

ANNUAL REPORT

**STUDENT LEARNING
OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT**

ENGLISH (AY 2016-2017)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROGRAM OVERVIEW	3
ENGLISH ASSESSMENT	3
PROGRAM ASSESSMENT	3
COURSE ASSESSMENT	9
ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT WORK	16
WRITING CENTER.....	16
HIGH IMPACT PRACTICES.....	17
APPENDIX A: ASSESSMENT MEETING, FALL CONVOCATION.....	20
APPENDIX B: COMPOSITION REPORT, FALL CONVOCATION	21
APPENDIX C: CURRENT STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLOs).....	25
APPENDIX D: ACCELERATED COURSE REPORT.....	35

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The English program encompasses two main components: Composition, consisting of lower-division courses 092, 093, 110, 111, 211, and 212, and the upper division course 311; and the Bachelor of Arts in English, consisting of a core of required courses on the 200 level, and advanced courses on the 300 and 400 levels in Literature, Literature and the Environment, and Creative Writing. Assessments of student learning outcomes in each these components serve different goals and embrace separate criteria. The GER-oriented service component of Composition is not an element of the BA in English, though it is delivered by English faculty and adjuncts.

Below are the results of our assessment activities for AY 2016-17.

ENGLISH ASSESSMENT

The English faculty assesses our work in three primary categories:

- **Program Assessment:** B.A. in English with three emphasis areas (literature, creative writing, and literature and the environment)
- **Course Assessment:** composition, literature, creative writing, pilot programs
- **Additional Assessment:** writing center, high-impact practices

Over the course of the year, in our monthly meetings and especially during our convocation meeting time, we work through assessment for each of these categories.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

1. **Program Outcomes**
2. **Program Assessment Plan & Activities**
3. **Program Assessment Results & Analysis**

1. Program Outcomes

In Fall of 2016 the Curriculum Committee passed the program outcomes the English faculty wrote as we prepared our program report in 2015. They are as follows:

- Students will be introduced to a variety of theoretical approaches through which literature and literary craft may be analyzed.
- Students will learn the terminology specific to English literary studies, as well as critical reading skills and methodologies employed in the study of writing.
- Students will be able to demonstrate an ability to analyze literature and writing from critical, historical, gender, and multi-cultural perspectives.
- Students will acquire advanced skills in critical reading, research, writing, speaking, and problem solving.
- Students will acquire professional skills through a capstone experience, internship, or senior thesis.

We are now two years from that initial work, and recently voted to take a look at them again and revise them. Notably the creative writing faculty members would like to see a more inclusive language that reflects creative writing outcomes. We have started this conversation and plan to have revised outcomes ready for the fall curriculum deadline.

2. Program Assessment Plan & Activities

Last year we came up with a new assessment plan for our program, and this year (AY16-17) was our first year of implementation. Here is the current model for how we assess how our students are achieving those outcomes:

Our program assessment plan:

- In April of every year we will gather graduation data on the previous year's graduates including names, areas of emphasis, number of graduates, and their GPAs.
- All English B.A. graduates are required to take either the Humanities Capstone course or complete a thesis or internship. In each of these options student produce material that shows their progress as a student and the skills gained in the last four years of study. These writing projects should demonstrate mastery (or not) of the above outcomes. Faculty teaching the capstone course for the previous year as well as those mentoring thesis and internship students will be asked to collect a sampling of student work to be shared with the entire faculty.
- The English faculty will meet to review the outcomes, the data, and the sampling of materials. This meeting is meant to be a conversation about our observations, or evaluation of student work, and an assessment of whether or not students are meeting our outcomes. We anticipate also comparing our data to the previous years' data to see how the program is growing, progressing, or changing. A brief report will be produced by the English B.A. Coordinator summarizing findings in this meeting. We will use this conversation to make any adjustments to our courses, the summative projects, and/or the program itself.

3. Program Assessment Results & Analysis

The following is the data on the 2016 graduates

LastName	FirstName	City	DegcCode	MajrCode1	MajrCodeConc1	GradTerm	GPA
		Tenakee					
Meyer	Hannah	Springs	BA	ENGL	LITR	201601	3.61
Shearer	Mason	Juneau	BA	ENGL	CRTW	201601	2.84
Tripp	Stephanie	Juneau	BA	ENGL	LITR	201602	3.71
Wisner	Brittni	Palmer	BA	ENGL	LITR	201601	3.86

Graduated Students Survey Results

Each spring we contact the graduates of the following year and ask them 1) what their current employment is and 2) any strengths or weaknesses they see in the English program. Here are the answers we got back this year:

- Current Employment:
 - Brittni Weisner: Currently a volunteer with a Christian organization, volunteering for 11 months in 11 countries (currently in month 7). She has a specific role within the larger group of volunteers as a “Story Leader.” She writes blogs from the field for the advertising and media department of the organization to use, which includes producing (usually) weekly content and larger themed assignments as well.
 - Mason Shearer: M.A.T. program for secondary education. Currently student teaching at Floyd Dryden for 7th grade English.
- Strengths/Weaknesses:
 - Mason Shearer: The program has many connections and variations which makes it valuable. There are many branches for English majors to go. It fits the specific needs and interests of students.
 - Brittni Weisner: There are so many strengths of the English program! One major strength is that undergraduate students have the opportunity to research, produce, and defend a thesis! This process was so great, especially with one-on-one time with a professor. I learned a lot through the process and because I loved the thesis process, it made me consider doing a Master’s program in English, whereas before I had only ever considered the MAT program at UAS.

Another strength of the program, besides the obvious advantage of small class sizes at the upper division level, is the small faculty size, too. This meant, for me, that I could continue to be able to take classes from the same professors who I knew had similar interests as me. While a small faculty was also a weakness at times (struggling to find diverse classes), I think the professors’ interests were varied enough to let me explore different focuses in literature. Ultimately, I enjoyed being able to have the same professors multiple times.

Analysis of Senior Projects

Literature Thesis Projects

Student	Semester	Professor	Thesis Title
James Kelleher	Spring 2012	Neely	Pixels & Ethics: Contemporary Video Games as Procedural Allegory
Dominic Lodovici	Spring 2013	Neely	Martial Arts, Martial Institutions, and Ethical Responsibility: Existential Concerns in a Disciplined Society
Will Geiger	Spring 2014	Neely	In Order to Hear: An Examination of Language, Religion, and Economy for the Purpose of Tlingit Language Revitalization
Laura Tripp	Fall 2015	Neely	"And This is Her Voice": Women's Representation in Victorian Literature
Brittini Wisner	Spring 2016	Neely	The Cultural Logic of Monstrosity: Reading Monsters in Literature, Film, and Culture
J. David Miller	Spring 2016	Simpson	Space and Representation: Mediations of Culture in Postmodern Geography of Southeast Alaska
Chris Pierce	Fall 2016	Neely	Mythic Pellucidity: Demystifying the Heroic in <i>Beowulf</i> Old and New
Nate Block	Spring 2017	Simpson	In Progress
Daniel Piscoya	Spring 2017	Chordas	The Word Made Flesh: The Catholic Literary Imagination

ENGL 499 | Senior Thesis (Literature Emphasis)

Many students with a literature emphasis in English opt to write a senior thesis as their capstone experience. Typically, a senior thesis in literature is a researched critical essay that runs at least 50 pages long (15,000-20,000 words) and draws from a year of sustained research for a student working carefully with an academic mentor. The work involved in producing a thesis enables students to draw from their broad coursework while focusing their erudition on topics important to them. Once completed, the student must defend the thesis with a faculty panel that includes no less than three faculty members and may include additional outside readers as is typical of a thesis defense in graduate programs.

Value to Our Program: Students who opt to write theses are generally self-motivated, disciplined, and aspire to graduate study. The thesis, as a long-standing academic genre and tradition, offers dynamic value to our program. On the one hand, we recognize the value of mentorship in research and writing. Students who pass through a professor's erudition benefit from sustained pedagogical intimacy and attention. On the other hand, the professor is not unaffected by this work as the student brings new questions, critical perspective, and insight to the topic and literature.

Areas of Strength: Over the past five years, it is our consensus that the large majority of English majors who write a senior thesis as their capstone experience are already doing graduate-level work. Indeed, three of our seniors in the literature emphasis went directly into graduate programs upon successfully defending their theses while all but one of the remainder plan to enter graduate studies after taking a year to travel or attend to local projects and opportunities. We have no doubt about the quality, integrity, and value of all our senior theses produced in the past five years at UAS. More importantly, these theses develop their concerns through the aperture of social justice, attending to matters of historical violence, cultural study, and critical theory.

Areas of Improvement: The English faculty at UAS has identified two aspects of the senior thesis process that could use some improvement. (1) First, the best thesis projects begin in the Fall semester with an Independent Study (ENGL 497) under the supervision of the professor with whom the student writes the Senior Thesis (ENGL 499). Insisting, whenever possible, that students take ENGL 497 in the Fall and ENGL 499 in the Spring offers students and faculty the most efficient and sustained critical focus for getting the most out of the thesis capstone experience. (2) Second, English faculty want to do a better job of archiving these completed projects in our program and at the UAS Egan Library. We would like to develop a more formal process for “depositing” theses so that future students can consult them.

English faculty members who regularly mentor students through thesis writing find the work rewarding and inspiring. While not an option for everyone, students who opt for such opportunity produce relevant and contemporary research that helps them gain confidence, develop their self-discipline, and impact their community through sustained research and scholarly

Creative Writing Thesis Projects

The three creative writing faculty members (Emily Wall, Ernestine Hayes, Math Trafton) met to analyze the three creative writing thesis projects from the past year. The three thesis projects this year were all poetry. Below are their findings and recommendations:

Analysis

- We found that the artistic statements were not up to the caliber we expected. As one faculty member noted “they lacked meaningful self-reflection.”
- We were pleased that all three projects demonstrated an awareness of thematic development across the manuscript. This shows an awareness of what constitutes a “book” as opposed to a collection of poems.
- For two of the three students we felt their work demonstrated mastery of the techniques we study in our classes. We felt confident these students would be strong candidates for graduate school.
- All three faculty were unhappy with the inability to offer a letter grade for the process. We had student we “passed” but would have liked the option to assign a grade both as an incentive (he ignored his thesis advisor’s advice) and as a way to differentiate between truly strong thesis projects and those which merely passed.
- We found students were not as articulate as we hoped for in their defense. Some talked for 15 minutes and offered pretty specific analysis of their work; others seemed “lost” and rambled a bit.

- Although this wasn't reflected in these three projects, there has been inconsistency in the past in what is produced and what we expect for a thesis. Although we agree that projects will vary and that each student and professor needs to have freedom to allow for project flexibility, some consistency will be useful, as well as more articulated criteria helpful as we evaluate the student (esp. with letter grades).
- One of the three students had a fairly weak thesis. We recognize that once a student is defending/graduating it's difficult to fail him/her at that point. We had a conversation about allowing students to even begin a thesis project. As a faculty we agree that this option is not optimum for all students, and faculty shouldn't feel obligated to take on a student whose writing is not strong enough for a thesis. That student should be encouraged to take the internship option or join the capstone class.
- Finally, we noted that we often felt rushed in the 60-minute time slot we have been working with.

Recommendations

- We will create "Thesis Guidelines" document that outlines the following:
 - A "guideline" for the artistic statement that will include our expectations.
 - A "guideline" for what we expect in the verbal defense.
 - A "guideline" for our expectations about the book/chapbook itself (length, general parameters, etc.).

We will give this to students as they begin their projects. We also will attach this to the paperwork when students sign up, as a "syllabus" (one option) rather than a description of the individual projects. This should streamline the registration process as well.

- Explore through curriculum committee the option to create the grade option for thesis projects.
- Change the defense time slot to 90 minutes.

Internships

In reviewing the various internship projects we oversaw this year we noted there isn't a good way to assess the outcomes of internships. The work varies so widely and there often aren't "projects" or tangible documents we can assess. We agreed that at convocation Fall 2017 we'd put this on our assessment agenda and brainstorm a practical way to assess internship work.

COURSE ASSESSMENT

1. **Course Outcomes**
2. **Course Assessment Plan & Activities**
3. **Composition Course Assessment Results & Analysis**
4. **Pilot Programs**
5. **Additional Findings & Recommendations on Courses**

1. Course Outcomes

Please see Appendix C for the full list of SLOs for each English course. Several of these were revised this year, and we anticipate revising several of them again based on our assessment work from this past convocation (see below).

2. Course Assessment Plan & Activities

Two years ago, at the fall 2015 convocation, the faculty met and agreed to revise our assessment program. The Directors of Writing led a brainstorming session during convocation. Faculty members were then divided into working groups and worked for the next month to draft a new plan. Toward the end of September the whole group met again and created a working assessment plan. The goal was to begin implementation in the fall of 2016. At the fall 2016 convocation we followed our new plan. Here is our current assessment plan and activities.

- Each course we teach now has a revised set of student learning outcomes.
- The faculty will be divided into “working groups” to assess the courses assigned to each group. There is one group for each composition class, one group for the literature courses, and one group for the creative writing courses. These are regional groups with all three campuses participating.
- Each year at convocation the working groups will meet. This will happen on a two-year rotation: one year composition courses will be assessed, and the next year the literature and creative writing courses. We assessed composition courses in AY 16 and will assess the literature and creative writing courses in AY 17.
- When the faculty meet, they will bring and share a collection of student papers (with names removed). A range of papers will be shared—successful ones to problematic ones. Using the rubric the student work will be evaluated to see how it meets the student learning outcomes for each course. Faculty will also share syllabi and discuss methods for meeting those outcomes.
- During that meeting, notes will be taken and changes, ideas, problems, solutions, etc. will be discussed and noted. The working groups will be responsible for turning in a written report to the Directors of Writing. The Directors will collate the reports and distribute them to the entire English faculty, ensuring that all faculty, including adjuncts, have access to the data and decisions of the working groups.

- Working Groups:
 - Directors of Writing: Professors Landis and Wall
 - ENGL 092/110: Professors Landis (chair) and Hayes
 - ENGL 111: Professors Maier (chair), Trafton, Elliott, and Patton
 - ENGL 211: Professors Neely (chair), Wall, and Whalen
 - ENGL 212: Professors Enge (chair) and Wall
 - Literature Courses: Professors Maier (chair), Hayes, Landis, and Simpson
 - Creative Writing Courses: Professors Wall (chair), Trafton, and Hayes

3. Composition Course Assessment Results & Analysis

At convocation in fall 2016 we met as a regional faculty and implemented our plan. We met as a large group to review the new program outcomes and the SLOs for each course or course/area. The directors of composition gave the group leaders their charge (see Appendix A) and then we divided into the above groups. Each group's facilitator led the afternoon's session and then we met again as a large group to review results. Each group leader then summarized the group's findings and recommendations and the Directors of Writing compiled those into a report and circulated that among faculty (see Appendix B).

The summarized findings are as follows:

ENGL 110 Assessment Group Report

Group: Nina Chordas, Chair; Carrie Enge, Ernestine Hayes, Rod Landis

The ENGL 110 Assessment Group read through four sample papers and considered the existing SLOs for ENGL 110.

Issue: Of the 8 SLOs, only one, #6 ("Describe the writing process, from brainstorming to proofreading"), currently has no corresponding assignment that can be evaluated in the general ENGL 110 assessment process.

Recommendation: Require a paragraph addressing the writing process either in the Final Portfolio cover letter, or alternately in discussion of the student's "starred" essay in the Final Portfolio. Which approach to use would be left to the discretion of each individual instructor.

Issue: A couple of SLOs, as currently worded, either omit crucial components of student essays that we regularly assess in 110 portfolio reviews, or are subject to possible misinterpretation.

Recommendation: Reword #1 ("Write college-level essays of moderate length (3-4 pages)") to read, "Write college-level essays of moderate length (3-4 pages), containing a clear main point or message."

Recommendation: Reword #8 ("Demonstrate the process of analysis and the part it plays in determining a focus for certain types of writing") to read, "Attempt one piece of writing centered on analysis."

Issue: The importance of ENGL 110 apropos student retention was discussed, as well as the need to get more English faculty involved in the 110 portfolio assessment process.

Recommendation: Ernestine's suggestion that faculty teaching ENGL 111 participate in 110 assessment received strong support. The group also strongly encourages all English faculty to participate in these 110 portfolio readings.

- **Note:** The fall 2016 110 portfolio readings saw a significant increase in faculty involvement including those who regularly teach ENGL 111. In addition the faculty invited the new Writing Center Specialist to join the readings, which resulted in excellent conversations about student learning and use of the Writing Center.

Issue: Sometimes issues relating to pedagogy arise with specific 110 instructors, usually attributable to a misunderstanding of the goals of ENGL 110, and resulting in many of the instructor's students turning in non-passing or problematic portfolios.

Recommendation: Mentoring of novice ENGL 110 instructors, and early intervention when problems are first noticed, for all instructors. ENGL 110 assessment is a collaborative process. All instructors should be encouraged to make sure that every 110 assignment addresses one or more of the SLOs. Reading the student papers and discussing them informally reinforced general agreement on our assessments of the student writing involved. Multiple drafts and sample syllabi would also be helpful for future assessment exercises. ENGL 110 has long had a robust assessment process, and suggestions included here are meant to strengthen it even further.

Note: In Fall 16 we "hired" a new adjunct to teach ENGL 110. In her capacity as Co-Director of Writing Emily worked extensively with her to create a syllabus, reading list, and assignment design to ensure she understood this population and our expectations. Due to falling enrollment this new adjunct didn't teach the course, but we will continue this mentoring process for any adjunct who teaches in the future.

Special Note on ENGL 110

As a higher-level developmental course utilizing portfolio assessment, ENGL 110 has been singled out by previous Accreditation committees for its region-based portfolio evaluation system as well as its success rate. This course continues to be assessed via regional portfolio evaluation at midterm and final points in each semester.

This program has been in place for many decades and has worked well. One of the values of this assessment activity is that it brings together regional faculty to share assignments, discuss strategies, and assess how well our developing and high-need students are performing.

The 2016-2017 academic year has brought new challenges to this model. For the first time in over 20 years the faculty has not met regionally, due to travel restrictions and budget cuts. The Directors of Writing had a number of meetings to discuss the situation and adjust our model. This year the two campuses assessed portfolios separately. Ketchikan faculty got together to share papers and the Juneau faculty did the same. The fall meetings (mid-term and final) were successful on the Juneau campus; most of the full-time faculty participated and the dialogue was excellent. This year we also invited the new Writing Center specialist to be a part of the group and that facilitated an excellent dialogue about how the Writing Center can best be used to serve our students.

While we found this year's work productive, we would like to make note of the loss of regional dialogue. All faculty members missed the connection and conversations that happen on a regional level and we hope that funding will be restored in the future.

ENGL 111 Assessment Group Report

Group: Kevin Maier, Chair; Richard Simpson, Will Elliot, & Math Trafton

The ENGL 111 Assessment Group also read sample essays, and determined as did the ENGL 110 group, that the SLO's as they stand now are in need of revision--or at least not applicable to an assessment of essays without broader context of the larger class from which the essay emerged. Five of the ten existing outcomes --#1, #2, #6, #7, and #9—were used to evaluate the three essays, which were drawn from three separate classes as well as three separate instructors. Conversation ranged to the broader context of each assignment and in fact each student's individual situation—and the group consensus is that much of the writing process and in particular the evaluation of each essay is irreducible to a number or simple metric.

Each essay was evaluated based on the learning outcomes. At the conclusion of the discussions of each essay each group member assigned a letter grade based upon whether they were meeting the SLOs, and there was general agreement (within the range of a half letter grade in all three cases). In this process, the work group found it useful to return to the ENGL 092 and 110 SLOs to make sure the essays considered were already meeting these criteria for success. The sense of this work group is that English 111 offers a place for students to take risks in their writing, engaging with academic discourse in ways that both show mastery and move beyond standard five-paragraph essays, for example.

In accord with the ENGL 110 group, the recommendation of those assessing ENG 111 is that in future, at least one essay with drafts ought to be submitted, as well as course syllabi to compare. An additional perception is that this productive process invites and identifies an opportune moment to revise our SLOs; however, broader statewide alignment of SLOs will prohibit this continuous improvement of our program.

ENGL 211 Assessment Group Report

Group: Sol Neely, Chair; Emily Wall, Teague Whalen

The ENGL 211 Assessment Group, after reading through and discussing the sample papers, are in accord that students are completing the course having achieved the published student learning outcomes. There is general agreement that this new course assessment strategy is proving helpful and that as it continues to be refined and developed, English program assessment will increase in value.

One feature of ENGL 211 at UAS that stands out is the rich pedagogical diversity that faculty bring to teaching the course. This diversity brings innovation and a certain level of interdisciplinary breadth to our course delivery, but also allows us to discern a wide variety of intellectual and critical values unique to each faculty member. In terms of assessment, it is clear that different instructors emphasize certain learning outcomes over others, and one consequence of our assessment review is to find ways that we can bring our diverse perspectives into alignment while preserving academic freedom.

For example, SLO #2 states that students ought to complete the course with the ability to “identify and name the major literary elements and rhetorical strategies” of a text. Some faculty members focus their teaching on literary elements while others focus more on rhetorical strategies. This means that students from different ENGL 211 courses will adopt critical analysis terminology to different ends. By itself, this is not a problem, but those in the work group concur that better coordination in the future will guarantee that, at the very least, we stay apprised of each other’s developing critical and pedagogical perspectives. This is one way by which this new assessment approach is proving useful.

Another quality feature of ENGL 211 courses at UAS is the way that students are able to connect their personal concerns with philosophical and political questions. Despite varying pedagogical perspectives, the faculty holds this competency with high regard—which aligns with a number of ENGL 211 SLOs. Nevertheless, SLO assessment shows that some students have a more difficult time negotiating their “presence” in their writing, and faculty ought to address this difficulty with more attention in the future. The difficulty of negotiating presence in students’ writing is not unrelated to another aspect of ENGL 211 delivery singled out for improvement by this group, which is the need to help students better negotiate their research. There is too much “quote-quilting” in some students’ papers, while in other papers there is evidence that students are not using literary databases effectively.

Assessment reveals, however, that these are difficult dialectics for students to develop competency in since they are learning a great deal in ENGL 211—from introduction to basic literary elements to a critical discernment for rhetorical strategies, all of which are articulated through the demands of “original” analysis, self-examination, and the professional and intellectual expectations of research and documentation. It is no wonder that our faculty exhibit diverse pedagogical perspectives relating to ENGL 211 delivery, but new assessment approaches will enable a sustained dialogue on how this course can continue to improve.

This group’s opinion is, in accord with the other work groups, that this assessment exercise helps to discern the limitations of the SLO’s adopted last year. However, with GER alignment across the UA system taking hold, we expect these learning outcomes to be revised.

ENGL 212 Assessment Group Report

Group: Carrie Enge, Chair; Emily Wall

The English 212 assessment group reviewed three technical writing essays and arrived at the following conclusions:

1. **Revision of the current SLOs** is imperative; they are occasionally repetitive, vague and indeterminate.
2. Many students do not grasp certain **important technical writing factors** including heading hierarchy, concision, clear visuals, and the difference between the abstract and the introduction.
3. A **lack of continuity between the two technical writing classes** should be addressed.

4. Pilot Programs

Studio Pilot

Three years ago faculty instituted a new pilot program for students who test into ENGL 110 but are close to testing into ENGL 111. In this model “borderline” students are invited to move up to ENGL 111 and take a 1-credit “studio” course. This is a small class aimed at bringing students up to the 111 level. Professors Trafton and Mitchell have successfully used this model for the last year and the department is holding ongoing conversations about continuing this program beyond its pilot status.

Accelerated Pilot

In 2012 Professor Ernestine Hayes introduced a pilot program to offer students an entire year’s worth of English composition in a single semester (8 credits). This was initially a 3-year pilot program. After 3 years the department decided to continue with an accelerated course a year. Professor Hayes has successfully taught this class each fall since then. This year the Institutional Research Office produced a report on the success of this innovative program. The full results can be seen in Appendix D. The numbers show a good passing rate and a good retention rate.

Due to the success of the 092/110 accelerated class, the department decided to expand the program. In Spring 2017 we are running our first 110/111 accelerated class. Professors Hayes and Maier will be teaching that course.

5. Additional Findings & Recommendations on Courses

This was our first year using our new assessment model and we also spent time discussing the model itself and what worked/didn’t work. The following are our observations/recommendations for our work at convocation fall 2017:

Observations:

1. We found it fascinating to see our differences in teaching pedagogies. How do we make that a strength? We offer different theories, world views, etc. but especially from our varying disciplines, ethnic, and gender backgrounds. How do we balance that with the need for consistency?
2. We talked over some innovations (like the studio course, and the accelerated course) but would like to make more time/space for this conversation next year.
3. A lot of conversation revolved around the academic practice of removing the “I” from writing.
4. We also spent a great deal of time talking about what constituted “research” in student writing and how it should best be handled.
5. We found it difficult to fully assess outcomes based purely on reading a sample of student papers (some of the outcomes, for example, talk about class behavior or oral capability).

6. The real value of this assessment work is found in the *conversation* between faculty members. That can't be fully documented, but a lot of learning happened as we compared notes, debated teaching techniques, challenged each other's grading practices, etc. Because of the unique nature of our discipline, assessment has to be more than a "checklist." True assessment is in the conversation.
7. We also would like better retention data—for each instructor to know (if we can find a way to get this data) how their students fared in the next class.

Changes:

1. We "norm" ourselves by looking at SLOs but want to norm as well by comparing assignments and syllabi. In 2017 we will ask all faculty to bring a sampling of these to share.
2. Because we brought our own student papers sometimes discussion seemed "fragile" or "careful." We wondered if it would work better for us to examine papers not our own (i.e. those in the 111 group might examine 111 papers from those not in the group).
3. All student and faculty names should be removed from papers we are sampling.
4. Bring multiple drafts of a single paper so we can assess how feedback is working, how faculty offer feedback, and a related issue—how the writing center is assisting our students.
5. Bring SLOs for not only the group you are in, but for the class right before yours (i.e. if you are in the 211 group, read 111 SLOs as well).
6. As we norm and read, assign letter grades so we can compare grading levels and strategies.
7. We want to be able to revise our SLOs based on each year's conversation. They may not change after a while, but we noted a number of problems in the individual class SLOs once we began to assess the work. In revising the SLOs, we believe we can "close the loop" and create true assessment.
8. For the 110 portfolio reading we want to bring in 111 instructors. Since those faculty will have those students next, they are in an excellent position to determine if the student is ready for 111.
9. Directors of Writing should continue active mentoring of any part time faculty teaching composition (especially 110).

ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT WORK

WRITING CENTER

The English faculty are gratified to see a very successful year in the Writing Center. With the hiring of Allison Neeland, the new Writing Specialist, a number of positive changes have occurred with the result that the English faculty are coordinating and collaborating more directly with the Writing Center in a number of ways. In addition, it's become a useful assessment tool for our student progress. The Co-Director of Writing (Emily Wall) and the Writing Specialist (Allison Neeland) meet regularly to talk about initiatives and student learning. This collaboration has led to a series of initiatives aimed at meeting student needs and assessing our student writing and learning.

Initiatives that we've come up with this year, several of which we are already implementing:

- Detailed feedback to instructors from tutors on individual students and topics discussed during tutoring sessions.
- Formalizing the hiring process: providing a direct link between upper division English students and tutor need.
- Training Sessions coordination between Writing Specialist and Director of Writing: Specialist generates "most dealt with topics" list and faculty provide content training.
- Mini-Workshops: Faculty create topic list for mini-workshops students can take in person or online. Specialist creates content.
- Include Writing Specialist in the ENGL 110 Portfolio readings

HIGH IMPACT PRACTICES

The Association of American Colleges and Universities defines “high impact practices” as following:

The teaching and learning practices below have been widely tested and have been shown to be beneficial for college students from many backgrounds, especially historically underserved students, who often do not have equitable access to high-impact learning. These practices take many different forms, depending on learner characteristics and on institutional priorities and contexts.

- First-Year Experiences
- Common Intellectual Experiences
- Learning Communities
- Writing-Intensive Courses
- Collaborative Assignments and Projects
- Undergraduate Research
- Diversity/Global Learning
- Service Learning, Community-Based Learning
- Internships
- Capstone Courses and Projects

Of special note are several “high impact practices” imbedded in the B.A. in English program.

- **First-Year Experience:**

The English faculty are proud of the innovations we are making in serving underserved first year students and in creating “cohorts” to help with retention. The accelerated program we are currently working with aims to create collaborative learning and to provide a “learning community” of students who will continue together, course to course.

- **Writing-Intensive Courses:**

Every English course we offer is a “writing-intensive” course. While it may be common practice at other universities to forgo this in upper division courses (replaced with exams and one term paper) all of our upper division courses are writing-intensive. Our GER courses—including composition, survey, and creative writing—are also writing-intensive.

- **Collaborative Assignments and Projects**

Many English BA courses feature collaborative assignments and projects. Examples include ENGL 418 (Selected Topics: From Renaissance Utopia to the Evil Empire), for which students work collaboratively to create their own utopian societies, and ENGL 305 (Children’s Literature), which requires presentations, questions for class discussion, and class activities led by groups of students working together.

- **Undergraduate Research**

As a department we have had three successful URECA projects in the last four years. Two students were mentored by Professor Wall. One student attended a national writing conference and one is now traveling to Mexico to explore her Chicana background; she will finish her research by writing a chapbook of poems. One student was mentored by Professor Neely to help edit and produce a literary journal of the Flying University students.

- **Diversity/Global Learning**

In fall 2016, students in Richard Simpson's Documentary Theory and History course organized a research panel entitled "Through the Privileged Lens: A Critique of Regimes of Visuality" as part of the UAS Power and Privilege Symposium. Organizing this panel allowed students to exercise high-impact learning practices through collaboration across research interests, preparation of materials for a public audience of the academic and non-academic community one local issues of race and representation, as well as the development of professionalization experience through conference participation and protocols.

Our B.A. English program is also the first program on campus to change its requirements to reflect our commitment to studying "the cultures of Southeast Alaska" as stated in our university mission statement. Students are now allowed and encouraged to choose the study of Indigenous literatures to satisfy the pre-1800 requirement. The UAS English program is one of the first programs in the country to embrace this post-colonial approach to early literary studies.

- **Service Learning, Community-Based Learning**

Kevin Maier's English 303 Literature and Environment class includes an intensive weekend outing to a backcountry cabin, where student learning is enhanced by direct experience with the unique natural environment of Southeast Alaska.

In 2012 Professor Sol Neely started the Flying University, which takes UAS students into the Lemon Creek Correctional Center for mutual and collaborative study with incarcerated students. Additionally, the Flying University has developed into a transition program for students transitioning out of prison into the university. Because the Flying University seminars take up literature and philosophy, the UAS students who participate come from English, Philosophy, and Honors. Studying literature and philosophy within the prison provides students with unparalleled high-impact learning opportunities.

In Fall 2016, Prof. Neely taught Shakespeare inside the prison at the same time Perseverance Theatre produced *Othello*. Through outreach efforts, Prof. Neely was able to bring the two actors who played Desdemona and Othello inside the prison for dramatic readings and discussions with Flying University participants.

Most recently, Prof. Neely has incorporated a “Guest Faculty” component to the Flying University seminars, which brings UAS faculty (Professors Wall and Hayes) inside the prison to lead particular seminar discussions. Besides offering high-impact, interdisciplinary, community-based learning, this program provides students the opportunity to practice leadership and teaching skills. For example, this year Senior English student Maranda Clark (current editor of *Tidal Echoes*) is taking Flying University as Independent Study centered on the tasks of leading creative writing workshops inside the prison and producing a second volume of Flying University poetry.

Finally, many of the UAS students who participate in Flying University do community outreach efforts as well by participating in campus events, attending community dialogues for Juneau Reentry Coalition, and testifying before the state legislature on matters of recidivism, recovery, and reentry.

- **Internships, Capstone Projects, Thesis**

All of our B.A. English students are required to complete one of these three high-impact learning activities in their final year of the degree. This is the first year we have assessed our program outcomes by looking at a sampling from the thesis and capstone projects (see above).

Those who choose not to do a final project complete an internship. Students in the past have been placed at KTOO, *The Juneau Empire*, *The Capital City Weekly*, in classrooms around the district, and in other arts or education-related businesses. Each year three students choose to do their internship with Professor Emily Wall and work on the literary journal *Tidal Echoes*. *Tidal Echoes* is an excellent example of high-impact learning. Through interning with the journal, students go from beginning to understand how a literary journal is put together to fully editing it themselves.

We asked the 2017 Senior Editor, B.A. English/Creative Writing student Maranda Clark, to reflect on the “high impact” nature of this internship to her, and this was her response:

I want to be a writer, so being an editor of Tidal Echoes has given me hands-on learning about how to organize a manuscript. I never realized how important book order and structure is. I've learned how much thought goes into the structure of a manuscript.

APPENDIX A: ASSESSMENT MEETING, FALL CONVOCATION

ASSESSMENT English Department Meeting Convocation, Fall 2016

Group Task

1. Read through sample papers (take notes if helpful)
2. Review Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the course you are assessment
3. Answer the following:
 - a. Does this paper meet the SLOs? Why/why not? (Small narrative, notes, etc.)
 - b. Successes we want to highlight?
 - c. Problems we want to note?
 - d. Recommendations or ideas to explore in coming semester/year
4. Write up outline/notes for a 1-page report the chair will write and give to Emily/Rod

Assessment Small Groups

Composition (AY 2016-2017)

211

Sol (chair)
Emily
Teague
Karen

111

Kevin (chair)
Math
Will
Clare
Richard

110

Nina (chair)
Ernestine
Rod
Carrie

212

Carrie (chair)
Dawn
Emily

** Rod & Emily will take all draft memos from groups and create a comprehensive report

APPENDIX B: COMPOSITION REPORT, FALL CONVOCATION

This report was compiled by the Co-Directors of Writing after the Fall 2016 convocation and then disseminated to all English faculty.

Overview & History

During convocation in 2015, the English faculty designed a new assessment model for assessing all English courses and the B.A. in English. The plan was to begin implementation at Convocation 2016. This plan was agreed upon by all full time faculty on all three campuses; a number of long-term term and adjunct faculty were also part of the conversation.

At fall Convocation this year, Directors of Writing Wall and Landis convened four work groups comprised of regional English faculty to assess the suite of pre-college and introductory writing courses taught at UAS. English 110, 111, 211, and 212 were assessed this fall, as per the rotation initiated in the department's *Annual Report of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (AY 2015-16)*, published last spring.

The members of each course assessment work group submitted student papers written at the relevant course level during the previous year. These sample papers were evaluated and discussed in light of student learning outcomes for the relevant course passed by the UAS Curriculum Committee. Notes were taken by the chairs of each work group and brief reports submitted to the Directors of Writing afterward. What follows is a compendium of the work done that day.

ENGL 110 Assessment Group Report

Group: Nina Chordas, Chair; Carrie Enge, Ernestine Hayes, Rod Landis

The ENGL 110 Assessment Group read through four sample papers and considered the existing SLOs for ENGL 110.

Issue: Of the 8 SLOs, only one, #6 ("Describe the writing process, from brainstorming to proofreading"), currently has no corresponding assignment that can be evaluated in the general ENGL 110 assessment process.

Recommendation: Require a paragraph addressing the writing process either in the Final Portfolio cover letter, or alternately in discussion of the student's "starred" essay in the Final Portfolio. Which approach to use would be left to the discretion of each individual instructor.

Issue: A couple of SLOs, as currently worded, either omit crucial components of student essays that we regularly assess in 110 portfolio reviews, or are subject to possible misinterpretation.

Recommendation: Reword #1 ("Write college-level essays of moderate length (3-4 pages)") to read, "Write college-level essays of moderate length (3-4 pages), containing a clear main point or message."

Recommendation: Reword #8 ("Demonstrate the process of analysis and the part it plays in determining a focus for certain types of writing") to read, "Attempt one piece of writing centered on analysis."

Issue: The importance of ENGL 110 apropos student retention was discussed, as well as the need to get more English faculty involved in the 110 portfolio assessment process.

Recommendation: Ernestine's suggestion that faculty teaching ENGL 111 participate in 110 assessment received strong support. The group also strongly encourages all English faculty to participate in these 110 portfolio readings.

Issue: Sometimes issues relating to pedagogy arise with specific 110 instructors, usually attributable to a misunderstanding of the goals of ENGL 110, and resulting in many of the instructor's students turning in non-passing or problematic portfolios.

Recommendation: Mentoring of novice ENGL 110 instructors, and early intervention when problems are first noticed, for all instructors. ENGL 110 assessment is a collaborative process. All instructors should be encouraged to make sure that every 110 assignment addresses one or more of the SLOs. Reading the student papers and discussing them informally reinforced general agreement on our assessments of the student writing involved. Multiple drafts and sample syllabi would also be helpful for future assessment exercises. ENGL 110 has long had a robust assessment process, and suggestions included here are meant to strengthen it even further.

ENGL 111 Assessment Group Report

Group: Kevin Maier, Chair; Richard Simpson, Will Elliot, & Math Trafton

The ENGL 111 Assessment Group also read sample essays, and determined as did the ENGL 110 group that the SLO's as they stand now are in need of revision--or at least not applicable to an assessment of essays without broader context of the larger class from which the essay emerged. Five of the ten existing outcomes --#1, #2, #6, #7, and #9—were used to evaluate the three essays, which were drawn from three separate classes as well as three separate instructors. Conversation ranged to the broader context of each assignment and in fact each student's individual situation—and the group consensus is that much of the writing process and in particular the evaluation of each essay is irreducible to a number or simple metric.

Each essay was evaluated based on the learning outcomes. At the conclusion of the discussions of each essay each group member assigned a letter grade based upon whether they were meeting the SLOs, and there was general agreement (within the range of a half letter grade in all three cases). In this process, the work group found it useful to return to the ENGL 092 and 110 SLOs to make sure the essays considered were already meeting these criteria for success. The sense of this work group is that English 111 offers a place for students to take risks in their writing, engaging with academic discourse in ways that both show mastery and move beyond standard five-paragraph essays, for example.

In accord with the ENGL 110 group, the recommendation of those assessing ENG 111 is that in future, at least one essay with drafts ought to be submitted, as well as course syllabi to compare. An additional perception is that this productive process invites and identifies an opportune moment to revise our SLOs; however, broader state-wide alignment of SLOs will prohibit this continuous improvement of our program.

ENGL 211 Assessment Group Report

Group: Sol Neely, Chair; Emily Wall, Teague Whalen

The ENGL 211 Assessment Group, after reading through and discussing the sample papers, are in accord that students are completing the course having achieved the published student learning outcomes. There is general agreement that this new course assessment strategy is proving helpful and that as it continues to be refined and developed, English program assessment will increase in value.

One feature of ENGL 211 at UAS that stands out is the rich pedagogical diversity that faculty bring to teaching the course. This diversity brings innovation and a certain level of interdisciplinary breadth to our course delivery, but also allows us to discern a wide variety of intellectual and critical values unique to each faculty member. In terms of assessment, it is clear that different instructors emphasize certain learning outcomes over others, and one consequence of our assessment review is to find ways that we can bring our diverse perspectives into alignment while preserving academic freedom.

For example, SLO #2 states that students ought to complete the course with the ability to “identify and name the major literary elements and rhetorical strategies” of a text. Some faculty members focus their teaching on literary elements while others focus more on rhetorical strategies. This means that students from different ENGL 211 courses will adopt critical analysis terminology to different ends. By itself, this is not a problem, but those in the work group concur that better coordination in the future will guarantee that, at the very least, we stay apprised of each other’s developing critical and pedagogical perspectives. This is one way by which this new assessment approach is proving useful.

Another quality feature of ENGL 211 courses at UAS is the way that students are able to connect their personal concerns with philosophical and political questions. Despite varying pedagogical perspectives, the faculty hold this competency with high regard—which aligns with a number of ENGL 211 SLOs. Nevertheless, SLO assessment shows that some students have a more difficult time negotiating their “presence” in their writing, and faculty ought to address this difficulty with more attention in the future. The difficulty of negotiating presence in students’ writing is not unrelated to another aspect of ENGL 211 delivery singled out for improvement by this group, which is the need to help students better negotiate their research. There is too much “quote-quilting” in some students’ papers, while in other papers there is evidence that students are not using literary databases effectively.

Assessment reveals, however, that these are difficult dialectics for students to develop competency in since they are learning a great deal in ENGL 211—from introduction to basic literary elements to a critical discernment for rhetorical strategies, all of which are articulated through the demands of “original” analysis, self-examination, and the professional and intellectual expectations of research and documentation. It is no wonder that our faculty exhibit diverse pedagogical perspectives relating to ENGL 211 delivery, but new assessment approaches will enable a sustained dialogue on how this course can continue to improve.

This group’s opinion is, in accord with the other work groups, that this assessment exercise helps to discern the limitations of the SLO’s adopted last year. However, with GER alignment across the UA system taking hold, we expect these learning outcomes to be revised.

ENGL 212 Assessment Group Report

Group: Carrie Enge, Chair; Emily Wall

The English 212 assessment group reviewed three technical writing essays and arrived at the following conclusions:

CONCERNS:

6. **Revision of the current SLOs** is imperative; they are occasionally repetitive, vague and indeterminate.
7. Many students do not grasp certain **important technical writing factors** including heading hierarchy, concision, clear visuals, and the difference between the abstract and the introduction.
8. A **lack of continuity between the two technical writing classes** should be addressed.

ACTIONS:

1. **SLOs** - Because of the 212 assessment, instructors were able to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the Technical Writing SLOs. Enge is currently in the process of revising for a more effective learning tool that is concise, readily evaluated and useful for current and future 212 instructors.
2. **Technical Writing Factors** – This discussion was extremely helpful in clarifying which aspects of technical writing need to be addressed in future classes. The instructor is revising some instructional units to eliminate the weaknesses present in the current technical writing samples.
3. **Lack of Continuity** – This issue remains a concern. The benefits of evaluating course progress with a peer are unquestionable; however, this evaluation is both difficult, and less effective without the input of all instructors. The university is to be commended for its promotion of course evaluation, but this process is handicapped unless all participants – including adjuncts – are present to benefit from the discussion. Some means of involving all players is vital for effective evaluation.

Assessment Process/Model

The entire group met at the end to discuss recommendations and to analyze the process of assessment itself; this was our first year running this program and while we agree it is a process that can work well for us (and provide real value in the classroom) we came up with some recommendations to make the process more useful.

Successes

The faculty as a group agreed that this new assessment model is useful. Our primary goal was to use this as a way to foster collaboration and to strengthen our own teaching methods. Each group came away with good ideas, and more enthusiasm for teaching. In particular, the following successes were noted:

1. This model encourages an annual review of SLOs (at least for a few years) which will further refine those to meet what we want our students to achieve.
2. This model encourages the sharing of syllabi, assignments, and other methodologies
3. This model encourages mentoring as each group has both senior and junior faculty members
4. This model allows for frank pedagogical conversations that benefit our teaching

Recommendations

In our conversations and during our work, each group found itself making recommendations for how to make the process more efficient and useful for next year. We will make the following changes in the 2017 convocation meeting:

1. Each member of a working group will submit syllabi
2. The names of faculty will be removed from papers being analyzed
3. Make sure there are a *range* of papers (A, B, C)
4. At least one paper should have draft(s) attached

APPENDIX C: CURRENT STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLOs)

Following are the student learning outcomes for every English course offered. They were passed through the curriculum committee in the last year.

The WRTG designations are new, and are a result of the year-long Statewide Alignment assignment. Those new designations recently passed the curriculum committee.

After going through our first full assessment cycle, the faculty are in agreement that the SLOs will need to be revised. We plan to complete that work at the fall 2017 convocation and have those ready to submit to the curriculum committee by the fall deadline.

ENGL 092 Improving Writing Skills

WRTG 090 Writing and Reading Strategies

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Identify elements of sentence and paragraph construction and compose effective sentences and paragraphs.
2. Compose coherent and well-organized essays.
3. Present thoughtful and orderly responses to writings and dialogue.
4. Articulate reasonable assertions and listen to responses from others with a respectful attitude.
5. Apply competent computer skills when writing essays.
6. Demonstrate professional conduct in the classroom.

ENGL 110 Introduction to College Writing

WRTG 110 Introduction to College Writing

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Write college-level essays of moderate length (3-4 pages).
2. Write using a variety of organizational strategies, for example, description, narration, and persuasion.
3. Write cohesive, well-structured paragraphs.
4. Apply the basic rules of grammar and punctuation.
5. Perform edits to written work pertaining to organization, development, grammar, and punctuation.
6. Describe the writing process, from brainstorming to proofreading.
7. Use formatting and stylistic tools of the word processor in preparing essays.
8. Demonstrate the process of analysis and the part it plays in determining a focus for certain types of writing.

ENGL 111 Methods of Written Communication
WRTG 111 Writing Across Contexts

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Write an ethical persuasive essay.
2. Write a clear thesis statement and write supporting assertions with reasoning and evidence that will contribute to persuading an audience.
3. Write sequenced assignments that require revision, rethinking, and reflection at almost every turn.
4. Demonstrate communication skills in class discussions.
5. Apply critical reading to peers' work and engage peers in thoughtful discourse about writing.
6. Perform critical thinking through frequent reading and writing assignments.
7. Demonstrate knowledge, through communication, that the process of critical thinking is a social activity that involves exchanging ideas, listening to others, taking responsibility for views, and keeping an open mind about alternative approaches.
8. Apply competent computer skills when writing essays.
9. Apply research skills in hard copy and/or computer research areas.
10. Demonstrate professional conduct in the classroom.

ENGL 211 Intermediate Composition: Writing About Literature
WRTG 211 Writing and the Humanities

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Identify themes in a piece of literature.
2. Identify and name the major literary elements and rhetorical strategies.
3. Articulate original analysis on a piece of writing.
4. Read and analyze literature in multiple genres.
5. Use critical analysis terminology appropriately.
6. Contribute to class discussions of literary texts.
7. Write an original, persuasive claim about a piece of literature.
8. Write a clear, well-organized analysis essay.
9. Write analysis essays of varying lengths.
10. Write analysis essays using various theoretical approaches or organizational strategies.
11. Cite sources in MLA format.
12. Demonstrate competency in working with literary databases.
13. Use primary and secondary material to support original ideas.
14. Use secondary material ethically.

ENGL 212 Technical Writing
WRTG 212 Writing and the Professions

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Gather, interpret, and document information logically and ethically.
2. Analyze data for both content and reliability.
3. Cite data in either MLA or APA format.
4. Develop annotated citations.
5. Recognize and utilize basic premises of technical writing.
6. Write clear, concise, unbiased sentences.
7. Write short, coherent paragraphs.
8. Utilize logical organization.
9. Write using forecasting statements, transitions, bullets, numbers and headings.
10. Recognize and develop the formal elements of technical writing including abstracts, user manuals, research reports, memos, resumes and business letters.
11. Apply appropriate formats to the appropriate situation.
12. Synthesize data into coherent paragraphs and reports.
13. Analyze rhetorical situations including ethos, pathos, logos, tone and audience.
14. Develop content appropriate to specific rhetorical needs.
15. Design clear, persuasive documents.
16. Choose the appropriate format for presenting information.
17. Create tables, charts and graphs.
18. Balance visual and verbal elements in documents.
19. Apply technical design (headings, clumping, clear visuals) to Power Point or Prezi presentations and pamphlet.
20. Demonstrate professional conduct in the classroom.

ENGL 215 Introduction to Literary Study

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Demonstrate knowledge of literature in its aesthetic, political, and ethical dimensions through written and/or oral assignments.
2. Demonstrate knowledge of the history of literary criticism and theory from Plato through poststructuralism through written and/or oral assignments.
3. Critically analyze literature by evaluating primary texts, making personal responses, and reading works of contemporary critical theory.
4. Demonstrate knowledge of the history, responsibilities, and demands of seminar-style course work that will enrich their upper-level studies through written and/or oral assignments.
5. Demonstrate research competencies and information literacy by navigating online databases to search for both reviews and academic (peer-reviewed) journals.
6. Demonstrate proficiency in using MLA style guidelines and writing about literature according to professional conventions.

ENGL 218 Themes in Literature: Selected Topics

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the selected topic by identifying its key components and employing appropriate literary terminology in both seminar discussions and written work.
2. Analyze literary and cultural issues related to the topic from interdisciplinary and multicultural perspectives.
3. Synthesize primary and secondary texts about the topic as a basis for contextualizing original thinking and writing.
4. Apply diverse theoretical, rhetorical, or performative strategies for encountering the selected topic in comprehensive ways.
5. Conduct research-based scholarship on the selected literature according to professional practices such as those outlined by the MLA style guide or other media or genre forms.
6. Pursue subsequent concentration and further study in the same (or related) selected topic.

ENGL 223 Survey of British Literature I

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the broad stages of English literature from the 7th through the 18th centuries.
2. Identify and discuss characteristics of English literature throughout the time period in question.
3. Analyze works produced during the time period in question.
4. Discuss the ways various kinds of English literature reflect and possibly help shape the historical context in which they are produced throughout the time period in question.

ENGL 224 Survey of British Literature II

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Demonstrate knowledge of key texts of British Literature from Romanticism, the Victorian Era, Modernism, and Post-colonialism.
2. Demonstrate critical thinking by evaluating primary texts in their historical contexts with emphasis on how empire, slavery, and industry shaped cultural mores.
3. Critically analyze the problems and politics of canon formation.
4. Demonstrate knowledge of how Romanticism thoroughly saturated the discourse of modernity.
5. Demonstrate research competencies and information literacy by navigating online databases to search for both reviews and academic (peer-reviewed) journals.
6. Demonstrate style competencies including MLA style guidelines and writing about literature according to professional conventions.

ENGL 225 Survey of American Literature I

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Employ close reading skills.
2. Identify and discuss the development of American literature during the Colonial period, through the Revolutionary War, and into the new century, with emphasis upon Transcendentalism and its impact.
3. Make stylistic and thematic connections between texts.
4. Contextualize literature within the philosophical and cultural history of the United States, explaining how place, time, culture, race, gender, and class impact American literature.
5. Use terminology and critical approaches.
6. Perform a critical analysis of a topic or work, then present and defend analysis in writing, both formally & informally.
7. Explore ideas on given topics within large and small-group discussion settings, and share analysis and reasoning in class presentations.
8. Demonstrate understanding that the process of critical reading is a social activity that involves exchanging ideas, listening to others, taking responsibility for one's views, and keeping an open mind about alternative approaches.
9. Demonstrate professionalism through attendance, preparation, and participation for enhancing & ensuring college success. This includes turning work in on time, distinguishing between formal & informal writing strategies in response to assignments.

ENGL 226 Survey of American Literature II

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Employ close reading skills.
2. Identify and discuss the major eras of American literature including Romanticism, Transcendentalism, Regionalism, Realism, Modernism and Postmodernism.
3. Make stylistic and thematic connections between texts.
4. Contextualize literature within the philosophical and cultural history of the United States, explaining how place, time, culture, race, gender, and class impact American literature.
5. Use terminology and critical approaches.
6. Perform a critical analysis of a topic or work, then present and defend analysis in writing, both formally & informally.
7. Explore ideas on given topics within large and small-group discussion settings, and share analysis and reasoning in class presentations.
8. Demonstrate understanding that the process of critical reading is a social activity that involves exchanging ideas, listening to others, taking responsibility for one's views, and keeping an open mind about alternative approaches.
9. Demonstrate professionalism through attendance, preparation, and participation for enhancing & ensuring college success. This includes turning work in on time, distinguishing between formal & informal writing strategies in response to assignments.

ENGL 261 Introduction to Creative Writing

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Identify all the literary elements in a poem or story.
2. Identify works that are recognized as demonstrating literary quality.
3. Articulate what makes a compelling story or poem and why.
4. Apply techniques of creative writing and elements of craft to original written work and revise work to respond to critiques.
5. Create an initial draft of writing in multiple genres.
6. Explicate a published text as a method of learning technique.

ENGL S302 – Masterpieces of World Lit

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Demonstrate ability to discuss course texts in their thematic, historical, and regional contexts.
2. Perform literary analysis of course texts.
3. Identify and contextualize cultural elements of course texts in relation to the culture in which they are situated.
4. Discuss cultural elements of course texts in relation to students' home culture.

ENGL S303 – Literature and the Environment

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Effectively contextualize environmental literature within the appropriate aesthetic, philosophical, political, and cultural history.
2. Prepare formal and informal presentations about environmental history, literary history, and course texts and authors.
3. Analyze primary texts in formal and informal discussions and writing assignments.
4. Conduct interdisciplinary research-based scholarship on environmental literature according to professional practices such as those outlined by the MLA style guide or other media or genre forms.

ENGL S305 – Children's Literature

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Recognize characteristics of children's literature produced in various historical contexts.
2. Identify and discuss characteristics and didactic elements of literature aimed at various age groups, including picture books, fairy tales, beginning reader chapter books, classical children's literature, and young adult novels.
3. Discuss the effectiveness of the relationship between text and illustrations in children's books.
4. Evaluate literature written for children in terms of its suitability for target age group in social and developmental contexts.
5. Perform literary analysis of stories and books aimed at children.

ENGL S311 – The Art of the Essay

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Write about their understanding of their concept of the essay and how it has changed throughout the semester.
2. Define specific audiences for essays they read and write.
3. Identify ethos in essays and be able to articulate how ethos is changes in their own writing.
4. Write about their progress in developing personal voice through reading and writing essays.

ENGL S330 – Shakespeare

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Identify and describe distinct literary, cultural, and historical contexts that shaped Shakespeare's work.
2. Demonstrate a familiarity with textual conventions and the elements of performance required for rich interpretative encounters with Shakespeare's plays.
3. Display greater reading fluency of Elizabethan English through in-class dramatic readings and interpretation.
4. Write analytically about Shakespeare's work using MLA guidelines and thoughtful research on the varied interpretations and dramatizations of these works since the 16th century.
5. Demonstrate ability to translate Shakespeare's language into contemporary vernacular and cultural contexts.

ENGL S362 – Memoir Writing

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Identify and discuss literary elements characteristic of the memoir form.
2. Discuss published works of memoir and their place along the literary continuum of life writing.
3. Articulate the distinctions between memoir writing and other creative writing forms.
4. Discuss the creative writing process as it applies to the writing of memoir.
5. Practice and apply creative writing techniques and elements of craft to original writing.
6. Offer and receive critiques of original creative writing in the memoir form.
7. Revise original work on an advanced level in response to critiques.
8. Create a series of polished drafts of memoir writing.
9. Lead discussion of a published memoir.
10. Compare a published memoir to original memoir writing produced for this course.
11. Edit and revise in the creative writing process.

ENGL S363 – Nature Writing

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Identify and discuss the literary elements of nature writing.
2. Discuss published works of nature writing and their place along the literary history of writing about nature.
3. Discuss the creative writing process as it applies to writing about nature.
4. Practice and apply creative writing techniques and elements of craft to original writing.
5. Offer and receive critiques of original creative writing about nature.
6. Revise original work on an advanced level in response to critiques.
7. Create a series of polished drafts of writing about nature.
8. Lead discussion of a published work of nature writing.
9. Compare a published work of nature writing to original nature writing produced for this course.
10. Edit and revise in the creative writing process.

ENGL S365 – Literature of Alaska: Native and Non-Native

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Recognize and discuss the variety of Indigenous cultures of what is now Alaska.
2. Identify and discuss the historical, political, and literary contexts of Alaska Native oral and written traditions.
3. Evaluate the history and critical issues present in Alaska Native literature and discuss their cultural context.
4. Recognize the presence of characteristics of contemporary written Native American literature and their relation to oral tradition in the literatures of contemporary Alaska Native writers.
5. Identify and discuss how oral and written Alaska Native literatures are related to place.
6. Identify the historical and political background present in Alaska Native literatures.
7. Articulate and discuss the significance of tribal ownership of histories and stories and their relation to tribal identity.

ENGL S370 – Native American Literature

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Recognize and discuss the variety of Indigenous cultures of North America.
2. Identify and discuss the historical, political, and literary contexts of Native oral and written traditions.
3. Evaluate the history and critical issues present in Native American literature and discuss their cultural context.
4. Demonstrate ability to distinguish among various theories and interpretive strategies and their applicability to Native American literature.
5. Recognize characteristics of contemporary written Native American literature and their relation to oral tradition.

ENGL S418 – Advanced Themes in Literature: Selected Topics

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the selected topic by identifying its key components and employing appropriate literary terminology in both seminar discussions and written work.
2. Analyze literary and cultural issues related to the topic from interdisciplinary and multicultural perspectives.
3. Synthesize primary and secondary texts about the topic as a basis for contextualizing original thinking and writing.
4. Apply diverse theoretical, rhetorical, or performative strategies for encountering the selected topic in comprehensive ways.
5. Conduct research-based scholarship on the selected literature according to professional practices such as those outlined by the MLA style guide or other media or genre forms.
6. Pursue subsequent concentration and further study in the same (or related) selected topic.

ENGL S419 – Major Authors: Selected Topics

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Describe the significant historical, cultural, and aesthetic topics of concern related to the author(s) by analyzing appropriate primary and secondary sources.
2. Describe the development and current status of literary studies of the author(s) by employing discipline-specific terminology and key concepts.
3. Conduct research-based scholarship on the selected literary genre according to professional practices such as those outlined by the MLA style guide or other media or genre forms.

ENGL S420 – Genre Studies: Selected Topics

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Describe the significant historical, cultural, and aesthetic topics of concern related to the genre by analyzing appropriate primary and secondary sources.
2. Demonstrate knowledge of the major literary figures who shaped the genre.
3. Demonstrate familiarity with the concept and politics of genres conventions.
4. Describe the development and current status of literary studies of the genre by employing discipline-specific terminology and key concepts.
5. Conduct research-based scholarship on the selected literary genre according to professional practices such as those outlined by the MLA style guide or other media or genre forms.

ENGL S421 – Women and Literature

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Describe the significant historical, cultural, and aesthetic topics of concern related to literature written by and/or about women by analyzing primary and secondary sources.
2. Demonstrate knowledge of the major literary figures who shaped the subject.
3. Demonstrate familiarity with the concept of gender and politics of canon formation and periodization.
4. Describe the development and current status of literary gender studies by employing discipline-specific terminology and key concepts.
5. Conduct research-based scholarship on literature written by and/or about women according to professional practices such as those outlined by the MLA style guide or other media or genre forms.

ENGL S422 – Literary Periods: Selected Topics

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Describe the significant historical, cultural, and aesthetic topics of concern related to the literary period by analyzing primary and secondary sources appropriate to the period.
2. Demonstrate knowledge of the major literary figures who shaped the period.
3. Demonstrate familiarity with the concept and politics of canon formation and periodization.
4. Describe the development and current status of literary studies of the period by employing discipline-specific terminology and key concepts.
5. Conduct research-based scholarship on the selected literary period according to professional practices such as those outlined by the MLA style guide or other media or genre forms.

ENGL S423 – Ecocriticism

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Identify a variety of philosophies regarding what knowledge is produced and/or prohibited as a result of representations and productions of environment.
2. Explain historical differences and similarities in the production of environment.
3. Synthesize and communicate the interdisciplinary relationships of environment and economy.
4. Demonstrate critical thinking through discussion of the construction of the natural world and the way contemporary environments function.
5. Cultivate interdisciplinary methods for evaluating visual and material cultural artifacts.

ENGL S461 – Advanced Creative Writing: Selected Topics

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Identify and discuss literary elements in their more advanced forms.
2. Identify works that are recognized as demonstrating literary quality.
3. Articulate what makes a compelling story or poem and why.
4. Practice and apply techniques of creative writing and elements of craft to their original written work.
5. Constructively criticize and receive criticism on creative writing.
6. Revise their own work on an advanced level in response to critiques.
7. Create an initial draft of writing in multiple genres.
8. Explicate a published text as a method of learning technique.

ENGL S491 – Internship

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Show that he/she can successfully perform the required the tasks required for this specific internship.
2. Demonstrate professional behavior in working with employers or mentors.
3. Demonstrate success and independence in a working situation.
4. Demonstrate critical thinking skills in the project being undertaken.

ENGL S499 – English Thesis

Students successfully completing this course will be able to:

1. Produce a successful manuscript in the genre or discipline he/she is working in
2. Demonstrate professional behavior in working with faculty mentor
3. Demonstrate independent working skills.
4. Demonstrate critical thinking skills in the project being undertaken.
5. Successfully defend his/her work to an evaluation committee.

APPENDIX D: ACCELERATED COURSE REPORT

Accelerated English 092/110 for 201503 and 201603

The following summary table compares the cohorts for accelerated ENGL 092/110 and non-accelerated ENGL 092 in Fall 2015 (201503) and Fall 2016 (201603):

Accelerated (ENGL 092/110) vs. Non-accelerated (ENGL 092) Cohorts for Fall 2015 (201503) and Fall 2016 (201603)											
	Cohort	Completed	%	092 GPA	Registered Fall 2016	%	Average SCH	Registered Spring 2017	%	Average SCH	
201503 Accel. ENGL 092/110	8	5	63%	2.98	3	60%	14	2	67%	15	
201503 ENGL 092	35	24	69%	2.75	11	46%	8.5	4	36%	7.5	
201603 Accel. ENGL 092/110	12	10	83%	3.58				9	90%	12.9	
201603 ENGL 092	18	12	67%	2.16				10	83%	11.3	

In Fall 2016, the accelerated cohort completed ENGL 092/110 at a higher rate than the non-accelerated cohort completed ENGL 092 (83% vs. 67%).

Students in the accelerated cohorts have a higher average GPA in ENGL 092, register for subsequent semesters at higher rates, and take more credits than students in the non-accelerated cohorts.

The following summaries and tables provide more detailed information for each cohort, similar to what we have done in previous years.

1. Fall 2015 accelerated English 092/110 students who returned and successfully completed Fall 2016/are returning for Spring 2017
 - a. 8 students were part of the accelerated ENGL 092/110 cohort in Fall 2015.
 - b. 5/8 (63%) completed ENGL 092 and 110 in Fall 2015 (C- or above).
 - c. 3 of those 5 (60%) registered for a Fall 2016 course at UAS. The average student credit hours for those 3 students was 14 in Fall 2016.
 - d. 2 of those 3 (67%) registered for a Spring 2017 course at UAS. The average student credit hours for those 2 students is 15 in Spring 2017.
 - e. Of the 5 students who completed ENGL 092/110 in Fall 2015, 4 have completed ENGL 111. One of those 4 has also completed ENGL 211, and one has also completed ENGL 212.

Accelerated Cohort (ENGL 092/110 in 201503)					
	S092	S110	S111	S211	S212
Student 1	4.0	4.0	3.0		
Student 2	4.0	4.0	3.3	3.7	
Student 3	3.7	3.7	3.0		
Student 4	3.7	0.7			
Student 5	3.7	4.0	3.3		3.0
Student 6	2.7	3.7	W		
Student 7	2.0	0.0			
Student 8	0.0	W			
Cohort GPA	2.98	2.87	3.15	3.70	3.00

2. Fall 2015 non-accelerated English 092 students who returned and successfully completed Fall 2016/are returning for Spring 2017
 - a. 35 students were part of the non-accelerated ENGL 092 cohort in Fall 2015, taking 092 in Fall 2015.
 - b. 24/35 (69%) completed ENGL 092 in Fall 2015 (C- or above).
 - c. 11 of those 24 (46%) registered for a Fall 2016 course at UAS. The average student credit hours for those 11 students was 8.5 in Fall 2016.
 - d. 4 of those 11 (36%) registered for a Spring 2017 course at UAS. The average student credit hours for those 4 students is 7.5 in Spring 2017.
 - e. Of the 24 students who completed ENGL 092 in Fall 2015, 10 have completed ENGL 110 and 2 are enrolled in ENGL 110 in Spring 2017. 2 have completed ENGL 111, and one is enrolled in ENGL 111 in Spring 2017.

Non-Accelerated Cohort (All other ENGL 092 in 201503)					
	S092	S110	S111	S211	S212
Student 1	3.7				
Student 2	3.7	4.0	4.0		
Student 3	3.7				
Student 4	3.7	2.0			
Student 5	3.7				
Student 6	3.0			W	
Student 7	3.0	3.7	W		
Student 8	3.0		3.0		
Student 9	3.0	2.0			
Student 10	2.7	2.0			
Student 11	3.3	Enrolled 201701			
Student 12	3.3	3.3			
Student 13	3.3				
Student 14	3.3				
Student 15	3.3				
Student 16	3.3	1.3			
Student 17	2.0	1.3			
Student 18	2.0				
Student 19	2.0				
Student 20	1.7				
Student 21	1.7				
Student 22	1.7				
Student 23	2.3	W			
Student 24	2.3	1.0			
Student 25	0.0				
Student 26	W				
Student 27	W	Enrolled 201701	Enrolled 201701		
Student 28	W				
Student 29	W				
Student 30	W				
Student 31	W	2.0			
Student 32	W				
Student 33	W				
Student 34	W				
Student 35	W				
Cohort GPA	2.75	2.26	3.50		

3. Fall 2016 accelerated English 092/110 students who are returning for Spring 2017 classes
 - a. 12 students were part of the accelerated ENGL 092/110 cohort in Fall 2016.
 - b. 10/12 (83%) completed ENGL 092 and 110 in Fall 2016 (C- or above).

- c. 9 of those 10 (90%) registered for a Spring 2017 course at UAS. The average student credit hours for those 9 students is 12.9 in Spring 2017.
- d. Of the 10 students who completed ENGL 092/110 in Fall 2016, 7 are enrolled in ENGL 111 in Spring 2017.

Accelerated Cohort (ENGL 092/110 in 201603)				
	S092	S110	S111	S211 S212
Student 1	4.0	3.7	Enrolled 201701	
Student 2	4.0	4.0	Enrolled 201701	
Student 3	4.0	4.0	Enrolled 201701	
Student 4	4.0	4.0	Enrolled 201701	
Student 5	4.0	3.0	Enrolled 201701	
Student 6	4.0	2.0		
Student 7	4.0	4.0	Enrolled 201701	
Student 8	4.0	3.3		
Student 9	4.0	2.0	Enrolled 201701	
Student 10	4.0	2.0		
Student 11	2.0			
Student 12	1.0			
Cohort GPA	3.58	3.20		

4. Fall 2016 non-accelerated English 092 students who are returning for Spring 2017 classes
- 18 students were part of the non-accelerated ENGL 092 cohort in Fall 2016, taking 092 in Fall 2016.
 - 12/18 (67%) completed ENGL 092 successfully (C- or above).
 - 10 of those 12 (83%) registered for a Spring 2017 course at UAS. The average student credit hours for those 10 students is 11.3 in Spring 2017.
 - Of the 12 students who completed ENGL 092 in Fall 2016, 4 are enrolled in ENGL 110 in Spring 2017.

Non-Accelerated Cohort (All other ENGL 092 in 201603)				
	S092	S110	S111	S211 S212
Student 1	4.0	Enrolled 201701	Enrolled 201701	
Student 2	3.7	Enrolled 201701		
Student 3	3.7	Enrolled 201701		
Student 4	3.7	Enrolled 201701		
Student 5	2.7			
Student 6	3.3			
Student 7	2.0			
Student 8	1.7			
Student 9	1.7			
Student 10	2.3			
Student 11	2.3			
Student 12	2.3			
Student 13	1.0			
Student 14	1.0			
Student 15	1.3			
Student 16	0.0			
Student 17	0.0			
Student 18	W			
Cohort GPA	2.16			

Notes:

CRNs: 201503 accelerated S092/S110: [76703](#), [76706](#)

201603 accelerated S092/S110: [73059](#), [73061](#)

Semesters:

201503 = Fall Semester 2015

201601 = Spring Semester 2016

201602 = Summer Semester 2016

201603 = Fall Semester 2016

201701 = Spring Semester 2017