



## ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT

Academic Program Department	Culture and Communication
Reporting for Academic Year	2021-2022
Department Chair	Colin Dewey
Date Submitted	2/15/2023

### **1. SELF-STUDY (about 1 page)**

#### **A. Five-year Review Planning Goals**

C&C is not following a comprehensive five-year plan. Beyond the survival of the department, our goals include continuing improvement in instruction and support of individual students, their programs, and the development of our faculty and the university. None of the areas in which we teach grants a Baccalaureate degree, although we contribute substantially to every degree granted by this institution. We house what would otherwise be called programs in Rhetoric and Composition (including speech), Modern Languages/LOTE, Fine Art, Philosophy, Literature, and Cultural Studies. Rather than *plan*, we *react* to ever-changing circumstances that we cannot control and that we can only tangentially influence. As a service department helping to meet the general education needs of degree-granting departments and programs, any planning we attempt is subject to decisions about curricula and schedules made in other places on our campus and at the system level. This situation persists despite our faculty's outsized presence as leaders in campus governance, scholars pursuing diverse and notable research, and dedicated teachers recognized by campus awards and consistently superior student testimony.

Recent in-house department assessment data in writing shows that fewer than 10% of all freshmen or juniors can independently produce writing that meets the department benchmark for satisfactory college-level competence. The benchmark is based on a nationally recognized rubric for Written Communication published by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (and is the same rubric used by IWAC). With freshmen we might expect a lower result since we use the same benchmark across the board, but the juniors and seniors in GWAR courses do not show that a measurable increase in ability is achieved during their program. Since grading is different than assessment, many elements besides a single writing assessment factor into a semester grade. Consequently, we find that many students will pass a course that emphasizes scaffolded and closely-supported revision but cannot independently reproduce those results on their own. Individual instructors in C&C as well as the department are under pressure to pass students, or to "not hold them up" for a lack of writing ability; indeed, it has been suggested to me both that our lower-division standards are too high and that our teaching is not effective enough to produce competent upper division writers (eg that our standards are simultaneously too high and too low). Since high-stakes tests such as a "do-

or-die” final exam timed writing exercise in EGL 100 or 300 have been discouraged or outright banned by the Chancellor’s Office, available actions are limited.

As a result of all this, I have concluded that the traditional composition of C&C may no longer be able to meet the most pressing needs of the campus. It may be time to consider radical change, including strong growth in Rhet-Comp style writing instruction by qualified faculty. By qualified faculty I mean those who have training in modern Composition and Rhetoric methods and have experience serving students who do not arrive prepared for what we have been accustomed to call “college-level writing” (and math, I suspect). I have previously suggested considering a development model whereby writing instruction is spun into a separate division of the department, under a WPA-qualified program director and staffed by qualified specialist faculty, if not a new department of its own. The remaining faculty specializing in arts and humanities would continue to provide GE Area C and some A instruction as well as, potentially, work with Social Science faculty to develop new degree programming. While CSUM retains its rigid traditional focus on vocational and technical instruction to the exclusion of fostering a complete and balanced intellectual life and wider degree opportunities, I have little expectation of new programs in any of the areas in which we excel. However, a shift in emphasis toward excellence in skills training could be part of a campus-wide commitment to fundamentally change how we serve students’ needs and may indeed be required to meet the newest CO mandates in supplemental instruction and retention/graduation rates. Supported students will be more successful, and more successful students will be retained and graduated ones.

## **B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress**

N/A

## **C. Program Changes and Needs**

For reasons articulated above and in previous reports, the status of C&C remains precarious. Declining campus enrollment overall and proportionally fewer traditional students (4-year freshmen) means that the percentage of basic writing (GE Area A2) students we teach has declined, while enrolment in Critical Thinking (A3) and Speech (A1) classes remains relatively strong. Humanities, especially C2, as a share in the GE-Breadth pattern for CSU students is under continuing pressure as we saw during the debates and resolutions produced on many campuses over AB928. New CSU measures to encourage students to complete lower-division GE in community colleges before transferring to a CSU campus will result in further cuts to our traditional students, although the licensed programs here will have difficulty attracting the guaranteed 2-year transfers that other programs might, so I believe we will have a reduced but continuing stream of freshmen completing GE here.

The idea that a service-only, GE-delivering department can continue to exist as an academic department in any normal sense, eg not solely in a student services or support function, is fading. CSU changes in enrollment policies around the use of SAT and ACT scores has apparently placed many more students in “Stretch” English composition than before, while more are arriving with AP credit allowing them to bypass A2 courses here. This credit is of questionable and inconsistent value, and we continue to see many students in the later courses who cannot perform the basic skills needed to succeed in college: some struggle through, while others drop out or are academically disqualified. Unfortunately, as presently constituted, C&C lacks the faculty numbers or specialized expertise to adequately serve students with these crucial needs. Furthermore, our overall faculty size is declining along with the number of WTUs we teach. As a result, and exacerbating this problem, the outsized

service and governance roles that many of our faculty provide has taken key people and their expertise away from addressing these programmatic (GE) and departmental needs, but with fewer students overall, there is little case to be made for hiring new TT personnel in C&C.

Remaining faculty are exhausted and demoralized. Further limiting our ability to meet these challenges is the lack of prestige or recognition given to either the problems or the people who might address them by the campus community overall. Improving “basic skills” outcomes and supporting challenged students lacks the “cachet” of some of the other activities on campus, and consequently, we lack the support to perform them as well as our students require. Assessment data in writing classes (see below) again demonstrates the crucial need but additional tutoring, staff, though helpful, cannot alone meet these challenges. Upcoming changes in IBL and GSMA threaten our enrollment in Languages other than English (LOTE). Both of our LOTE faculty resigned midyear and were temporarily replaced in December 2022, although that event will be dealt with in next year’s report. Changes to GWAR policy at the CO level place our Advanced Writing classes at risk, while, to date, only GSMA and OCN have made credit-bearing courses part of their curricula to certify GWAR for graduation.

For general education program assessment and recommendations, please see the GE Committee’s Program Report (2020): <https://www.csum.edu/student-success/media/general-education-program-review-2020.pdf>

Despite the precarity of our position as a department, individual faculty have been making significant contributions in many areas of teaching, service, and governance which we hope will bear fruit in the months and years ahead.

## **2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (about 1 page)**

### **A. Program Student Learning Outcomes**

See: “C&C Program Learning Outcomes” at:

<https://www.csum.edu/culture-and-communication/assessment-and-outcomes.html>

### **B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed**

1. Clearly express ideas in writing. (ILO A, GELO 1)

### **C. Summary of Assessment Process**

1. May 14 2021 Assessed EGL 100/300 (Spring 21)

2. May 17 2022 Assessed EGL 100 (Fall 21 /Spring 22)

On each of these occasions department faculty met and, following a norming session led by Dr. Sinha, read an equal number of papers, and scored each on a rubric based on the LEAP Written Communication rubric used by IWAC. The results were tabulated, and a summary follows.

### **D. Summary of Assessment Results**

#### **2021 EGL 100 (4 SECTIONS)**

Artifacts = 34

Met Benchmark = 4

% met benchmark = 12%

**2021 EGL 300 (4 SECTIONS)**

Artifacts = 41

Met Benchmark = 4

% met benchmark = 10%**2022 EGL 100 (5 SECTIONS)**

Artifacts = 39

Met Benchmark = 3

% met benchmark = 8%**3. STATISTICAL DATA**

Statistical data is meant to enhance and support program development decisions. These statistics will be attached to the Annual Report of the Program Unit. This statistical document will contain the same data as required for the five-year review including student demographics of majors, faculty and academic allocation, and course data.

<b>Program</b>	Fall 2020
<b>A. Students</b>	
1. Undergraduate	
2. Postbaccalaureate	
<b>B. Degrees Awarded</b>	
<b>C. Faculty</b>	
<b>Tenured/Track Headcount</b>	
1. Full-Time	6
2. Part-Time	
3a. Total Tenure Track	6
3b. % Tenure Track	60
<b>Lecturer Headcount</b>	
4. Full-Time	1
5. Part-Time	3
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	4
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	40
7. Grand Total All Faculty	10
<b>Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)</b>	
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	4.75
9. Lecturer FTEF	1.80
10. Total Instructional FTEF	6.55
<b>Lecturer Teaching</b>	
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	84.6
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	68
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	40.4
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	32
13. Total FTES taught	125
14. Total SCU taught	1875
<b>D. Student Faculty Ratios</b>	
1. Tenured/Track	17.8
2. Lecturer	22.4
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	19.1
4. Lower Division	17.7
5. Upper Division	21.4
<b>E. Section Size</b>	
1. Number of Sections (non-laboratory courses) Offered	28
2. Number of Labs Offered (if any)	0

3. Average Section Size	22.3
4. Average Section Size for LD	21.2
5. Average Section Size for UD	26.2
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	10
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	9
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	8
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	1