% female and 34% male, although it should be noted that many of our students identify as gender non-binary, gender neutral, gender queer. Our department embraces a diversity of gender expression in our curriculum and culture. The gender gap has narrowed over the last decade, from 75/25 in 2011, although there was a spike to 80/20 in 2015.

The following demographic information is from SSU's Tableau site:

https://tableau.sonoma.edu/#/views/StudentEnrollmentandDemographics_V2/StudentDemographics?:iid=4

First Generation Students: The percentage of SSU English Majors who identify as First Generation is 18.5, according to SSU's Tableau information.

According to this data source, the percentage of students who are underrepresented minorities is 29.2%, which differs slightly from the data on the CSU Student Success website.

Social-Economic Status: According to Dr. Heather Brown of Institutional Research, English Majors who qualify for Pell Grants, an indicator of low-income, are 34%. The figure for the campus is also 34%. In terms of income, it is our sense that our department's community includes many students who struggle to make ends meet, and we do our best to accommodate work schedules.

Age. Most of our students are of traditional age, with a total of 10.4% who are over the age of 30. These has changed dramatically over the last few decades. At the turn of the century, we served mainly transfer students and many of them were of non-traditional age. That was in part due to the community outreach done by J.J. Wilson mentioned in the first part of this review. Today, we still serve many transfer students, but most of them are traditional age.

Numbers of first-time freshmen and transfer students

As with the rest of the University, the English Department has seen a decline in the number of first-year students and transfer students declaring the major.

Major	Admit		Fall 17	Fall 18	Fall 19	Fall 20	Fall 21	Fall 22
ENGLISH	FTF	Enrolled	50	58	47	28	29	20
ENGLISH	Transfer	Enrolled	26	43	27	32	43	28

These are significant losses, although many students do declare English as a major after arriving at the campus. Still, we are reeling with the implications in many ways, and are working to support the campus efforts at recruitment and publicity.

Trends in the English Major.

There are and always have been news stories predicting the demise of the English Major, yet it remains a popular choice here, as one of the three largest majors in the School of Arts and Humanities. It is hard to see reasons for the loss in majors through the noise and distortion of the overall decline of students at SSU.

Salary earnings and employment fields

Earnings

Earnings	All SSU	English Majors	Difference
2 years after graduation	\$49,519	\$40,860	-17.5%
5 years after graduation	\$60,837	\$53,058	-12.8%
10 years after graduation	\$72,973	\$63,073	-13.6%
15 years after graduation	\$83,388	\$73,531	-11.8%
https://tableau.calstate.edu/views/LaborMarketOutcomes/LaborMarketOutcomes?iframeSizedToWindow=true&%3Aembed=y&%3AshowAppBanner=false&%3Adisplay_count=no&%3AshowVizHome=no&%3Aorigin=viz_share_link			

This data shows a declining gap between the earnings of SSU English majors and those in other majors. Most students don't choose English or other fields in the Humanities for hopes of high salaries, but this data suggests that there may not be as much difference as public perception imagines. Since the following table suggests that fully 35% of our students go into K-12 teaching or Higher Education, it may be that these earnings are deflated by a lack of society support for those fields. We cannot break the salary data down by field, but we suspect English majors in other fields do just as well as those with other degrees.

Another reminder of how we might think through salary data is offered by Jane Beal, who addresses the very real gender gap in pay that is also affecting these salary figures:

Meanwhile, people protest that university graduates, including English majors, cannot pay off their student-loan debt and that their debt-to-income ratio is too high upon graduation. This has become increasingly concerning as more women than men enter the English major. Women in all areas of employment in America still make less than men: an average of 82 cents to the dollar, which amounts to a \$10,194 difference annually ([National Partnership for Women and Families 2020](#))¹. This “gender wage gap” is real, and when we assess the income of English graduates, the fact that women still do not make salaries comparable to those of men in our society means that female English graduates make less money than those in traditionally male-dominated professions, such as the STEM fields. “The Value of the English Major Today” *Humanities* 2020, 9(3), 77; <https://doi.org/10.3390/h9030077>

There has been some coverage in recent years of tech copies looking to hire English Majors and recent research is backing up the idea that “fuzzy” majors can do just fine. For instance, research by Strada finds that Liberal Arts majors do well in the job market, especially starting from their mid-career.

Liberal arts graduates hit their stride later in their careers, experiencing rapid wage growth in their late 30s and early 40s—the fastest among majors.
<https://stradaeducation.org/report/the-real-long-term-outcomes-of-liberal-arts-graduates/>

This source supports that data on the CSU site that shows that earning gap between English degree graduates and other majors narrows over time. We often tell our students that Business majors may get better initial jobs, but English majors get bet careers, and this study support may that claim.

Where English Majors are ten years out, by field.

Fields	Percentage of SSU English Major in Fields, after 10 years.
K-12 Education	30%
Manufacturing, Public Administration, Food/accommodation svcs	Each 6%
Higher Education, Health Care, Finance and Insurance	Each 5%

Graduation, Persistence, GPA: English Majors compare favorable to Sonoma State as a whole in all of these metrics. We are proud that we provide personal advising and a culture of support,

even during the zoom years. Our programs are designed to support student success. We have worked in the last ten years to build a four-year curriculum and culture to support students.

Metric	English	Sonoma State	Difference
4-year Degree Completion	43%	30%	+13%
6-year Degree Completion	70%	63%	+7%
First year Persistence	92%	84%	+8%
Fourth Year Persistence	70%	65%	+5%
4-Year GPA	3.35	3.29	+0.04
https://csusuccess.dashboards.calstate.edu/public/faculty-dashboard/academic-outcomes			

Student Life Post-Graduation

Immediate past Chair Stefan Kiesbye oversaw the implementation of “Alumni Spotlights” on our webpage, showcasing student reflections on life during their time here and afterwards. Student from diverse backgrounds speak have gone on to work in varying fields, including writing novels, tutoring, doctoral study, MFA study, and high-school teaching.

<https://www.ssualumni.org/s/937/m21/interior.aspx?sid=937&gid=1&pgid=1554>

This year, Brad Seligman (English 1975) was honored in a spring 2023 ceremony as a Sonoma State Distinguished Alumni for his long and distinguished career in the legal field, as a judge, and in civic engagement.

The Honorable Brad Seligman is one of the country’s pre-eminent public interest attorneys and serves on the California Superior Court for the County of Alameda and was appointed by Governor Jerry Brown in 2012. For over 30 years, Hon. Seligman has been a civil rights attorney specializing in class action and individual employment and civil rights litigation and the legal community in California and nationwide recognizes him as a champion of justice.

<https://www.ssualumni.org/s/937/m21/interior.aspx?sid=937&gid=1&pgid=1554>

F. Reflection and Plan of Action

Review and response to 2015 Action Plan

1. Hold Three Yearly Retreats: In addition to regular meetings, the department will hold three substantial retreats per year. Retreats will be held on a relatively regular schedule, with one in late August, one in late January, and one in May.

Reflection: Before the Pandemic hit, we had been successfully holding three retreats per year. Since then, we’ve still managed two per year, using zoom and online discussion as our primary modality for meetings.

Create a Senior Capstone Course: The department will create a required senior-level capstone course for majors, starting with the literature track. The capstone course will feature a senior thesis requirement.

Reflection: The Department met this goal with its program revision that was implemented in fall 2017 after much planning, consultation and feedback from administrators and campus curriculum committees. Each concentration now has an approved capstone course:

- ENGL496 for Single Subject students
- ENGL435 SC for Creative Writing students
- ENGL485 for Literature students

2. Build Four Years of the English Major: The department will continue to build a curriculum that will engage our majors from their first year to their senior year and, for some, beyond through the M. A. program. Such planning might involve renumbering and re-sequencing of courses, evaluation of department-wide goals for student skills and writing.

Reflection: This goal was met. In fall 2017, The Department successfully revised its programs to meet this goal, creating programs that reflect a 4-year journey towards graduation. English has never been a program that is structured vertically, but we wanted to create key stepping stones through the major. These changes are highlight in the ***** section, but as they pertain to this goal, this program review highlights the following:

Introductory Courses: The inclusion of introductory courses in the major at the first- and second-year level. Each of these courses may now count towards the program “Introductory” requirement:

- English 160A/B, a year-long learning community that includes peer mentors guiding first-year students is now gateway to the major that counts toward the major (Composition courses do not)
- ENGL 207, Introduction to Creative Writing
- ENGL203. although not part of the revision in 2017,” Introduction to Linguistic Studies” was brought into the curriculum by Dr. Theresa Burrell-Stone, as an entryway course into the major, particularly for Single Subject students

Sophomore Survey Courses. All majors now take a two-semester survey course that covers both British and American Literature. Previously, only one of the four surveys was required.

Introduction to Literary Analysis (ENGL201), was shifted from the junior to the sophomore level.

More clearly designed sequencing. All tracks now have 300/400 level sequencing for intermediate and advanced level study, including junior and senior seminars.

3. Enhance Department Culture for Students and Faculty: The department will work to build on its existing strengths as a vibrant community distinguished by frequent readings and lectures, renowned publications, enthusiastic students, and small class sizes featuring personal mentoring. The department will strengthen this “culture of belonging” by improving advising,

by continuing the faculty symposium series, by increasing communication and coordination to ensure more support and attendance at events and readings, by fostering the re-creation of the English Students' Association (ESA), and by creating opportunities (both in one-off events, programs, or courses) for students to learn more about meaningful lives, jobs, and careers relating to the many aspects of the major.

Reflection. Although we always want to improve, this goal has been partially met and departmental culture has been enhanced before the pandemic and has survived through it. The English Student Association club has been chartered with the support of club advisor, Chair Wandling. The creation of opportunities for English Majors to meet each other in the First-Year Learning Community (ENGL160A/B) has been a tremendous success. Some of the student return to the program as Peer Mentors the following years and some have volunteered to hold film nights for students to watch the films at the heart of that program's curriculum. While the numbers in that course have dropped from 125 in AY 2016-17 to 25 the last two years, we plan to rebuild that starting with an enrollment of 75 in fall 2023. As indicated in the "Student Success" section, there are several key locales where students experience "the life of an English Major." One part of this goal we'd like to carry forward specifically is to work on our communication, both from students via surveys and to student via effective advising and program messages. We would also like to increase our social media presence (see next section).

4. Enhance Diversity in the Major: The department will build on its previous diversity commitments by even more fully and purposefully including diversity and diversity issues in the major. The department will find ways to make the major even more welcoming to students from diverse backgrounds. The department will also think strategically about cross-listing courses and about seeking faculty hires who can help support a more diverse student body, especially among those groups dramatically underrepresented in our student body.

Reflection. In terms of curricular design, this goal has been partially met, especially with the creation of the "Survey in a Distinct Ethnic Tradition" course (ENGL350). that is now a central required course in the core of our major. As noted in the "faculty" section, our instructors put diversity at the heart of their teaching and scholarship. However, student demographics remain less than we have hoped for, in part due to the body of students the campus attracts. However, Sonoma State is now a Hispanic Serving Institution and will enthusiastically partner with campus efforts to promote inclusivity and diversity in our student body. In the curricular redesign proposal put forward by Dr. Johnson and Dr. Theresa Burrell-Stone (see Appendix C), this purpose is made explicit.

Our work has two major programmatic objectives: 1) to better attract, support, and retain diverse populations of students while they are at SSU, and 2) to better prepare all of our students to thrive as secondary educators serving culturally and linguistically diverse student populations in the region and state.

5. Develop New Ways of Fairly Apportioning Faculty Workload: The department will revisit its committee structure, its plans for release time, and its ways of defining workload for tenure-line and lecturer faculty in order to improve our working experience. The department will develop new ways of acknowledging and respecting both shared and individual work. In acting

on this item, the department will avoid *at all costs* the creation of additional or unnecessary work. The department will strive to find equitable, fair, and realistic ways of making certain that necessary work is done in order to allow faculty to thrive.

Reflection. This goal has not been met. Our faculty ranks have shrunk so much that there are just not enough people to get certain things done. The Staffing Committee this year had six adjunct faculty coming through for review, each of whom had to have an observation scheduled and an evaluation done on their prior three-years teaching and work. Curriculum Committee and Graduate Studies Committee work hard to get their basic scheduling and admitting tasks done each year. All of these Department committees have overlap. This is one reason work on assessment has been so slow over the years in our department, as it is always going to come after the basic operational things that must be done each year. We have been successful at times in gain release or assigned time for our Composition Director and Single-Subject Advisor, which was not always the case at the time of our prior review. So that part of this goal has been met, although we have to annually justify release time in the face of budget crises. Rather than continue this goal to the current Program Review, we will instead focus on necessary hiring if we are to get this departmental work done adequately and fairly.

Plan of Action

Hire faculty.

Hiring faculty is the most pressing need our department faces. Indeed, without doing so, we cannot hope to address the ideas and issues that follow. While due to recent campus-wide drops in enrollment our total majors, minors and MA students have dipped from our usual 300 to around 239 (21%), we have had a 53% drop in full-time tenure-line faculty over the last 15 years. At a minimum we need to hire in these fields to bring our faculty up to at least 11 full-time members.

- A literature professor who specialization includes 20th and/or 21st century American Literature
- At least one but preferably two Creative Writers to replace Professor Gillian Conoley, who retires at the end of this year, and Professor Anne Goldman, who's FERP will end a few years later.
- A Rhetoric and Composition specialist to replace Dr. Megan McIntyre, who left at the end of AY 2021-22. We currently have a terrific adjunct professor, Dr. Anthony Rizzuto, serving in the capacity of Writing Program Director.

As part of the goal of arguing for and earning hires, we need to do all we can to attract students to our major, so the numbers help to justify these hires. Without these hires, we cannot provide mentoring and expertise, and sometimes not even the courses, to ensure coverage of the historical fields we provided when we had 15 or even 12 faculty members.

Reflect on the nature and structure of our overall major and its courses, especially with respect to our commitments to increasing diversity of the student body in our programs

We plan to use our retreat opportunities to continue to reflect on ways to improve our curriculum, especially with regards to the centrality of literature, especially British literature. The historical areas of study in British Literature have changed considerably over the years, and our scholars teaching in those fields include global voices and writing far from the Northern European Island that gives our discipline its name. We want to promote and show the clear alignment of our program and coursework with the university's commitment to anti-racist pedagogies. We will consider proposals made by our Single-Subject faculty at the February 2022 retreat (also mentioned earlier with respect to assessment and diversity) to rethink our core courses in ways that might better serve future teachers, especially with respect to the diverse students these future teachers will serve. The Department is happy with the revisions it made to our curriculum in 2017, but will consider further changes in the years ahead.

Limited residency Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing.

Immediate Past Chair Stefan Kiesbye made this a priority planning item during his tenure as Chair (2019-22). The idea was widely supported in the department. While many creative-writing students thrive in our Master's Program, we recognize that the MFA is the preferred degree for those who wish to hold teaching positions in their future. Moreover, our writing faculty here have been well recognized (see Appendix E) and influential practitioners of their craft, who would attract students from diverse parts of our country. However, both a downturn in student enrollments campus-wide and the pandemic put these plans on hold. As we return to normal times, we hope to revisit the feasibility of developing such a program, particularly since the campus and our faculty, have, out of necessity, become adept in online teaching modalities.

Assessment

At the very least, we plan to develop a set of assessable learning outcomes in the core of our major, and potential across the tracks as well. student learning and track their experience, via regular assessment of student work and regular student surveys embedded into our curricular and planning processes.

Social Media and Communication. Ensure our social media and webpage presence is cutting edge and invites current and prospective students into engagement with both necessary information and our Department's culture. In spring 2023, Chair Wandling created an internship for a student to serve as a social media intern for the department, as we have tremendous "content" happening all the time in our courses and program. The Department Chair will offer "Advising Memos" to students before registration each semester. The Department Chair and Administrative Analyst will continue to work on the appearance and function of our home web page, for both prospective and current students.

Action Plan Specific to our Composition Program

CSU Supportive Pathways for First-Year Students

Partner with University Academic Programs to support new grants and initiatives to increase student success and retention in the first year. Our role in this project will include paid professional development for our composition instructors to reflect on hidden barriers to success. We will also work to support the use of embedded tutors, learning communities and other high impact practices that lead to student success.

Closing equity gaps in first-year curriculum.

As part of our partnership with Academic Programs, we will work to embrace the findings of Dr. McIntyre's study (in Appendix A) and work to close equity gaps in achievement in our program.

Dr. McIntyre's paper, which is based on numerical assessment data of student success rates in our composition courses, calls for

- An inclusive, equity- and asset-based model for A2 courses, with an emphasis on enhancing student self-efficacy through High Impact Practices (Kuh, 2008) and deep reflection
- More positive outcomes for at-risk students, in terms of both success in A2 and in terms of retention at the University
- An opportunity for collaboration across departments and schools on high-impact curriculum design that affirms department and university goals regarding equity, particularly our core value of "Diversity and Social Justice"

Also, of note is the paper's call for embedded advising/tutoring, one of the ideas we hope to support and see implemented as part of the local implementation of the "CSU Supportive Pathways for First-Year Students."

G. Dissemination of this Program Review.

The Program Review will be updated to reflect feedback from the external reviewer, Dr. Kathryn Rummell of Cal Poly

The Review and the External Review shall be forwarded to

- The Arts and Humanities School Curriculum Committee
- Arts and Humanities Interim Dean Ed Beebout

After receiving and incorporating feedback from these two steps, the Program Review, External Review and Campus, the program review will be forwarded to the University Program Review Subcommittee (UPRS). .

Appendices:

- A. Dr. Megan McIntyre Teagle Report on ENGLISH 101 Composition, including learning outcomes and signature assignment.
- B. English composition assessment data and analysis
- C. Dr. Jennifer Johnson and Dr. Theresa Burrell-Stone, Teagle report on English Single-Subject Redesign.
- D. Signature Assignments for GE Classes: ENGLISH 160B (Science-Fiction, Fantasy and Identity, First-Year Learning Community)
- E. Distinction of Creative Writing Faculty
- F. Proposed Learning Outcomes Mapping Exercise (August 2022)
- G. English Department Resolution against the implementation of Executive Order 1100.

English Undergraduate Program Review Sonoma State University

Prepared by: Kathryn Rummell, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Personnel
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo

Introduction

I would, first of all, like to thank all of the faculty, staff, students, and administrators with whom I met as part of this program review. Without exception, our conversations were informative, collegial, frank, and engaging. It was a pleasure to visit Sonoma State's beautiful campus and interact with everyone as I learned more about the undergraduate English program.

My visit confirmed the importance of the English Department to both the Sonoma State campus and the larger community it serves. The department produces college graduates with the skills and talents cultivated by the English Department: graduates with effective written and oral communication, who can think critically and creatively, who can understand multiple perspectives, discover ambiguities, and pay close and sustained attention to detail.

Besides the value of its graduates to the community, the English Department provides a vital service to the university as a whole by supporting all SSU students in developing the written communication and critical thinking skills necessary to succeed academically across all disciplines and areas of study. Unlike most other departments on campus, English is a point of contact for first-time entering students, since all are required to take writing courses during their first year of enrollment. Retention statistics nationwide have long confirmed that the vast majority of students who drop out of higher education do so in their first year. As such, the English Department provides a pivotal source of support for SSU students during this crucial first year and is instrumental in helping the campus retain and graduate students in a timely manner.

At the outset of this report it is important to recognize the context in which Sonoma State is and has been operating. From 2017-2019, a number of wildfires caused periodic campus closures. These closures impacted the daily operations of campus, of course, but also caused physical, emotional, and psychological stress for faculty, students, and staff. In March of 2020 the COVID pandemic required the abrupt transition to online courses, and the campus is continuing to feel the effects of the pandemic three years later. Caused in part by these emergencies and exacerbated by declining enrollment figures, Sonoma State is also facing a significant budget shortage that is necessitating a comprehensive Academic Master Planning effort. These conditions make this program review report significantly more difficult to write, because budgets and possible changes to university structure are still unknown. I believe it is important to acknowledge these challenges and to understand the ways that the suggestions in this report may not be possible or advisable depending on the budget and university structure. Additionally, reports like these are always challenging

because while an outsider's perspective can illuminate issues unseen by insiders, they are also necessarily limited by the very perspective of an outsider. My comments below come from a position of great respect for the faculty in the program and I hope they find them useful.

Selected Strengths of the English Department

Without a doubt, the biggest strength of the English Department is its faculty. Undergraduate and graduate students alike praised the faculty for their knowledge, expertise, enthusiasm, and compassion. Additionally, they were grateful for the welcoming atmosphere created by the faculty, which facilitated students' comfort in class, in office hours, and in campus conversations. I met with approximately 40 students, mostly undergraduates pursuing literature and creative writing tracks, for 50 minutes. Our lively conversation illuminated students' deep admiration of their faculty; their appreciation for the individualized attention they received in the major; and their gratitude for the strong sense of community within the major. These are students who feel seen, heard, and included in the department. Especially given the tumultuous experiences of the recent past, the enthusiasm for the faculty and the department is remarkable to see.

In addition to supporting the students in generous and compassionate ways, the faculty in the department are outstanding teacher-scholars. I will not repeat the list of faculty accomplishments outlined in the self-study, but I do want to express my respect for the scholarly and creative output the department's faculty has produced. The teaching load in the CSU is high, and forwarding one's research and creative agenda can be difficult. Yet these faculty have managed to do so in meaningful and important ways.

Another real strength of this department is its collegiality. Though they have lost 53% of their tenure-line faculty over the past 15 years (a figure that is, quite frankly, astonishing to see), they continue to work together productively and fruitfully. Even more impressive is that the external challenges posed by wildfires and COVID have not seemed to significantly erode their department culture. Many departments across the CSU and nation have struggled to adjust to post-COVID life, but this department's faculty does not seem to have suffered that fate, and it is inspiring and gratifying to know that their respect for one another has not diminished.

Though all of the faculty are performing extraordinarily well under the circumstances, the outstanding two newer faculty in the single subject program should be especially commended for their work in antiracist pedagogy. Dr. Jennifer Johnson and Dr. Theresa Burrell-Stone received a Teagle grant to research and implement antiracist interventions in the single subject curriculum (more on this later). Dr. Johnson and Dr. Burrell-Stone have also proposed and received funding for a Faculty Learning Community focused on antiracism. Like the other faculty in the department, they are engaged, active teacher-scholars who are committed to student success.

Students, too, are a real strength of this program. As mentioned above, I greatly enjoyed my meeting with students. They spoke passionately about their experiences in the major and at

the institution, and they were knowledgeable about the ways the English major differed from other majors. I was especially impressed with students' success in pursuing advanced degrees; one student I spoke with was headed to the PhD program at Ohio State, and other students were pursuing graduate degrees elsewhere.

Student graduation and persistence rates in the English major significantly outstrip those at the university. Especially laudatory is the English major's 13% increase over the university's four-year graduation rate (43% compared to 30%). That gap decreases, but is still meaningful, in six-year graduation rates (70% compared to 63%). I am also very impressed by the English major's first-year persistence rate of 92%. These statistics should be noted by the university not just as numbers, but also as indicators of the careful curricular planning, individualized advising, and compassionate mentoring performed by English faculty.

Opportunities for the English Department

As mentioned in the Introduction, the conditions at Sonoma State are the direst I've seen. Given the small size of the faculty (there will be only 7 full-time tenure-line faculty working in fall 2023), the budget uncertainty, and the possible university restructuring, my ideas and suggestions may not be practical. Nevertheless, I would encourage the department and university to consider these opportunities to strengthen the already-strong English undergraduate program.

The self-study identified six plans of actions for the program review: 1) hire faculty; 2) reconsider the nature and structure of the overall major, especially with respect to commitments to diversity; 3) revisit plans for a low-residency MFA program; 4) improve assessment efforts; 5) develop the department's social media and communication plans; and 6) close equity gaps in the first-year curriculum. I will reference these six goals within my recommendations below.

Curriculum Revision

The current major curriculum includes three tracks: literature (53 students), creative writing (82 students), and single subject (41 students). These three tracks and their student numbers reflect national trends, particularly with respect to student interest in creative writing. A serious challenge that the department faces is the need for a curriculum that serves all three tracks. Additionally, because the department is severely under-staffed (more on that later), it struggles to deliver the classes all three tracks need in order to graduate. This semester, for instance, two required courses (385 and 401) were merged in order to ensure that students could graduate on time.

The department is undergoing conversations about curricular revision right now (goal 2). In fact, on the day after my site visit the department held a faculty retreat to continue these discussions. I am sympathetic to the issues raised in these conversations and do not presume to have easy solutions to them, especially since I do not have the in-depth understanding of the curriculum that the SSU faculty do. What I can offer, however, are

some suggestions for ways to think about curricular revision based on my understanding of the needs and desires of SSU English majors (as well as English majors in general).

- Are there ways to pursue cross-listing courses and/or team-teaching with faculty in other disciplines, such as Theatre, Modern Languages, American Multicultural Studies, etc.? One faculty member lamented that it had “always been difficult” to cross-list courses at SSU, and in my experience that can be true everywhere. Given the situation that the university finds itself in now, though, it seems like removing the structural barriers to cross-listing and team-teaching would be worth the investment of time and energy. The benefit of cross-listing is that it can expand options for students. Cross-listing seems especially beneficial since some of the department’s current faculty are teaching in other departments, most notably AMCS. I would also encourage the department to consider cross-listing with departments it may not typically think of. For instance, there might be a productive partnership between creative writing and computer science in a course on narrative game design. Or, something closer to home might be a team-taught course with the History department on the literature of World War I.
- If cross-listing and/or team-teaching aren’t options, would the department consider allowing a course from an outside field to be substituted for a course in the major? For instance, students indicated that there were literature courses offered in other departments (AMCS, for example) that they would be interested in taking. While I understand that allowing substitutions might reduce the number of classes taken in the English department, I think that allowing these substitutions, at least in the short-term, might be beneficial.
- Are there possibilities of expanding General Education courses to English majors? For instance, could some of the courses required in the literature track, especially, also serve GE students, thereby increasing the student numbers? There are differences in major and GE classes, to be sure, both in content and in expectations, but providing majors with the opportunity to take classes that meet GE for other students might expand their current options. Such a strategy might be especially beneficial for lower-division courses since they can be used as a recruiting tool for the major.
- The literature curriculum is fairly British-centric and skews towards pre-20th century. This reality is partly the effect of the current faculty specialties. Students expressed some frustration with the curricular offerings even while acknowledging the reasons for them. Obviously, the department can only teach what its faculty study, but I do wonder if the department has recently considered the Shakespeare requirement. Many English departments have moved away from single-author course requirements such as Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Milton, for instance. If the department has recently considered the issue and decided to maintain the course, they should do so. But if they haven’t discussed it recently, they might wish to.
- As a result of the last program review the department added a course devoted to a distinct ethnic or cultural tradition. This is an excellent step towards diversifying the curriculum. Another way to do so, though, is to infuse non-canonical writers into all literature courses, especially the required two-course sequence in British and

American literature. An equally important thing to share with students is that diversity isn't only about race, ethnicity, and gender. Highlighting other identities such as disability and sexual orientation also introduces students to the diversity inherent in earlier periods.

- Another way to consider diversity in the curriculum is to continue the work that Drs. Johnson and Burrell-Stone began with their Teagle grant. Their work illustrates the importance of antiracist pedagogies and practices throughout the English curriculum.
- The low-residency MFA program mentioned in the self-study (goal 3) is a terrific aspirational goal for when the department has more bandwidth. Given the faculty numbers and the other curricular needs, I think now is probably not the time to engage in serious conversations about this program.

Each of the suggestions above has trade-offs such that the department may decide they aren't worth pursuing. Until the department has a more robust tenure-line faculty, though, curricular revision is extremely challenging.

Other Curricular Challenges

The students I met with were mostly juniors and seniors in the creative writing and literature tracks. A frequently cited concern was their lack of confidence in their writing skills. Students in both tracks asked for more writing practice and feedback, claiming that in most of their major courses they composed one final essay at the end of the term and so didn't feel like their writing was improving. They expressed concerns about their ability to perform in graduate programs and in their future careers since English majors are supposed to be known for their writing skills.

As the department faculty know, though, responding to writing is an incredibly time-consuming endeavor. I understand how difficult it is to respond to multiple pieces of writing throughout the term, especially when class sizes are large (there were 40 students in the class session I attended). I wasn't able to discuss this issue with the faculty, and I'm confident they are aware of and have explored best practices for responding to student writing, but I wanted to mention it here because the students were quite vocal about it.

Faculty Hiring

This is the department's top priority (goal 1) and I completely concur. The department as a whole is in dire need of more faculty. I recognize that it is *de rigueur* for program reviewers to request additional hires. However, in my experience conducting program reviews, I have not encountered a faculty as depleted as this one. While I recognize that all departments at SSU have struggled over the past several years of crisis, the SSU English Department seems to have borne more than its fair share of loss. In 2006, the department boasted 15 tenure-line faculty; in fall of 2023 they will be down to 7 full-time tenure-line faculty, with an additional two who are FERPing and thus part-time. This reduction has meant that the department has been unable to offer key aspects of its curriculum, including American literature and Composition/Rhetoric courses. As referenced above, curriculum

development and faculty hiring go hand-in-hand, so the department does need to prioritize its requests for hiring.

The department's self-study expresses a need for at least three to four positions: 20th/21st century American literature; creative writing (possibly two lines); and composition and rhetoric. All of these positions are critical to the success of the program and its students. Given the student demand, it may be that the creative writing hire is the most vital, at least at first. One suggestion might be to advertise for a creative writing expert who can also teach 20th/21st century American literature (in their genre or across the board). Our campus has had good luck with that approach; neither of our creative writing faculty teaches only creative writing. That approach might help stem the tide in the short term.

The other area I would encourage the department and university to prioritize is the composition/rhetoric position. Because of Megan McIntyre's departure, the position of Writing Program Director has been held by a faculty member with a specialty in literature, not composition and rhetoric. Given the importance of this position not only to the English Department, but also to the entire university, the Writing Program Director should have a PhD in composition and rhetoric or in writing studies. Prioritizing this faculty position would help ensure that writing program faculty have the support they need and would benefit all SSU students. Additionally, it would enable the department to make significant headway in goal 6, closing equity gaps in first-year writing (more on that goal below).

I want to reiterate that *all* of these positions are critically needed. I hope that the university will provide the support and resources to enable the department to find the equilibrium it needs to continue as an indispensable asset to students, the campus, and the wider community.

Tenure-line Faculty Workload

Unsurprisingly, given the reduction in tenure-line faculty over the past several years, faculty workload has increased. The self-study references it especially with respect to assessment efforts (which are still in the beginning stages), but also with respect to committee work and service to the university. I mention it here because I want to be sure that the university understands the tremendous burden on these faculty to perform all of the service required to maintain and deliver their programs. Additionally, I want to be sure that SSU English faculty are aware of the Assigned Time for Exceptional Service to Students program (article 20.37 of the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement). This program may provide some support for the excellent work faculty do to support students, especially those from underrepresented and underserved backgrounds.

Student Advising

Students complimented the department for making them feel welcome and part of the community, and the department's student advising model is undoubtedly partly responsible for creating that feeling. However, students also raised concerns about two advising issues: a difficulty planning their schedules because the catalog isn't reflective of course offerings in a given year, and a desire for more career advising from faculty.

Course Planning

The catalog issue is a common one that is likely out of the department's control. The catalog lists "terms typically offered" for courses, but the crisis in English department staffing has meant that some courses aren't being offered. Students indicated that the department schedule typically listed courses one semester at a time rather than projecting for two semesters, which they would find more useful. I understand the difficulties in publishing course offerings a full year in advance (that is, spring 2024 posted in spring 2023), but I would encourage the department to consider doing so on its website and making clear the "tentative" nature of the offerings. Doing so might help students plan more effectively and help them feel more in control of their degree progress.

Career Advising

Students definitely want more help in this area, and not from the Career Services office (though they are aware of that office). Instead, they would like help more directly related to English careers and options. This request has become a common one from English majors, and it can be time-consuming, but ultimately very rewarding, to address. I have two suggestions the department might pursue.

1. Establish an Advisory Board of alumni and other interested constituents (including non-SSU English graduates in the local area). Advisory Boards can be helpful in a number of ways: they can help with fundraising, with outreach to prospective students, and with career advising. Given SSU's location, alumni would probably jump at the chance to come to campus once or twice a year for meetings. I formed an Advisory Board twelve years ago; I would be happy to talk at more length about the process and the benefits we've reaped.
2. Establish a Career Connections program designed to showcase career options for English majors. There are multiple ways to enact this program ranging from a digital-only program (website linking to career research/programs), to a LinkedIn group with SSU English alumni, to in-person events like resume workshops and Speed Networking events. If the department has the bandwidth to engage in any of these ideas I am more than happy to talk with them.

Lecturer Faculty

The department currently has twelve lecturer faculty, many of whom teach at other institutions, as well. For the most part, these faculty teach in the first-year writing program, though occasionally they are asked to teach literature and creative writing courses. One common concern was the lack of clear guidelines about how courses are assigned. The impression is that the qualifications for different classes vary from department chair to department chair. Additionally, lecturers feel undervalued for the work they do to recruit and retain students both in the department and at the institution. Despite being the first point of contact for first-time freshmen, the lecturers feel like the department and university leadership don't involve them in conversations about retention and best practices. Finally, though the lecturers expressed fondness for the department's tenure-line faculty as individuals, they feel a lack of community and support in general.

None of the concerns raised by the lecturers are ones particular to SSU, unfortunately. Every English department I know has lecturers voicing similar concerns. Their universality, however, doesn't mean they can't be addressed on some level. I have a few suggestions that might help, but I also recognize that there are many other issues at play here: entitlements; the unpredictability of course needs, especially as the university struggles with enrollment issues; degree requirements for various course levels; and the lack of compensation for service. Nevertheless, I offer these suggestions in the spirit of helping the department and university find ways to better support these faculty.

1. One of the concerns is around invisibility and exclusion, particularly with respect to research and teaching that lecturers are doing. Post-COVID life has made in-person meetings more challenging, but I would suggest having at least two meetings/semester in person and inviting all faculty to attend. The department could devote 30 minutes of the meeting to hearing about innovative teaching practices and/or exciting research ideas from faculty interested in sharing, including lecturer faculty.
2. Similarly, the department chair could send monthly emails highlighting these sorts of accomplishments and activities, a Monthly Kudos of sorts. If the chair doesn't have the time to do so, perhaps the social media/department communications student intern could share these. In order for this approach to be successful, though, faculty have to be willing to share their teaching/research updates—the chair isn't a mind reader. This sort of email/communication would also help with the department's goal 5.
3. The department should consider establishing some basic guidelines for determining qualifications to teach different kinds of classes. For example, perhaps an MA or MFA is required to teach lower-division literature courses, but a PhD is required to upper-division courses. It's possible that such guidelines already exist, but if they do, the lecturers are not aware of them.
4. The self-study indicates that one way the department hopes to help close the equity gaps in first-year writing (goal six) is by partnering with University Academic Program to support new grants and initiatives to increase student success and retention in the first year. The self-study also reports that paid professional development opportunities will be available for the composition instructors to reflect on hidden barriers to success. I encourage the university administrators reading this report to ensure that this work is compensated, especially since it will be performed by lecturer faculty who are not paid to perform service. Additionally, I want to reiterate the Assigned Time for Exceptional Service to Students program mentioned above; lecturers are also eligible for those WTUs.

Faculty Support

In general, faculty (tenure-line and lecturer) feel overworked and under-supported, especially with respect to research, scholarship, and creative activities. Many faculty

mentioned the teaching resources offered by the Center for Teaching & Educational Technology (CTET), but they indicated that those resources were aimed at faculty with less teaching experience and pedagogical expertise than English faculty. Consequently, they felt that the support was not relevant or current for their needs. Instead of resources for supporting teaching, the faculty indicated that they need resources that support research. I am not sure what can be done with respect to this support right now, but I mention it here because it was expressed as a very serious need for faculty. In my meetings with interim dean Ed Beebout and AVP Stacey Bosick, both expressed an admiration for the faculty in the department and a desire to retain them. While appreciation doesn't pay the bills, I want to memorialize their sentiments in this report so that faculty know they are valued.

Another way the college and university can support faculty is through meaningful consultation and clear and timely communication regarding the Academic Master Planning efforts. Faculty expressed feelings of uncertainty and anxiety about what will happen to their departments, schools, and professional lives. And there is a sense that the administration is making decisions without real consultation. I encourage the university administration to be attentive to these concerns because the English faculty are likely not the only ones feeling this way.

Goal 4: Improve assessment efforts

The department's assessment efforts are in nascent stages, but that is largely because of the faculty numbers. They have program learning outcomes and have done some curricular mapping. While I understand the importance of assessment, given the current situation in the department, I would suggest they focus their attention on more pressing issues.

Goal 5: Develop the department's social media and communication plans

The self-study lists this as a goal that it has already begun addressing. This spring, department chair Tim Wandling created an internship opportunity for a student to serve as a social media intern. I think this is a terrific idea and it is one that has worked well at Cal Poly, SLO. In addition to social media content, though, a student or students could produce department and alumni newsletters, revamp the department's website, and help with the career programming the students have requested. Internships like this one are terrific opportunities for students to gain experience and have a product they can use for job-seeking upon graduation.

Goal 6: Close equity gaps in first-year writing

This goal is referenced above but deserves more attention. The department's former tenure-line Writing Program Director produced a series of recommendations to address these gaps, and the department is partnering with Academic Programs to implement them. One example of an intervention is to use embedded tutors in first-year writing classes. This approach has been quite successful elsewhere and will likely be successful at SSU, as well. As the department works to close the equity gaps I encourage it to be attentive to the issues raised above: the need for a disciplinary expert to lead these efforts and a recognition that lecturer faculty teach the majority of these classes. It will be important to meaningfully recognize and compensate these faculty for the work they do to achieve these goals.

Conclusion

I hope the preceding suggestions can help the English Department continue to succeed. I want to end by returning to the praise I opened with: I was incredibly impressed with the faculty, staff, and students in the department and wish them every success as they navigate these challenging waters.

Humanities Curriculum Committee

Fall 2023

English Program Review

The Arts and Humanities Curriculum Committee unanimously and enthusiastically commends the English Department for their reflective and comprehensive program review. We recognize the thoughtful approach the Department has taken to its program's opportunities and challenges. In particular, AHCC notes the following:

1. We concur with the External Reviewer's assessment that the English Department needs more hires. As Dr. Rummell notes, "[t]he department as a whole is in dire need of more faculty. I recognize that it is de rigueur for program reviewers to request additional hires. However, in my experience conducting program reviews, I have not encountered a faculty as depleted as this one."
2. To have a fully functional program, the English department needs stronger support for staffing. In particular, there is a need for full-time, tenure-track hiring in creative writing.
3. In addition, English should be recognized for its outsized service to the entire institution in the form of its composition offerings. Consequently, it needs permanent staff and support in that domain, including a Director of Composition.
4. We applaud English's deep assessment structure, and also note that it requires ample resources to be fully implemented.

It is the hope of AHCC that, as the University emerges from its looming restructuring of Academic Affairs, it will invest in these ways in the English department and its programs after years of shrinking the number of its faculty.

Committee Membership:

Josh Glasgow (chair)
Stefan Kiesbye
Scott Horstein
Patricia Kim-Rajal
Tim Wandling
Mike Ezra
Michaela Grobbel
Stephanie Dyer
Liz Burch
Jenny Bent

October 10, 2023



Dean's response to the English Program Self-Study & External Review

The Department of English is to be commended for its detailed and thoughtful self-study. The documents provided create a clear picture of the strong contributions the program continues to make to the university, as well as addressing curricular and workforce issues that need to be addressed in order to keep the program strong.

The English faculty can take pride in its many achievements: innovative instructional programs, strong contributions to the university's GE curriculum, a very successful first-year learning community, providing leadership to other departments and university-wide committees, dedicated and award-winning instructors. In fact, external reviewer Dr. Kathryn Rummell of Cal Poly San Luis Obispo stated she was "incredibly impressed" with the department's "outstanding teacher-scholars" as well as the exceptional collegiality of its faculty.

But the program faces significant challenges in serving its students. Six permanent faculty have retired since the last program review in 2015 (and others are nearing retirement), with new hires not keeping pace. This has significantly increased the advising and committee workload of faculty and has left the creative writing program particularly understaffed. This also comes at time when students have expressed their desire to the external reviewer for more opportunities to receive writing instruction, practice and feedback.

While it goes without saying that the university faces serious budget challenges in the wake of the pandemic, it is my hope that we can give serious attention to the recommendations outlined in the self-study and find ways to deliver the support and resources necessary to maintain excellence.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Edward Beebout", written over a horizontal line.

Edward Beebout

Interim Dean, The School of Arts and Humanities
Sonoma State University

UPRS Findings and Recommendations Report

Chair Timothy Wandling represented the Bachelor of Arts in English program at a meeting with UPRS on November 29, 2023, to discuss the program review materials submitted during the 2022-23 and 2023-24 academic years.

Curriculum

The English Department curriculum is bifurcated between general education courses—particularly those that serve as a “point of contact for first-time entering students, since all are required to take writing courses during their first year of enrollment”—and courses in the major. In terms of the former, the external reviewer noted, “the English Department provides a pivotal source of support for SSU students during this crucial first year and is instrumental in helping the campus retain and graduate students in a timely manner” and providing the foundation about academic composition and rhetoric that students will require throughout their matriculation.

From 2017, the curriculum morphed substantially with hitherto focus on British and American English literature traditions shifted to include broader themes and values of SSU. The approaches to the core, creative writing, and literature concentrations are from lenses of social, racial, and gender diversity, equality, and justice, to mention a few and reflects years of hard work and collaboration across the School of Arts and Humanities. In this department, curriculum and faculty have a symbiotic relationship and hence any lapses that result in attrition or gaps in hiring can have serious impact on the department’s offerings.

Assessment

As noted during Dr. Wandling’s presentation to UPRS as well as in the Program Review documents, the English department struggles with having too few resources to appropriately conduct assessment. Additional difficulty is in measuring intangible factors such as the experiences and values of students. Nevertheless, the department put substantial efforts in establishing student learning outcomes and completing a curriculum mapping exercise to see how these learning outcomes are mapped to the current curriculum. Several assessment methods are used, depending on the nature and level of the courses in the department, e.g., book exploration and artifact assignment and other signature assignments in each General Education course. In several courses, students read journal articles, write reading reflections, compose annotated bibliographies, and write research-supported, thesis-driven papers or projects, all of which are examples of assessment methods. Still, several difficulties remain, and assessment is a ‘work in progress.’ Additional resources (both in terms of faculty and support for technology) to make these endeavors fruitful.

Staffing and Resources

The department strength has decreased by at least 50% in the past 15 years. So, there is heavy reliance on adjunct faculty for teaching and assessment purposes, particularly within the General Education courses that are many SSU students' first experience with academic writing. English currently has seven full-time faculty, two faculty who are in the Faculty Early Retirement Program, and 12 adjunct faculty. Faculty seem reasonably diverse, but not so diverse in terms of the kind and variety of courses they can offer. In addition, EO 1100 and GE course revisions decreased weighted teaching units from four to three units per course, disproportionately burdening English faculty because they now have only 9 weighted-teaching units with three courses and may be compelled to teach extra courses to fill the gap. The single staff member supporting the department, although highly committed, is spread very thin. For advising, students are assigned according to the availability of faculty capacity rather than based on student concentration (e.g., creative writing or literature). This dearth of human resources also restricts advising to curricular requirements and does not address career advising or mentoring. In summary, the department lacks the tenure-track faculty and the staff to adequately provide for teaching, assessment, and advising requirements, to the detriment of students and faculty. As the external reviewer summed up the situation: "the conditions at Sonoma State are the direst I've seen...in my experience conducting program reviews, I have not encountered a faculty as depleted as this one."

Students

While UPRS does not want to forget the nuanced issues relating to the huge number of students enrolled in English GE courses, here we focus on undergraduates in the English major. English department students, according to the external reviewer, "spoke passionately about their experiences in the major and at the institution, and they were knowledgeable about the ways the English major differed from other majors." She also called out students' success in pursuing advanced degrees after graduating from SSU. English majors' four-year graduation rates are significantly above the university (43% compared to 30%, respectively). That gap decreases, but is still meaningful, in six-year graduation rates (70% compared to 63%, respectively). The external reviewer noted that the university should see those figures not just as quantitative data points, but also as "indicators of the careful curricular planning, individualized advising, and compassionate mentoring performed by English faculty."

However, the small faculty and large class sizes are not conducive to student success writ large. As the external reviewer stated: "The students I met with were mostly juniors and seniors in the

creative writing and literature tracks. A frequently cited concern was their lack of confidence in their writing skills. I understand how difficult it is to respond to multiple pieces of writing throughout the term, especially when class sizes are large (there were 40 students in the class session I attended).”

Program Review Process

The program review document from the English Department is very well-structured and reflects the deep engagement of the faculty members in this process. Dr. Wandling and colleagues in the department are not only involved in the program review process but in several important GE curriculum-related activities in the university. The review is very thoughtful about all relevant aspects, e.g., curriculum, staffing, students, and assessment. The review clearly tracks the goals they began with after the previous program review and how and why they could or could not achieve the goals. Samples of signature assignments that are required as part of the curriculum were provided. The data used from Tableau is quite extensive and provides a clear understanding of first-time freshmen and transfer student enrolment trends, student success, and labor market outcomes, in addition to detailed information about faculty expertise. During the visit with UPRS, Dr. Wandling responded to all aspects of external reviewer and Dean’s comments and provided a perspective on desirability and feasibility of several issues created by the environment of change and limited budgets at SSU, e.g., the serious burden on all lines of faculty due to conversion from 4 units to 3 units because of executive orders.

UPRS commends the department for the following:

1. A thorough review of the program and a realistic presentation of feasible paths into the future.
2. Providing an elaborate background on why and how assessment happens in the department and why it will not follow the general recommendations made to other departments.
3. Sincere and committed faculty who hold the flag high in the era of faculty attrition and limited tenure-track hiring.

UPRS recommends the following:

1. Focus on securing tenure-track hiring lines
2. Focus on increasing the diversity of students within the major
3. Focus on revising the curriculum and assessment methods with an eye toward closing equity gaps
4. Work out with the Dean and other relevant stakeholders suitable mechanisms to ensure that faculty are not overburdened, particularly because of the four- to three-unit conversion.

Action Plan / (MOU) English BA			
Rec	Action	Responsibility	Planned Completion (e.g. by mid-cycle)
1	Focus on revising the curriculum and pedagogy with an eye toward closing equity gaps; consider focusing on literature of the Americas	Faculty	2026/27
2	As resources become available to hire new faculty, consider a new hire in creative writing and/or composition and rhetoric.	Chair, Dean, & Provost	n/a
3	Consider highlighting affiliated faculty on the website to showcase the more robust and diverse faculty available to students and to acknowledge the contributions of faculty across the University.	Chair with Kate Sims	2025/26
4	Collaborate with the career center to build-up career advising	Chair & Career Center	2026/27
5	Department social media and communication plan (website, department and alumni newsletter, and career programming)	Chair & Faculty with Enrollment Management	ongoing
6	Focus on increasing the diversity of students within the major, e.g. through collaboration and cross-listing with CALS and other majors to offer Americanist Literature and attracting additional students.	Chairs of Engl, CALS, AMCS, etc. with support from the Deans	2026/27

Note: AVP Bosick, Dean Troi, & Chair Wandling discussed on 11/22/24. Final version emailed to all plus Provost on 11/22/24