Weber State University
Annual Assessment of Evidence of Learning

Cover Page

Department/Program: Master of Arts in English
Academic Year of Report: 2016/17 (Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017)
Date Submitted: November 15, 2017
Report author: Mali Subbiah, Program Director

Contact Information:
     Phone: 801-626-6335
     Email: msubbiah@weber.edu

A. **Brief Introductory Statement:**
   Please review the Introductory Statement and contact information for your department or academic program displayed on the assessment site:
   http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.hXtml - if this information is current, please place an 'X' below. No further information is needed. We will indicate "Last Reviewed: [current date]" on the page.

   _X__ Information is current; no changes required.
   ___ Information is not current; updates below.

   Update:

B. Mission Statement

Please review the Mission Statement for your department or academic program displayed on the assessment site:
http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html - if it is current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as "Last Reviewed [current date]". No further information is needed.
If the information is not current, please provide an update:

_X__ Information is current; no changes required.
___ Information is not current; updates below.

Update:

C. Student Learning Outcomes

Please review the Student Learning Outcomes for your academic program displayed on the assessment site:
http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html - if they are current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as "Last Reviewed [current date]". No further information is needed.

If they are not current, please provide an update:

__X_ **Information is current; no changes required.**
___ **Information is not current; updates below.**

Updated Measurable Learning Outcomes

At the end of their study at WSU, students in this program will:
1) ...
2) ...
3) ...
4) ...
5) ...
6) etc.

D. **Curriculum**

Please review the Curriculum Grid for your department or academic program displayed on the assessment site:
http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html - if it is current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as "Last Reviewed: [current data]". No further information is needed.

If the curriculum grid is not current, please provide an update:

___ Information is current; no changes required.
_X__ Information is not current; updates below

Curriculum Map

Core Courses in Department/Program	Department/Program Learning Outcomes					
	LO 1	LO 2	LO 3	LO 4	LO 5	LO 6
	Gather, analyze, communicate effectively	Cultivate skills in careful reading, critical thinking, etc.	Theoretical approaches	Scholarly criticism	Key primary texts	Conventions and protocols
MENG 5000 Level Courses	X	X	X	X	X	X
MENG 6010 Intro to Grad Studies	X	X	X	X	X	X
MENG 6030 Theory/Criticism	Not offered					
MENG 6110 Writing for Teachers	X	X	X		X	X
MENG 6210 Teaching Lit in 2nd	X	X	X		X	X
MENG 6230 WRWP	Not offered					
MENG 6231 WRWP Advanced	Not offered	X			X	X
MENG 6240 Seminar American Lit	X	X	X	X	X	X
MENG 6250 Seminar British Lit	X	X	X	X	X	X
MENG 6260 Seminar in World Lit	X	X	X	X	X	X

Report due 11/15/2017

MENG 6280 TESOL Practicum	X	X	X	-	-	-
MENG 6310 Language/Ling Teach	Not offered	-	-	-	-	-
MENG 6320 World Languages	Not offered					
MENG 6330 Lit/Rhet Stylistics	Not offered					
MENG 6400 Multicult Persp YA Lit	Not offered	-	-	-	-	-
MENG 6410 Strategies/ ESL	X	X			X	X
MENG 6420 Phono & Syntax ESL	X	X			X	X
MENG 6450 ESL Assessment	X	X			X	X
MENG 6510 Eminent Writers	X	X	X	X	X	X
MENG 6520 Shakespeare	X	X			X	X
MENG 6610 Genre	X	X	X	X	X	X
MENG 6710 Variable Topics	X	X	X	X	X	X
MENG 6730 CW Forms and Crafts	X	X			X	X
MENG 6740 Creative Nonfiction Writing	X	X			X	X
MENG 6750 Fiction Writing	X	X			X	X
MENG 6760 Poetry Writing	X	X			X	X
MENG 6821 Teach Dev Read/Write	Not offered	-	-	-	-	-
MENG 6822 Teach College Writing	X	X		X		
MENG 6823 Teaching Practicum	X	X				
MENG 6830 Directed Readings	X	X	X	X	X	X
MENG 6920 Course/Workshops	Not offered					
MENG 6940 Masters Project	X	X	X	X	X	X
MENG 6960 Thesis	X	X	X	X	X	X
MENG 6960 Extension of Thesis/Project	X	X	X	X	X	X

The nature of the MENG curriculum does not lend itself to scaling across classes. In other words, because MENG does not have a fixed progression of courses, it would not be useful to identify Introduction, Application, or Mastery of concepts.

E. Assessment Plan
Please review the Assessment Plan for your department displayed on the assessment site: http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html - if the plan is current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as "Last Reviewed [current date]". No further information is needed.

The site should contain an up-to-date assessment plan with planning going out a *minimum of three years* beyond the current year. Please review the plan displayed for your department at the above site. The plan should include a list of courses from which data will be gathered and the schedule, as well as an overview of the assessment strategy the department is using (for example, portfolios, or a combination of Chi assessment data and student survey information, or industry certification exams, etc.).

Please be sure to include your planned assessment of any general education courses taught within your department. This information will be used to update the General Education Improvement and Assessment Committee's planning documentation.

2016-17: Beginning Fall 2016, the revised learning outcomes were used in all MENG courses. Working with the Steering Committee, the assessment rubric was revised in Spring 2017 from the previous years' criteria of "Strong," "Adequate," and "Inadequate" to two criteria: "Acceptable" and "Not Acceptable." The new threshold will be 80% Acceptable.

All students enrolled in the required MENG 6010 Introduction to Graduate Studies class are required to upload to Canvas a writing sample of 12-15 pages. This class is the only class required of all MENG students. These artifacts are randomly sampled and evaluated to determine if MENG 6010 is meeting all of the learning outcomes.

The 6000-level courses require a syllabus or contract. They were received and reviewed to ensure they included and incorporated the learning outcomes.

All 5000-level syllabi were reviewed (100%). All assignments in the syllabi are directly linked to program learning outcomes. The assessment

The Spring 2017 assessment results:
6010: Five LOs met in 2017 compared to 3 in 2016.
Portfolio: Three LOs met in 2017 compared to 5 in 2016.
5000: Three LOs met in 2017 compared to 0 in 2016.

Report due 11/15/2017

The assessment discussion held by the MENG Steering Committee on November 13, 2017 was very robust. The committee grappled with the following issues:

- Importance and need for critical theories in literary studies
- Gathering input from MENG faculty about their interpretation of Learning Outcomes, particularly LO 3, as students continue to underperform in meeting this outcome
- Analysis of how close faculty's understanding of LO 3 to one another, and if this analysis would provide some clues to the continuous under performance of students regarding this outcome

Here is the specific plan of action for next three years:
2017-18:
Share the assessment data results with MENG faculty, encouraging them to take measures, so students achieve threshold in LOs where they seem to lag. Use the revised rubric and emphasize norming, perhaps spend more time in norming session to reach agreement on the meaning of outcomes, particularly LO 3.

2018-19: Depending on the results of 2017-18, gather faculty input regarding their interpretation of LO 3 and other outcomes if the Steering deems necessary. Revise the LOs based on faculty input and revise the assessment rubric used in norming.

2019-20: Implement the revised LOs and use the revised rubric for next few cycles, and take appropriate measures to ensure the LOs align with course objectives and faculty consensus on the interpretation of the outcomes.

F. Report of assessment results for the most previous academic year:

There are a variety of ways in which departments can choose to show evidence of learning. This is one example. The critical pieces to include are 1) what learning outcome is being assessed, 2) what method of measurement was used, 3) what the threshold for 'acceptable performance' is for that measurement, 4) what the actual results of the assessment were, 5) how those findings are interpreted, and 6) what is the course of action to be taken based upon the interpretation.

6010 Introduction to Graduate Studies: As this is the only class required of all MENG students, 6010 is assessed each year. All students are required to submit their final paper in a Canvas repository. A random sample of artifacts was collected in April 2017.

Portfolio: Students not completing a thesis or master's project are required to submit three artifacts of their best writing. A random sample of artifacts was collected in April 2017.

5000-Level Courses: Based on feedback from the 2015-16 BOR Program Review, MENG is actively managing the 5000-level courses. The 5000-level courses are now designated in the catalog and banner with a "G." See attached Course Descriptions. This indicates that the courses are offered only as graduate courses. Beginning in Spring 2015, the 5000-level syllabi were requested for all classes. In Spring 2016, the courses were assessed with the previous learning outcomes. In Spring 2017, they were assessed with the revised learning outcomes.

MENG 5570G American Literature I, MENG 5580G American Literature II, MENG 5670G British Literature I and MENG 5680 British Literature II were created to align with changes in the undergraduate program. The 2017-18 catalog lists 24 5000-level courses. It is hoped that in the future all but these four new courses and MENG 5840G Methods and Practice in Tutoring Writers will be inactivated. Students register for 5000-level courses based on conditions of admission or in special circumstances. These changes allowed for individual assessment of 5000-level courses in Spring 2017

The Spring 2017 assessment results:
6010: Five LOs met in 2017 compared to 3 in 2016.
Portfolio: Three LOs met in 2017 compared to 5 in 2016.
5000: No LOs met in 2017 as in 2016.

Report due 11/15/2017

The assessment discussion held by the MENG Steering Committee on November 13, 2017 was very robust. The committee grappled with the following issues:

- Importance and need for critical theories in literary studies
- Gathering input from MENG faculty about their interpretation of Learning Outcomes, particularly LO 3, as students continue to underperform in meeting this outcome
- Analysis of how close faculty's understanding of LO 3 to one another, and if this analysis would provide some clues to the continuous under performance of students regarding this outcome

a. Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major

Evidence of Learning: 6010 Intro to Grad Studies					
Measurable Learning Outcome Students will…	Method of Measurement Direct Measures	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Learning Outcome 1: Gather, analyze, and communicate information and insights creatively and critically.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 12/12 Acceptable 100%	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 2: Cultivate skills in close reading, critical thinking, creative expression, and persuasive writing.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 12/12 Acceptable 100%	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 3: Understand and apply various theoretical perspectives and discipline-specific terminology to interpretations of texts and/or analysis of data.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 8/12 Acceptable 67% 3/12 Not acceptable 25% 1/12 Not applicable 8%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 4: Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key text(s) in specific genres, periods, cultures, styles or theoretical perspectives.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 12/12 Acceptable 100%	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 5 : Demonstrate knowledge of current scholarship and practices.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 12/12 Acceptable 100%	Measure 1: Met threshold	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 6 : Employ discipline-specific conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 11/12 Acceptable 92% 1/12 Not acceptable 8%	Measure 1: Met threshold	Measure 1: No action at this time.

Note:
Five LOs met threshold compared to 3 in 2016. Whereas we have seen improvement in meeting the threshold in all other outcomes, LO 3 continues to elude attainment. We will share the assessment data results with MENG faculty, encouraging them to take measures, so students achieve threshold in LO 3. We will also use the revised rubric and emphasize norming, perhaps spend more time in norming session to reach agreement on the meaning of LO 3.

Evidence of Learning: Portfolio					
Measurable Learning Outcome Students will…	Method of Measurement Direct Measures	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Learning Outcome 1: Gather, analyze, and communicate information and insights creatively and critically.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 11/12 Acceptable 92% 1/12 Not acceptable 8%	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 2: Cultivate skills in close reading, critical thinking, creative expression, and persuasive writing.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 10/12 Acceptable 83% 2/12 Not acceptable 17%	Measure 1: Threshold is met.	Measure 1: No action at this time.
Learning Outcome 3: Understand and apply various theoretical perspectives and discipline-specific terminology to interpretations of texts and/or analysis of data.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 5/12 Acceptable 42% 7/12 Not acceptable 58%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 4: Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key text(s) in specific genres, periods, cultures, styles or theoretical perspectives.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 8/12 Acceptable 67% 4/12 Not acceptable 33%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 5 : Demonstrate knowledge of current scholarship and practices.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 8/12 Acceptable 67% 4/12 Not acceptable 33%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 6 : Employ discipline-specific conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 10/12 Acceptable 83% 2/12 Not acceptable 17%	Measure 1: Met threshold	Measure 1: No action at this time.

Report due 11/15/2017

<u>Note:</u>
Three LOs met in 2017 compared to 5 in 2016. We will share the assessment data results with MENG faculty, encouraging them to take measures, so students achieve threshold in all LOs 3. We will also use the revised rubric and emphasize norming, perhaps spend more time in norming session to reach agreement on the meaning of all LOs.

Report due 11/15/2017

Evidence of Learning: 5000-Level Courses					
Measurable Learning Outcome Students will…	Method of Measurement Direct Measures	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Learning Outcome 1: Gather, analyze, and communicate information and insights creatively and critically.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 10/13 Acceptable 77% 3/13 Not acceptable 23%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 2: Cultivate skills in close reading, critical thinking, creative expression, and persuasive writing.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 10/13 Acceptable 77% 3/13 Not acceptable 23%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 3: Understand and apply various theoretical perspectives and discipline-specific terminology to interpretations of texts and/or analysis of data.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 6/13 Acceptable 46% 7/13 Not acceptable 54%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 4: Acknowledge and articulate the significance of key text(s) in specific genres, periods, cultures, styles or theoretical perspectives.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 9/13 Acceptable 77% 4/13 Not acceptable 23%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 5 : Demonstrate knowledge of current scholarship and practices.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 6/13 Acceptable 46% 6/13 Not acceptable 46% 1/13 Not applicable 8%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.
Learning Outcome 6 : Employ discipline-specific conventions and protocols for written or multimodal presentations.	Measure 1: Final Paper	Measure 1: 80% Acceptable	Measure 1: 6/13 Acceptable 46% 7/13 Not acceptable 54%	Measure 1: Threshold is not met.	Measure 1: See note below at the bottom of this table.

<u>Note:</u>
None of the outcomes were met in 2017 as in 2016. This year is the second time we assess 5000-level courses. We will share the data with faculty who teach 5000 level courses and encourage them to address this issue with the MENG students, and emphasize to the faculty the need for close attention to, and mentoring of, these students.

b.   Evidence of Learning: High Impact Practices (HIPs)

List the activities you have within your academic program that you consider to be high impact. For key elements of high impact practices, see: Key Elements of High-Impact Practices.

If you cannot identify any HIPs occurring within your academic program, please indicate that. Are you planning to incorporate HIPs in the near future?

1. Significant investment of time and effort by students over an extended period of time: Because ours is a master's program, students know from the time they are admitted to the program the time commitment needed to do well in the program. Our student evaluations and exit interview with the program director indicate that our students invest a lot of time in successfully completing the program.

2. Interaction with faculty and peers about substantive matters: Our class sizes are capped at 15, and average enrollment is 8 students per class. This small size enables exceptional interaction between faculty and peers. At the master's level, students are expected to construct knowledge along with the faculty and fellow students, which results in meaningful relationship. Quite a few students choose to do Directed Readings and Thesis which gives the opportunity to faculty to mentor students.

3. Inclusive experiences: Many of our students self-identify themselves as multiracial, and they come with varied professional experience; these factors result in a rich exchange of ideas and opportunities for better understanding issues from others' perspectives.

4. Feedback: Exit interview and student evaluations indicate students' satisfaction with the quality and timely feedback on their works.

5. Personal Reflection: Many courses assign students to do professional journals, reading response journals, etc. which lead to reflection of learning and its significance to their lives.

6. Practical application: The teaching assistantship, research assistantship, publication assistantship, and internships we offer to qualified students provide excellent real-world opportunities for our students in applying what they learn in the classrooms.

7. Publications, professional conference presentations, public readings, and community outreach activities enable students to take their leaning to the public.

Report due 11/15/2017

NOT Applicable to MENG

    a. Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses
        (Area-specific EOL grids can be found at http://weber.edu/oie/Complete_Rubrics.html; they can replace this page.)

Evidence of Learning: General Education Area [fill in]					
Measurable Learning Outcome Students will…	Method of Measurement	Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Learning Outcome 1:	Measure 1	Measure 1	Measure 1:	Measure 1:	Measure 1:
	Measure 2:	Measure 2:	Measure 2:	Measure 2:	Measure 2:
Learning Outcome 2:	Measure 1:	Measure 1:	Measure 1:	Measure 1:	Measure 1:
	Measure 2:	Measure 2:	Measure 2:	Measure 2:	Measure 2:
Learning Outcome 3:	Measure 1:	Measure 1:	Measure 1:	Measure 1:	Measure 1:
	Measure 2:	Measure 2:	Measure 2:	Measure 2:	Measure 2:

*At least one measure per objective must be a direct measure; indirect measures may be used to supplement direct measure(s).

Report due 11/15/2017

Additional narrative (optional – use as much space as needed):

Report due 11/15/2017

G. **Summary of Artifact Collection Procedure**

Artifact	When/How Collected?	Where Stored?
(i.e. Final Project Rubric) Final paper of 6010 is required for submission. Any three other papers written in other 6000 level courses (portfolio). If 5000 leveling course is taken, final paper for the course.	(i.e. end of semester) 6010 is typically submitted at the end of semester. 5000 is also submitted at the end of semester. Portfolio is before students graduate.	(i.e. electronic copies) Students upload in Canvas.
(i.e. Chi Tester Outcome Report)	(i.e. 2-3 times per semester)	(i.e. electronic format, chi tester warehouse)

Summary Information (as needed)

Report due 11/15/2017

Appendix A

Most departments or programs receive a number of recommendations from their Five-Year Program Review processes. This page provides a means of updating progress towards the recommendations the department/program is acting upon.

Date of Program Review: ####	Recommendation	Progress Description
Recommendation 1	Text of recommendation	#### +1 progress
		#### +2 progress
		#### +3 progress
		#### +4 progress
Recommendation 2	Text of recommendation	#### +1 progress
		#### +2 progress
		#### +3 progress
		#### +4 progress
Recommendation 3	Text of recommendation	#### +1 progress
		#### +2 progress
		#### +3 progress
		#### +4 progress
(add as needed)		

Additional narrative:

Based on feedback from the 2015-16 BOR Program Review, MENG is actively managing the 5000-level courses. The 5000-level courses are now designated in the catalog and banner with a "G." See attached Course Descriptions. This indicates that the courses are offered only as graduate courses. Beginning in Spring 2015, the 5000-level syllabi were requested for all classes. In Spring 2016, the courses were assessed with the previous learning outcomes. In Spring 2017, they were assessed with the revised learning outcomes.

MENG 5570G American Literature I, MENG 5580G American Literature II, MENG 5670G British Literature I and MENG 5680 British Literature II were created to align with changes in the undergraduate program. The 2017-18 catalog lists 24 5000-level courses. It is hoped that in the future all but these four new courses and MENG 5840G Methods and Practice in Tutoring Writers will be inactivated. Students register for 5000-level courses based on conditions of admission or in special circumstances. These changes allowed for individual assessment of 5000-level courses in Spring 2017.

21
Report due 11/15/2017

Appendix B

Please provide the following information about the full-time and adjunct faculty contracted by your department during the last academic year (summer through spring). Gathering this information each year will help with the headcount reporting that must be done for the final Five Year Program Review document that is shared with the State Board of Regents.

Faculty 2016-17	
Headcount	23
With Doctoral Degrees (Including MFA and other terminal degrees, as specified by the institution)	22
Full-time Tenured	17
Full-time Non-Tenured (includes tenure-track)	
Part-time and adjunct	5
With Master's Degrees	1
Full-time Tenured	
Full-time Non-Tenured	
Part-time and adjunct	1
With Bachelor's Degrees	
Full-time Tenured	
Full-time Non-tenured	
Part-time and adjunct	
Other	
Full-time Tenured	
Full-time Non-tenured	
Part-time	
Total Headcount Faculty	23
Full-time Tenured	17
Full-time Non-tenured	0
Part-time	6

Report due 11/15/2017

Please respond to the following questions.

1) Based on your program's assessment findings, what subsequent action will your program take?

    2017-18:
    Share the assessment data with MENG faculty, encouraging them to take measures, so students achieve threshold in LOs where they seem to lag. Use the revised rubric and emphasize norming, perhaps spend more time in norming session to reach agreement on the meaning of outcomes, particularly LO 3.

    2018-19:
    Depending on the results of 2017-18, gather faculty input regarding their interpretation of LO 3 and other outcomes if the Steering deems necessary. Revise the LOs based on faculty input and revise the assessment rubric used in norming.

    2019-20: Implement the revised LOs and use the revised rubric for next few cycles, and take appropriate measures to ensure the LOs align with course objectives and faculty consensus on the interpretation of the outcomes.

2) We are interested in better understanding how departments/programs assess their graduating seniors or graduate students. Please provide a short narrative describing the practices/curriculum in place for your department/program. Please include both direct and indirect measures employed. Finally, what were your findings from this past year's graduates?

    At regular intervals, we conduct surveys with our existing students to assess their interest in new areas of study, mode of instruction delivery, preference among the three Weber campuses, and other issues. The survey results helps to make changes accommodating the needs of students.

At the end of each semester, the Steering Committee reviews syllabi for all our courses to ensure leaning outcomes are incorporated, and rigorous and consistent expectations regarding reading and writing are included across all courses.
Course evaluations are done at the end of each semester.

Exit interviews are done with the graduating students every semester.

The last exit interview of graduating students with the program director was done Spring 2017. Questions regarding the strength and weakness of the program revealed highest satisfaction among the students in terms of variety of course offerings, quality of learning, and faculty excellence.

All these initiatives continue to drive improvement initiatives at the individual class and program level

Report due 11/15/2017