

LJML SELF STUDY REPORT 2013-14

INTRODUCTION

Introduction of the LJML Self Study

Brief Summary of Recent Assessment Work (2010-): The Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages department over the past two and a half years has worked strategically to create a department mission statement, department learning outcomes, program learning outcomes (for our eight programs), and course learning outcomes for every course (90 courses) we offer in these eight programs. We have aligned our student learning outcomes, from course to program to department learning outcomes, with the university's institutional learning outcomes. Further, we have designed our learning outcomes to include all levels of Bloom's Taxonomy.

We have created and refined differentiated curriculum maps to show the alignment of program learning outcomes with each program's requirements.

We continue to develop and refine our assessment plans to assess each learning outcome in our programs and to assess the WASC Core Competencies. We have implemented new and continued using existing direct means of assessment (i.e. ETS Field Tests, ACTFL Exit Interviews, and internship on-site evaluations). We have revised our primary indirect means of assessment—alumni surveys—to align those surveys more explicitly with our department and program learning outcomes.

We continue to design and refine key assignments to align with and assess each program learning outcome and to implement and calibrate rubrics and assessment routines for those key assignments in our capstone courses or culminating experiences. We have also identified which of our programs need a capstone course.

As a result of our ongoing assessment work, we have identified some strengths and weaknesses in our program curricula. We are developing APC proposals to correct curricular weaknesses, and to meet the current and future needs of our students within the university's capped environment and current fiscal reality of prioritization. Many of the proposed changes have been mandated by the Prioritization Memo of April 2014.

Please see the LJML Assessment Wheel and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee's report on our Assessment Wheel—Appendix A.

Name of Academic Unit, Program(s), and Center(s)

Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages is the name of our academic unit. We exist within the College of Arts and Sciences and are comprised of four sections: Literature, Journalism, Modern Languages, and Writing. In these four sections we house eight majors (one of which we share with the Communication and Theatre Department) and nine minors (three of which are interdisciplinary):

MAJORS:

1. Broadcast Journalism (BR JRN) (42-43units)

The Prioritization Memo from the Provost calls on LJML to work with the COM-TRE Department in the redesign of this major.

2. Journalism (JRN) (53 units)
3. Literature (LIT-LIT) (54 units)
4. Literature: English-Education (LIT-EE) (53 units)
5. French (FRE) (41-44 units)
6. Romance Languages (ROML) (58 units)

The Prioritization Memo from the Provost calls for the elimination of this major program.

7. Spanish (SPA) (45 units)
8. Writing (WRI) (50-51 units)

MINORS:

1. American Literature (21 units: 0 GE units incl.)
2. British Literature (21 units: 0 GE units incl.)
3. World Literature (21 units: 6 GE units incl.)
4. Writing (17 units: 0 GE units incl.)
5. French (26 units: 8 GE units incl.)
6. Spanish (26 units: 8 GE units incl.)
7. Cinema Studies (*interdisciplinary*) (17-20 units: 2 GE units incl.)
8. Women's Studies (*interdisciplinary*) (17 units: 4 GE units incl.)
9. Public Relations (*interdisciplinary*) (18 units: 0 GE units incl.)

We do not currently house or operate any Centers though we often contribute department assistant hours to organize, arrange, and support events of the Women's Studies Center and the Wesleyan Center.

Program Overview

PROGRAMS: Each major program offers the Bachelor of Arts degree. All three Language majors require study abroad as a degree requirement. Journalism and Writing majors require a minimum of one internship as a degree requirement.

FACULTY (2014-15): Sixteen full-time and six permanent part-time faculty currently comprise the department. Of the full-time faculty 5 are women and 11 are men. Of the permanent part-time faculty, 5 are women and 1 is a man. The number of adjunct faculty serving the department varies semester by semester. Racial and ethnic demographics: Of the full-time faculty, 1 is Latina; 15 are Caucasian. Of the permanent part-time faculty, 2 are Latino/a and 4 are Caucasian.

Please see full time and part time faculty vitas—Appendix B.

Summary of Recommendations from Previous Program Review

The most recent LJML Program Review was completed in 2004. As such it pre-dates the established 2008 cutoff date as the last reference point for previous Program Review recommendations. Further, it did not conform to the current WASC or Program Review schema and thus will not be referenced in any formal way in this Self-Study Report. It did, however, inform the decisions to restructure the Literature and English Education Programs, develop the Writing Program as a distinct program from the Journalism Program, and develop the French Program.

History, Development, and Expectations of the Programs

LITERATURE PROGRAM

The Literature Program has been a part of PLNU since the early history of the university as Pasadena College and has played a central role in the General Education curriculum of PLNU. The Literature Program has been variously housed in the Department of Literature, a part of the Division of Letters, and then in the Department of Literature and Modern Languages when the department moved out of a division structure. The Literature Program added a concentration in Journalism in 1983, and the department was renamed the Department of Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages.

The core of the Literature Program has been its courses in American and British literature, but courses in World literature have been added at various points along its history. American, British, and World Literature courses served the General Education curriculum until 2004 when the department and GE committee recommended the removal of the American and British Literature lower-division survey courses from the GE curriculum.

Linguistics courses have also been added to the Literature Program across its history in order to meet California State Standards for teacher preparation. Although our Literature Program is not currently written to meet teacher-education state standards, we have retained our linguistics courses because of their importance in preparing our Literature English-Education majors for acceptance into credential programs and for employment as teachers.

In the 1990s and early 2000s, the Literature Program added a capstone course in literary theory and scholarship, diversity literature courses—such as Women Writers and American Ethnic (now African American) Literature, Post-Colonial Literature, and Non-Western Literature. Diversity literature courses are required to meet teacher-education state standards, and they address two university core values—Global Perspective and Experience, and Cultural and Ethnic Diversity—to which LJML is deeply committed and which prepare our students to succeed in graduate school admission and completion, to gain their teaching credentials, and to engage our diverse world as professionals, as church congregants and leaders, and as family members.

The expectations we have of our Literature Program is to prepare students for any career requiring the ability to communicate well in writing and in speaking, to consider issues from multi-cultural perspectives, and to thoughtfully consider others' perspectives and experiences, to critically analyze texts and structures, and to engage in deep reflection on our individual and communal lives. Most specifically, our graduates routinely succeed in the fields of secondary and post-secondary teaching, editing and publishing, law, the church, business, government and non-profit organizations.

MODERN LANGUAGES PROGRAM (Study Abroad Requirement)

In 1979 with institutional support, the Spanish Major was created in order to accommodate the needs of our students in light of the growing impact and role of Hispanic culture in southern California. Given the relative proximity, importance, and relevance of the Hispanic culture, the Department sought to meet the needs and demands of our students and our community. It was also necessary as a component of the University's Bilingual Cross Cultural Specialist Credential and a Master's Degree in Multi Cultural Education. Six years later the Spanish Major was revised to meet the requirements of the California Single Subject Credential in response to the increasing number of students seeking to teach Spanish. The program met with an immediate successful response which has grown and now includes a Minor that is the second-largest on campus. Prior to the establishment of the Major, Spanish was offered only as an undergraduate Foreign Language GE requirement.

Over the years the program has adapted by changing curriculum according to the needs of students in California. The Spanish Major added a number of Latin American Culture and Literature courses, as well as a Mexican American Literature course, to address the needs of the population in California. Later the program added a required Study Abroad component in order to improve oral proficiency and greater exposure and understanding of foreign cultures. Oral proficiency is summatively assessed using the ACTFL testing.

To build on the Spanish Major and to incorporate courses in French, the Department created the Romance Language Major in 1994. Prior to 2005 courses in the French minor (beyond GE) were offered only in the summer sessions; after 2005 French Minor courses were moved to the academic year. The Romance Languages Major has remained small due to the difficulty students have in completing a major which demands mastery in both French and Spanish. In 2012 we established a French Major with the likely intention to eliminate the Romance Language major in our Program Review; this plan was made official with the Prioritization Memo of April, 2014. Currently all language majors require a Study Abroad semester.

JOURNALISM PROGRAM (Pre-Professional—Internship Requirement)

In the 1980s very few member schools in the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) had journalism programs. In 1983 a Journalism concentration within the Literature major, to give more pre-professional options to Literature majors, was approved by the Literature Department faculty. Dean Nelson was hired as the Director of the Journalism concentration which began in 1984. In 1991 an additional journalism faculty line was added, and in 1992, the concentration became major.

One of the pre-professional strengths of the program is its adjunct faculty who work in the broader journalism industry. These long-term adjuncts have taught some of the program's specialty courses, such as Editing, Computer-Assisted Reporting, Writing for the Mass Media, and Magazine Editing and Concepts. These adjunct professors also open doors for internships and employment.

Our Journalism program has a close and long-standing connection with the CCCU's Washington, D.C. Journalism Center, which runs a semester-long program offering professional Washington experience to Journalism students from CCCU schools across the country. The PLNU Journalism Program has been viewed so positively by the CCCU, that they appointed PLNU Journalism faculty Dean Nelson to serve as one of only two Senior Fellows in this program to advise other schools in developing their own journalism programs. (One of our now retired Journalism professors, Sue Atkins, helped to develop this semester-long program in 1995.)

As journalism has moved to digital platforms in recent years, the Journalism Program has added social media content to our introductory courses and has added entire courses in Computer-Assisted Reporting and Multimedia Journalism to our upper division curriculum.

A Broadcast Journalism major was begun in 2006 to more specifically address the needs of students planning to go into broadcast rather than print journalism. This program is shared with the Communication and Theater Department; its courses are taught in these two departments.

The Journalism and Broadcast Journalism majors require internships as a culminating experience of these majors. The applied professional experience that internships provide is a crucial aspect of preparing these majors for employability once they graduate.

WRITING PROGRAM (Pre-Professional—Internship Requirement)

In 2000, to create a creative-writing concentration, the department hired Richard Hill who had designed and implemented a writing major at Taylor University. Previously a Business Writing major had existed, but its last student graduated in 1999. The only existing Writing courses were WRI320, Creative Writing, taught once per year by Kay Harkins or Journalism professor Dr. Dean Nelson; WRI315, Advanced Composition, taught once per year by Professor Harkins; and WRI 365 Technical and Business Writing, taught in alternate years by adjuncts.

With input from department members, Dr. Hill configured a Writing concentration of the Journalism major, and the concentration began accepting students in 2001. Creative writing was envisioned as the core of the Writing concentration; accordingly, three specific creative-writing genre courses were added: WRI321 Poetry, WRI322 Fiction, and WRI323 Creative Nonfiction. Carl Winderl was hired in 2001 to assist in teaching poetry and creative nonfiction courses. The goal of the new concentration was a well-rounded curriculum that would give students background in literature and journalism while preparing them for career-related writing across the employment spectrum. *Driftwood*, the campus literary magazine, was expanded, and WRI216 Literary Magazine Workshop, was added to the course list. The next year, WRI217 Yearbook Workshop, became an option in the Writing Workshop menu.

In 2008 the Writing concentration became a major program. More writing courses, as well as editing and design classes offered in the Journalism major, became required. Some literature and linguistics courses were included as electives. WRI420 Advanced Writing Workshop was introduced as a capstone course for the major, and WRI 470 Internships became a required course. By 2010 the numbers of writing majors and journalism majors were roughly equal and have remained so since that time.

In 2010 Michael Clark was hired to teach fiction and creative nonfiction. He offered hybrid online/off campus courses in Fiction for the first time in 2013-14. Clark departed at the end of the 2013-2014 academic year.

GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

The department has been heavily involved in the university's General Education Program housing 18 units of the General Education experience of the typical PLNU students (5 units of writing, 5 units of literature, and 8 units of modern language study). All full-time faculty (with the possible exception of the faculty member serving as chair) teach at least one general education course each year, and for many of the full-time faculty, general education courses constitute half of the annual load.

EXPECTATIONS: The broad expectations or purposes we have of all our programs are to enable students to

- critically read and interpret texts through close reading and literary analysis
- thoughtfully engage with diverse cultures through reading and discussing texts
- understand the nature, structure, and history of language
- conduct effective research and produce effective written and oral communication in various genres and media
- deepen their redemptive social and spiritual engagement with the world through studying languages, texts, and media

Enrollment and Retention Data

Data for individual programs will be provided later in the study, but below you will find the unduplicated department totals.

Bachelor's Degrees Awarded

Year	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Degree	45	28	41	60.5	35.5	28

Undergraduate Enrollment

Year	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
Total Students	167	162.5	144	128.5	107.5	113	118.5

First Time Freshmen Admissions

		Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012
Inquiries	Number	320.5	391	492	522	531.5
Applications	Number	81	161	168	151	167
	Conversion Rate	25.3%	41.2%	34.1%	28.9%	31.4%
Admitted	Number	67	118	102.5	93	106
	Selection Rate	82.7%	73.3%	61%	61.6%	63.5%
Matriculated	Number	22	34	25	27	29.5
	Yield	32.8%	28.6%	24.4%	29%	27.8%

The fluctuation in the enrollment numbers will be analyzed more fully in the program-by-program analysis to follow.

PART I – Institutional and Program Alignment of Vision, Mission, Core Values, and Learning Outcomes

- Alignment of the Program with the University's Missions, Core Values and Goals

UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT

Point Loma Nazarene University exists to provide higher education in a vital Christian community where minds are engaged and challenged, character is modeled and formed, and service becomes an expression of faith. Being of Wesleyan heritage, we aspire to be a learning community where grace is foundational, truth is pursued, and holiness is a way of life.

UNIVERSITY CORE VALUES

- Excellence in Teaching and Learning
- Intentional Christian Community
- Faithfulness to our Nazarene Heritage & Wesleyan Theological Tradition
- Development of Students as Whole Persons
- Global Perspective and Experience
- Ethnic and Cultural Diversity
- Stewardship of Resources
- Service as an Expression of Faith

LJML MISSION STATEMENT

Embodying the core values of a Christian liberal arts education in the Wesleyan theological tradition, and focusing on the power of language and story to shape us and our world, the LJML department and programs will provide students with knowledge, skills, and experiences to equip them to understand, interpret, analyze, evaluate, and create texts as linguistic and/or artistic expressions of diverse human experiences. We value reading, writing, researching, speaking, and discussing as profound means of participating in the redemptive work of God in all of creation.

We designed our LJML Mission Statement with the University Mission Statement and Core Values firmly in mind. In our Mission Statement we affirm our commitment to the Christian liberal arts and Wesleyan theological traditions. We articulate the specific purview of Literature, Journalism, Modern Language, and Writing within which we strive for excellence in developing the minds, characters, and serving hearts of our students. To these ends we also affirm paying careful attention to the breadth of the world where we live, the acknowledgement of whole and complex persons, and the necessity of practicing stewardship of earth's resources by addressing varied global perspectives and diversity in the texts, languages, and theoretical approaches we study, employ, and produce.

GOALS: PURPOSE STATEMENTS

We replaced our Department Learning Outcomes with department purpose statements at Maggie Bailey's and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee's suggestion after their review of our assessment wheel. These purpose statements have been added to LJML pages in the 2014-15 University Undergraduate Catalog:

http://catalog.pointloma.edu/preview_entity.php?catoid=14&ent_old=1519&returnto=1095.

They are also included above as expectations in the "History, Development, and Expectations" section of this report.

- **Alignment of the Program Learning Outcomes to the Institutional Learning Outcomes**

Each learning outcome is aligned to the learning outcome above it in the outcome hierarchy as indicated in parentheses following each outcome. For individual alignment documents for each LJML program, please see the Student Learning Outcomes page of our Assessment Wheel.

<http://assessment.pointloma.edu/academic-assessment/department-of-literature-journalism-modern-languages/student-learning-outcomes/>

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES

Whether GE Learning Outcomes will be assessed within departmental Program Reviews or through a separate GE Program Review in future remains to be determined. GE courses in LJML have been aligned to the GELOs our GE courses address.

PLOs and CLOs have been written for all levels of the learning outcome hierarchy

PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

All our Program Learning Outcomes were written to address all levels of Bloom's Taxonomy. The taxonomy levels have been indicated in each Program Learning Outcome.

WASC CORE COMPETENCIES

We have also embedded the WASC Core Competencies in the language of our Program Learning Outcomes.

COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES

All our Course Learning Outcomes were written to address all levels of Bloom's Taxonomy. The taxonomy levels have been indicated in each Course Learning Outcome.

- [11.LJML_Outcomes_2102-2014_Course Learning Outcomes](#)

Institutional and Program Alignment of Vision, Mission, Core Values, and Learning Outcomes,

Key Findings	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• We have learned that our Program Learning Outcomes are sufficient for assessing our programs and that we do not need Department Learning Outcomes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Delete our DLOs from our Assessment processes, materials, and wheel.• Replace our DLOs with Department Purposes and list these in the university catalog
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Our Assessment Wheel materials are in very good shape according to the report given to us by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee in November 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Make the few revisions to our Assessment Wheel narratives that the Institutional Effectiveness Committee recommended in their report memo to LJML
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some WASC Core Competencies are embedded in our Program Learning Outcomes, and some are not.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify and embed WASC Core Competencies in all Program Learning Outcomes for all programs, and revise Assessment Wheel documents accordingly. (Was done by May 2014)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Program Learning Outcomes have helped us identify gaps in the direct summative assessment of our Literature Program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Revise the Senior Portfolio (key summative assignment) in the Literature capstone course
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Program Learning Outcomes have helped us identify gaps in the direct summative assessment of our French Program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Implement the ACTFL testing (key summative assignment) in French, set and follow external disciplinary benchmarks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Journalism and Broadcast Journalism Programs lack capstone courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Create a capstone course for these programs by combining two existing courses--WRI 310 and WRI 350--into one course
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● We lack a capstone course in our French Major. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Create a capstone course in the French Major
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Program Learning Outcomes have given us a framework for reorganizing and improving our indirect summative assessment--our exit surveys for graduating seniors and alumni in the Literature, Language, Writing, Journalism, and Broadcast Journalism Programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Complete revision of surveys by June 1, 2014 ● Send out revised surveys using Qualtrics by June 1, 2014

LITERATURE

PART II – Capacity and Resource for Academic Quality

1. External Demand for the Program(s): Analysis of enrollment trends and retention data

For full data from the Office of Institutional Research on all university measures for the Journalism Program, please see

- <https://my.pointloma.edu/ICS/Departments/Administrative Offices/Institutional Research/Program Review.jnz>

Noel-Levitz data was used to identify regional interest of college-bound high school students in university majors. The High School Market Demand Share is based on data from college-bound high school students who complete NRCCUA's MyCollegeOptions Post-Secondary Planning Survey, and represents each program's share of all respondents from PLNU's primary market states (CA, AZ, CO, OR, WA).

The Noel-Levitz High School Market Demand Share data for literature programs indicates that our **Literature Program** attracts interest at a rate of 0.8% regionally (less than the PLNU median). Many of these other schools offer degrees in English with various concentrations. At PLNU, we offer distinct major programs.

Noel-Levitz PLNU Share of Regional Degrees Awarded data (based on the total number of bachelor's degrees awarded between 2003-04 and 2010-11 from institutions within a 150-mile radius of San Diego) shows that PLNU's share of Literature degrees awarded out of all Literature degrees awarded in the region is 0.7% (less than the PLNU median).

The enrollment headcount for the **Literature Program** from Fall 2006 through Fall 2012 shows a decline from 53.0 to 28.0 students. The rate of decline was similar in both concentrations of the Literature Program: in English-Education from 20 to 10 students (50% decline), and in Literature from 33 to 18 students (54.5% decline). This decline appears to be part of a national trend of fewer students choosing to major in literature (or English) programs, and universities and colleges posting decreasing numbers of positions in post-secondary Literature and Language teaching. The cuts to public schools in California have also contributed to a decline in students majoring in English-Education (our LIT-EE). However, currently, San Diego Unified School District is poised to need thousands of new teachers to fill the vacancies created by the 2013-14 retirements.

Literature Program retention and graduation rates, as indicated in the First-Time Freshman Persistence data and demonstrated in rolling three-year cohorts, sit at or slightly above the university retention and graduation rates with the exception of the 2009-2011 rolling cohort. This data would seem to indicate that students in the Literature Program since 2006 most typically have remained in the program and persisted to graduation at a higher percentage rate than the university's six-year graduation rate. Although our percentage for the 2009-2011 cohort does fall below the university rate by 2.7%, this is the only cohort in four chronological cohorts that has not been higher than the university persistence rate. Because of the small number of students represented, the volatility in this data is significant.

Year	Unduplicated University Total	Rolling 3-Year Combined Cohorts: Literature
2006-2008	84.7%	86.7%
2007-2009	83.8%	96.6%
2008-2010	83.1%	84.2%
2009-2011	82.7%	80.0%

We use the rolling three-year cohort data to review our persistence rates because it shows less volatility than does the single-year cohort data. We are reporting our rolling three-year cohort data here at Director of Institutional Research, Brent Goodman's suggestion.

2. Internal Demand for the Program(s)

Support of University Programs: The Literature Program supports the GE curriculum "Seeking Cultural Perspectives" with its LIT 205-209 and 325 (Great Works) and LIT 201-203 (World Masterpieces) courses for all PLNU undergraduate students. Our LIT 325 (Children's Literature) also supports the Cross Disciplinary Studies majors (Integrated Education and Teacher Education BAs). Additionally, we support the Cinema Studies and Women's Studies minors with our LIT 371 (World Cinema) and LIT 437 (Women Writers) courses.

Number of Units Generated: For the 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13 academic years, these two GE course streams generated 4.6%, 4.5%, and 4.2% of the PLNU undergraduate units taught. This data

shows a decline of .4% in the share of units taught which might be attributed to a rise in the number of lower-division GE units being transferred in by students trying to keep the costs of a PLNU university education down.

It is difficult to disaggregate from this data how many units were generated by majors and how many by non-majors. We serve a sizable GE population in our LIT 201-209 courses, and as long as these courses remain in the GE curriculum and as long as the university remains committed to including courses in literature in the GE curriculum, the internal demand will remain strong. If it is necessary to disaggregate the GE from the major-specific populations in these courses, we would have to go through the class lists for each of these sections, ascertain which students were literature majors, and then calculate the percentage of the whole class enrollment the literature majors comprised.

Current and Proposed GE Course Design: Currently, the two-unit Great Works courses serve **only** the GE curriculum and not the Literature major or minors unlike the Masterpieces courses which do count toward Literature major requirements (as well as Journalism major and Writing major requirements).

In our current program review we are proposing the following changes to our two-unit GE Great Works courses:

- to redesign the two-unit GE course as a Literature and Culture course with a more interdisciplinary scope than the current Great Works genre design, and
- to require it in our Literature major as well as GE.

We are also proposing the following changes to our three-unit Masterpieces courses:

- to move the three-unit lower-division GE course to the upper-division level so that students will be required to spread their GE literature curriculum over the course of their four years, and
- to replace the Masterpieces courses with four existing upper-division world and diversity literature courses: LIT 345 (African-American Literature), LIT 437 (Women Writers), LIT 361 (World Drama and Poetry), LIT 371 (World Cinema)
- to revise the course descriptions, names, and number (where needed) to achieve a broader diversity and global scope

We have presenting the proposed changes to the GE Committee for review and received their endorsement for taking these proposal forward through the Program Review and APC processes.

We are designing all these proposed changes to the GE literature courses with the university core values of *Global Perspective and Experience* and *Ethnic and Cultural Diversity* in view. As we noted in our prioritization report, we are addressing the needs for more interdisciplinary courses in our GE Literature courses, and for greater accessibility of the literature minor to all students by including the GE courses in its requirements.

Share of Undergraduate Headcount: Our share of PLNU undergraduate headcount has declined from a peak of 59 students in Fall 2008 to 26 students in Fall 2011. This decline of more than half of our enrollment is part of a wider national trend of decreasing enrollments in the humanities. Since Fall 2011 our enrollment has stabilized.

	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
Total	53	53	59	44	37	26	28	27

Students								
Average Load	15.57	15.79	15.35	15.18	15.46	14.94	15.82	

Retention Rates and Migration: Counterbalancing the share-of-headcount data, our retention rates in the Literature major show that more students migrate into our major than out of our program. Percentages graduated in year six for the five three-year rolling cohorts from 2000-02 through 2004-06 range from 76.3% to 86.4% with every one of those adjusted cohorts being larger than the original cohort for that cohort.

Please see First-Time Freshman Persistence, rolling 3-Year Combined Cohorts table for the Literature Program for full data: https://my.pointloma.edu/ICS/icsfs/LJML_FTF_Persistence.pdf?target=02d943ab-9c2c-47a5-a368-c79e9d9b6c30

	2000-02	2001-03	2002-04	2003-05	2004-06	2005-07	2006-08	2007-09	2008-10	2009-11
Original Cohort Size	25	18	16	23	27	31	26	20	15	13
Year 1	32	26	30	38	39	41	30	29	19	15
Year 2	47	46	41	45	45	44	33	28	18	
Year 3	47	47	39	45	46	46	34	28		
Year 4	46	47	38	43	44	45	34			
Year 5	46	47	38	43	44	45				
Year 6	46	47	38	43	44					

Our three-year rolling enrollment cohort data shows that cohort size has increased from year one to year six in every cohort since 2000-2002. A longitudinal look at our data would suggest that our patterns are tracking with national trends, and that incoming students may be directed more by understandable parental anxiety about market trends than by students' own desire to major in literature.

Tracking and advertising the job placement of our grads across many fields may lessen parental anxiety and increase student confidence in choosing to major in literature upon matriculation. Currently, we

- are building a Google Drive database to record the anecdotal information we receive from/about our alums; we are distributing a new career paths document as part of our Preview Day materials for students and parents: (<http://assessment.pointloma.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/LJML-career-paths.pdf>)
- are highlighting the employment of graduates on our department web pages: (<http://www.pointloma.edu/experience/academics/schools-departments/department-literature-journalism-modern-languages/careers-humanities>)
- have revised our exit/alumni survey ([LJML Evidence 2013-2014 LIT Alum Survey June Results](#)) to identify our placement rates in graduate programs and credentialing programs.

As noted in our prioritization report, growing areas of employment include teachers (at all levels: adult basic, secondary education, literacy teachers, graduate teaching assistants, and vocational), librarians, curators, archivists; legal occupations; religious workers; technical writing; editing, proofreading, and publishing for print and electronic formats; communications for all occupations. Literature majors are prepared to enter and have entered all of these careers. Skills identified by the San Diego Workforce Partnership and required in many careers include critical thinking, creative thinking, and writing are skills taught throughout our program.

3. Size, Scope, and Productivity of the Program(s)

Faculty Profile: As of Fall 2014 the **Literature Program** has four full time faculty members (Blessing, Martin, Pedersen, Wicks) , whose primary assignment is in literature. Three are tenured. All four also teach GE composition courses annually barring any research grants, sabbaticals, or administrative appointments. In addition the program has two full time faculty members (Bowles, McKinney), both tenured who split their assignments between literature and linguistics, and/or GE foreign language and GE composition courses. Our two full time, tenured, writing faculty members (Hill, Winderl) also teach GE literature courses annually. One instructor (Pate) teaches the Children’s Literature course and WRI 370 for the English Education program though her primary assignment is college composition and directing the Writers’ Studio. Two of these faculty members have administrative load release: Karl Martin (12 units annually for Department Chair appointment), Charlene Pate (6 units annually for directing the Writers’ Studio and college composition program).

Eight of the nine literature faculty mentioned above have completed the Ph.D. Most have active publication records.

Three of these nine faculty are nearing retirement age but only one (Bowles) has announced plans to retire in 2016. Five are mid-career and one is early-career--all with no plans to retire soon. All are of similar race/ethnicity, and only three are women; thus, the faculty lacks diversity.

Teaching Assignments: Faculty were hired for their specialties in literary study: American, British, and/or World literatures; early and/or late historical periods; genres and/or diversity literatures: film, women writers, non-western literatures. All faculty were hired to teach in the GE curriculum for literature and composition. The capstone course has been taught only by senior faculty members whose primary assignment is in literature (Blessing, Martin, and Pedersen). Students who wish to complete honors projects are encouraged to work with faculty who have theoretical and/or content specialties that align with the primary foci of the student project. Students are also encouraged to include faculty from other disciplines in addition to literature where appropriate. All literature faculty have been involved in mentoring student honors projects throughout the duration of the honors research program. Our department offers no graduate courses.

Student Profile: The enrollment numbers of Literature majors (in both concentrations: LIT-LIT and LIT-EE) from Fall 2006 through Fall 2013 is indicated in the table of institutional data below (also included above). Our enrollment numbers show a decrease from a peak of 59 students in 2009 to a consistent enrollment in the high twenties for 2011, 2012, and 2013. This decline in enrollment numbers tracks very closely with the economic recession as our numbers begin noticeably declining starting in 2009. This decline is also in line with the national decline in the humanities since the recession.

Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

53	53	59	44	37	26	28	27
----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

The enrollment status data for our Literature majors from Fall 2006 through Fall 2012 is indicated in the table of institutional data below. Our enrollment status data shows a fairly consistent percent of continuing students, ranging from 73.6% to 88.8%, from 2006 through 2011. The data for Fall 2012 shows an uncharacteristically low percentage of continuing students, an uncharacteristically high percentage of first-time freshmen, and an uncharacteristically high percentage of transfer students. These notable changes in only one year of seven is perhaps attributable to the dramatic statistical variations that can be produced by one or two students shifting in or out of our program given the small number of literature majors overall.

		Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012
Continuing	Headcount	39.0	41.0	50.0	39.0	31.0	20.0	16.0
	Percent	73.6%	77.4%	84.7%	88.6%	83.8%	76.9%	57.1%
First-time Freshmen	Headcount	9.0	10.0	7.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	7.0
	Percent	17.0%	18.9%	11.9%	6.8%	13.5%	19.2%	25.0%
New Transfers	Headcount	5.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	5.0
	Percent	9.4%	3.8%	3.4%	4.5%	2.7%	3.8%	17.9%
Average Load		15.57	15.79	15.35	15.18	15.46	14.94	15.82

The diversity profile of the Literature majors from Fall 2006 through Fall 2012 is indicated in the table of institutional data below.

		Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012
Gender:								
Men	Headcount	14.0	9.0	11.0	6.0	5.0	7.0	9.0
	Percent	26.4%	17.0%	18.6%	13.6%	13.5%	26.9%	32.1%
Women	Headcount	39.0	44.0	48.0	38.0	32.0	19.0	19.0
	Percent	73.6%	83.0%	81.4%	86.4%	86.5%	73.1%	67.9%
Ethnic Origin:								
Non-White	Headcount	4.0	8.0	7.0	6.0	10.0	7.0	7.0
	Percent	7.5%	15.1%	11.9%	13.6%	27.0%	26.9%	25.0%
White/Unknown	Headcount	49.0	45.0	52.0	38.0	27.0	19.0	21.0

	Percent	92.5%	84.9%	88.1%	86.4%	73.0%	73.1%	75.0%
--	---------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Our diversity profile data shows our program following national trends with more women than men enrolled though since Fall 2010 the percent of men students in our major has risen. In Fall 2012 we achieved the closest gender parity of the past six years. We are not close to ethnic parity, however, with only one quarter of our majors identifying as non-white ethnic origin.

The data from 2006 to 2012 shows that our program experienced a three-fold increase in the percentage of non-white students. As we look toward future hires in the program, making a diversity hire will be key in continuing to attract greater diversity in our student population.

The student class level profile of our literature majors from Fall 2006 through Fall 2012 is indicated in the table of institutional data below.

		Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012
Freshmen	Headcount	10.0	11.0	7.0	3.0	6.0	5.0	7.0
	Percent	18.9%	20.8%	11.9%	6.8%	16.2%	19.2%	25.0%
Sophomore	Headcount	17.0	4.0	16.0	11.0	6.0	4.0	8.0
	Percent	32.1%	7.5%	27.1%	25.0%	16.2%	15.4%	28.6%
Junior	Headcount	16.0	20.0	13.0	15.0	10.0	6.0	5.0
	Percent	30.2%	37.7%	22.0%	34.1%	27.0%	23.1%	17.9%
Seniors	Headcount	10.0	18.0	23.0	15.0	15.0	11.0	8.0
	Percent	18.9%	34.0%	39.0%	34.1%	40.5%	42.3%	28.6%

In the “Quality of Program Inputs” section of our prioritization report, we noted that the data shows (except where the sample is too small to measure) that incoming literature student SAT scores exceed the scores of their peers. They do so not only where we might expect this—in reading—but also in math scores. The average GPA also exceeds the university average. In summary, the program attracts very strong students.

Criteria	Indicators		Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
Incoming Student Data (1st-Time Freshmen)	SAT							
	Avg. SAT Composite	LIT	1263	sm	sm	1208	1238	sm
		PLNU*	1140	1125	1147	1150	1168	1161
	Avg. SAT Reading	LIT	654	sm	sm	620	642	sm
		PLNU*	565	561	573	572	583	582
	Avg. SAT Math	LIT	609	sm	sm	588	597	sm
		PLNU*	575	564	574	578	585	578
	Avg High School GPA	LIT	3.95	sm	3.84	3.90	3.89	4.01
		PLNU*	3.73	3.70	3.74	3.77	3.81	3.82

4. Revenue and Other Resources Generated by the Program

The program does not generate additional revenues beyond the tuition.

5. Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program(s)

The Literature Program budget is included in the budget for the Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages department; thus, it does not have a stand alone budget.

LJML Department budget totals for the past three years are in the table below and include all costs for departmental needs for all LJML programs.

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Annual LJML Budget	\$60, 979	\$60.979	\$60,970
Closing LJML Balance	\$6,810.39	\$3,997.95	-\$3480.58

The national benchmarks used in PLNU's version of the Dickeson Prioritization Process were those established by the Delaware Data. Delaware Data shows that we are sitting right at the Delaware Benchmark for 2010-2012. Delaware Data for 2012-13 (though not included in the Prioritization Report template) shows our TOTAL CREDIT HOURS (UNDG & GRAD)=2907 and our COST PER CREDIT HOUR (UNDG & GRAD) \$208--putting us at lower than the Delaware Benchmarks for 2010-11 and 2011-12. It shows we have reduced the number of student credit units taught each year from 2010-11 to 2012-13. The program generates significantly more student credit units per FTE than the university average, and the student to faculty ratio is higher than the university average. The data shows that the LIT program is taught mostly by full time faculty putting these costs above PLNU benchmarks; however, our Delaware Benchmark indicates that we are a good value to cost school. The number of full time faculty in the LIT program indicates that students receive high quality teaching and access to their professors--key characteristics that distinguish their PLNU experience compared with what they would have at a large state university.

6. Quality of Program Inputs and Processes

- **Faculty**

The majority of literature courses offered are taught by our full-time literature faculty; thus, ratio of full time to adjunct faculty teaching in the program is skewed toward full time faculty. Occasionally we employ adjunct professors to teach a GE literature course to cover faculty release time for a research grant or a sabbatical. Our director of the composition program teaches one literature course (LIT 325 Children's Literature) annually; she occasionally teaches a GE literature course in summer school as well. All full time literature faculty hold terminal degrees, four are tenured (Blessing, Martin, McKinney, and Pedersen), four hold the rank of full professor (Blessing, Martin, McKinney, and Pedersen) and one of associate (Wicks). One faculty member (Bowles) has taken the early retirement package offered in 2013-14 as part of prioritization: he is on a 25% reduced load in 2014-15 and on a 50% reduced load in 2015-16 which will be his final year on faculty.

Please see section II.3 above for Faculty Profile information already discussed.

Please see faculty vita in Appendix B.

- **Adequacy and Availability**

Currently we have two literature faculty members with specialization in British Literature (Blessing and Pedersen), two with specialization in World Literature (McKinney and Wicks) with

one of these having specialization in film, and one with specialization in American Literature (Martin). The British and American Literature faculty have substantive teaching experience in World Literature as well. Further, our writing faculty also teach GE literature courses as part of their regular teaching loads.

In looking forward to any future replacement hires, we will need to consider what specializations will be most needed for our evolving literature curriculum and what combination of linguistics, writing, and/or language specialties could serve the department efficiently across our multiple programs, including GE. As of 2014 and excluding Dr. Bowles 2016 retirement, we have no other literature faculty who have announced plans to retire.

The Literature Program has been very successful in recruiting, hiring, and retaining key faculty for our curriculum needs.

- **Professional Development/Travel Support**

Like faculty across campus, the program faculty would benefit greatly with increased professional development and travel funds. In addition faculty and students would benefit from administrative financial support for faculty to attend and/or host a conference on the humanities/liberal arts in Christian higher education. The current CIC initiative, Power of the Liberal Arts (<http://www.liberalartspower.org/Pages/default.aspx>), is an excellent example of an initiative in which to involve our faculty. Donors interested in supporting the humanities could also be identified by the Office of University Advancement, and PLNU could encourage donations to support an endowed annual PLNU conference, similar to the Gaede Institute at Westmont, to explore issues central to the humanities.

In December 2013, our department did receive an anonymous donation of \$25,000 for faculty scholarship for LJML faculty. A project fund has been set up for this money, and a department procedure has been outlined for applying for these funds.

- **Technology**

Instruction in the program tends to remain fairly low tech; however, we do use all the standard equipment of data projectors, computers, DVD/VHS players, and several faculty use only electronic gradebooks. Two program faculty (Bowles and Wicks) have been involved in pioneering on-line instruction. Technological support is adequate in both classrooms; however, we often have technological difficulties with some of our equipment in Bond Academic Center (BAC).

- **Information and technology resources**

- Library print and electronic holdings in the teaching and research areas of the program
Library print and electronic holdings are adequate—especially given our link with the consortium of California libraries and given the electronic databases, especially the MLA Bibliography, Gale Literature Resource, and JSTOR.

- Information literacy outcomes for graduates

Information literacy outcomes for our graduates are specified in our Program Learning Outcomes which may be viewed on our Assessment Wheel:

<http://assessment.pointloma.edu/academic-assessment/department-of-literature-journalism-modern-languages/student-learning-outcomes/>

These outcomes are introduced in the GE College Composition course, developed in our LIT 250 Introduction to the Study of Literature course, and mastered in our capstone course LIT 495 Literary Theory and Scholarship course. In these courses, students spend a few designated days in the library working with our librarians to extend their basic research skills to develop and apply research practices specific to literary analysis.

AAC&U rubrics for information literacy, written communication, and critical thinking are used to assess the introductory, developing, and mastery assignments, especially the portfolio submitted at the conclusion of the capstone course. Two years of assessment data (2012-13, 2013-14) for the capstone portfolio are stored in Live Text and may also be found on our Assessment Wheel: <http://assessment.pointloma.edu/academic-assessment/department-of-literature-journalism-modern-languages/evidence-of-student-learning/>

- Technology resources available to support the pedagogy and research in the program
Technology resources are adequate to support our pedagogy and research at this time.

- **Facilities and other**

The renovated Bond Academic Center (BAC) provides adequate office and classroom space for our full time faculty. Faculty offices are adequate in providing computers and storage space; the office design, however, would be substantially improved by installing standing computer stations and/or redesigning the placement of the computer stations in some offices to better arrange desk and computer access. Also the levels of work spaces may contribute to faculty developing health issues such as eye strain, carpal tunnel, neck, shoulder, and/or back strain.

With the departure of Michael Clark we now have additional office space for our adjunct faculty though most have to share office space with at least one other adjunct. Some adjuncts choose not to have any office space other than our lounge and main office area and some have office space in buildings other than BAC. With the 2016 retirement of Phil Bowles, we may have additional office space for our adjuncts and new writing hire as well.

Our main office lounge provides a very nice meeting space for low-tech meetings and social gatherings. For meetings requiring the use of data projector and screen, the room is less than adequate since bringing in portable equipment creates crowded doorways and walking space around our meeting tables. We did submit an equipment request for a television monitor, data projector, and docking station. This meeting space would be substantially improved by installing the “smart room” equipment we requested in the 2014-15 budget. This equipment would facilitate our access to online sites and materials pertinent to our annual assessment work especially.

The air-conditioning in the BAC is inconsistent with pockets of very cold and very warm air. We still regret the fact that we cannot open any windows to let the ocean breeze flow through the building.

- **Staff**

The program shares one department assistant with the programs in modern languages, writing, and journalism. In addition, the department assistant serves as BAC building coordinator. With the increased assessment demands for reporting and tracking data on our majors and program, with the increased use of online platforms for virtually all daily university business, and with the

increased growth of our annual Writer's Symposium by the Sea, the job description of our department assistant needs to be significantly amplified. It now needs to identify specific computing, clerical, and publicity/marketing proficiencies and test for each of these competencies during the hiring process, and more importantly, a key points throughout the first three years of employment.

Specific to assessment demands, the job description needs to include knowledge of compliance matters (WASC, DOE, etc.) so that our department assistant can complete a significant portion of the clerical work required in all this reporting.

- **Student Profile (See tables in section 3 above)**

As the data mentioned in section 3 above shows, our enrollment numbers decreased from a peak of 59 students in 2009 to a consistent enrollment in the high twenties for 2011, 2012, and 2013. This decline in enrollment numbers tracks very closely with the economic recession as our numbers begin noticeably declining starting in 2009. This decline is also in line with the national decline in the humanities since the recession.

Our enrollment status data shows a fairly consistent percent of continuing students, ranging from 73.6% to 88.8%, from 2006 through 2011. The data for Fall 2012 shows an uncharacteristically low percentage of continuing students, an uncharacteristically high percentage of first-time freshmen, and an uncharacteristically high percentage of transfer students. These notable changes in only one year of seven is perhaps attributable to the dramatic statistical variations that can be produced by one or two students shifting in or out of our program given the small number of literature majors overall.

As noted in section 3, our diversity profile data indicates that our program follows national trends of more women than men undergraduate students currently enrolled in colleges and universities though since Fall 2010 the percent of men students in our major has risen. In Fall 2012 we achieved the closest gender parity of the past six years. However, we are not close to ethnic parity with only one quarter of our majors being of non-white ethnic origin.

The data from 2006 to 2012 shows that our program experienced a three-fold increase in the percentage of non-white students. As we look toward future hires in the program (and department), making a diversity hire will be a key strategy in continuing to attract greater diversity in our student population.

The undergraduate enrollment data (except where the data sample is too small to measure) shows that incoming literature student scores exceed the PLNU composite scores in the SAT exam. As well, they exceed the PLNU score not only where we might expect this—in the reading scores—but also in the math scores. The average GPA of our Literature Majors also exceeds the university average in every year since Fall 2008 where the data sample is large enough to measure. In summary, the Literature Program attracts very strong students.

From 2006 through 2012, our students have carried an average course load ranging from 14.94 to 15.82 units.

Our recruitment practices and admission criteria are not different from the standard university practices. We do, however, include in our Preview Day packets for visiting inquiring students a document highlighting the kinds of careers our graduates have successfully entered. On our LJML web pages, we also spotlight alumni at work in some of these various careers. Please see our Career Paths document and our webpages:

- <http://assessment.pointloma.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/LJML-career-paths.pdf>
- <http://www.pointloma.edu/experience/academics/schools-departments/department-literature-journalism-modern-languages/careers-humanities>

The types and levels of financial assistance available to our students include all the loan possibilities open to all students. Continuing students in the program are eligible for the department scholarships (funded by the allotment we receive each year from the university) and eight endowed scholarships ranging from \$500 to \$1100 dollars each. These scholarships are shared among all the programs represented in our department: Literature, Journalism, Languages, and Writing Programs. Thus, the number of literature majors who receive scholarships annually varies.

The academic and career services, programs, and resources made available to our literature majors consist of our annual graduate school forum during which we outline the typical steps to follow in applying for graduate school in literature, one-on-one mentoring that faculty do of individual students and alumni preparing graduate school applications, and the annual staffing of the Writers' Studio with some of our majors. Working in the Writers' Studio is strong preparation both for our literature majors whether they pursue a career in secondary school teaching or go on to graduate school teaching assistantships.

The Literature Program participates in department social and special literary events along with the Journalism, Language, and Writing Programs. We typically have one social event in October or early November each year, and we have two Literary Teas a year that are specially designed to give our students a chance to hear writers and/or literary critics in a small event setting. These Literary Teas usually coincide with our two annual literary events: Writer's Symposium by the Sea and Poetry Day. We also sponsor an annual Creative Writing Reading on the Saturday of Homecoming. At this event we hear current students, alumni, and faculty read their creative writing (fiction, non-fiction, and poetry).

We do not typically have a great need for remediation, tutoring, or supplemental instruction for our literature majors. On occasion retired professor, Dr. Jim DeSaegher, has offered one-on-one tutoring in linguistics as have some of our strongest linguistics students.

We typically do not have students engaged in service learning as a required part of our program. We do, however, have students who participate in co-curricular service opportunities.

- **Course Profile:**

Delaware Data shows that we are sitting right at the Delaware Benchmark for 2010-2012. Delaware Data for 2012-13 shows our TOTAL CREDIT HOURS (UNDG & GRAD)=2907 and our COST PER CREDIT HOUR (UNDG & GRAD) \$208--putting us at lower than the Delaware Benchmarks for 2010-11 and 2011-12. It shows we have reduced the number of student credit units taught each year from 2010-11 to 2012-13. The program generates significantly more

student credit units per FTE than the university average, and the student to faculty ratio is higher than the university average, likely due to the portion of the GE curriculum within our Literature curriculum.

The data provided to us in the Prioritization Report template shows that the Literature Program is taught mostly by full time faculty putting these costs above PLNU benchmarks; however, our Delaware Benchmark indicates that we are a good value to cost school. The number of full time faculty in the Literature Program indicates that students receive high quality teaching and access to their professors--key characteristics that distinguish their PLNU experience compared with what they would have at a large state university.

The chart does not include lower enrollment courses offered in London or as a part of the Community Classroom program.

Course	F09 sec./ total	SP10 sec./ total	F10 sec./ total	SP11 sec./ total	F11 sec./ total	SP12 sec./ total	F12 sec./ total	SP13 sec./ total	F13 sec./ total	SP14 sec./ total
Masterpieces LIT 201, 202, 203	7/296	6/243	6/273	5/220	6/273	6/275	5/228	5/227	5/219	5/233
Great Works LIT 205-209 & 325	5/197	5/198	4/138	6/234	6/241	4/155	6/202	5/233	5/217	5/207
LIT 250	2/22	16	10	14	11	15	11	13	12	12
LIT 254	12		12		6		6		12	
LIT 255		14		10		10		9		17
LIT 256	15		9		10		10		14	
LIT 257		17		10		9		18		15
LIT 344		21				8				8
LIT 345				10				6		
LIT 346	9				7				7	
LIT 347			8				4			
LIT 361		4		12				4		
LIT 371						18				26
LIT 436			12				6			
LIT 437	18					11				12
LIT 438				29				19		
LIT 439		7				6				7

LIT 444	10				4				8	
LIT 445			3				1			
LIT 446				12				5		
LIT 447		12				7				10
LIT 448	6				8				7	
LIT 449			6				3			
LIT 461	17		14		9		9		4	
LIT 495		11		13		11		6		5
LIN 312	21		8		9		6		11	
LIN 365		18		15		12		9		8
LIN 404				5				2		

In a typical semester, five or six World Masterpiece courses, four Great Works courses and one section of Children’s Literature are offered. Three lower-division courses required in the major are offered each semester along with six or seven upper-division courses. While the upper-division courses rarely dip below five, many have been between five and ten students in the last three years. Low enrollments have reflected the smaller number of majors in the literature program and also in the journalism program whose students are required to take an upper-division literature course. The Literature Program includes no lab courses.

- **Resource Profile:**

Resources for the program are generally adequate though we do lack a smaller seminar-size classroom for our upper-division, seminar-style courses could be scheduled. Please note the discussion of information literacy in the “Technology” bullet above.

Capacity and Resource for Academic Quality

Key Findings	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Noel-Levitz data shows that PLNU's share of Literature degrees awarded out of all Literature degrees awarded in the region is 0.7% which is less than the PLNU median. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Continue to track the career paths and graduate and credential program acceptance rates of our graduates in shared Google Drive database ● Continue to improve and keep current our Preview Day materials and department web pages to highlight the employability of program graduates. ● Work more closely with Admissions and Marketing & Creative Services to design more effective ways to showcase our Program to external

	constituents.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using three-year rolling enrollment cohort data, students in the Literature Program since 2006 have remained in the program and persisted to graduation at a higher percentage rate than the university's six-year graduation rate in all but the 2009-2011 cohort. Three-year rolling enrollment cohort data also shows that cohort size has increased from year one to year six in every cohort since 2000-2002. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue the quality of the Literature Program which is yielding these strong persistence rates.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The two-unit Great Works courses are pure service courses serving only the GE curriculum and not the Literature major or minor unlike the Masterpieces courses which do count toward Literature major requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redesign the two-unit GE course as a Literature and Culture course with a more interdisciplinary scope than the current Great Works genre design, and Move the two-unit GE literature course into the Literature major requirements so that all GE literature courses will count in the major.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The enrollment in general education courses suggests that an appropriate number of sections are being offered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to monitor course enrollments and offer only the number of sections needed to maintain course enrollment above minimums and below caps
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low enrollment in some courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor enrollments especially as proposed changes are implemented to assess whether or not our enrollment and pedagogy goals are achieved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program faculty lacks diversity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work to make a diversity hire when senior faculty retire in coming years.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program needs a much-extended job description for its departmental assistant position and a more extensive performance evaluation process, especially during the first three years of employment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rewrite the job description for the department assistant position Work with Human Resources to develop a more rigorous performance evaluation and record keeping process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department and endowed scholarships are available only to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generate funds for scholarships that would be available to second-

continuing students in the program	semester first-year students in the program
•	•

**PART III –
Educational Effectiveness: Analysis of Evidence about
Academic Program Quality and Viability**

The status of assessment in the Literature Program is strong. Over the past three years (2011-2014) as a department and as a program section of the department we have designed our assessment processes and documents from the Mission Statement all the way through to the Use of Evidence of Student Learning. During each of the past three years we have implemented, reviewed, and then revised as needed the various components of assessment. Concurrently, we have piloted the DQP (Degree Qualifications Profile) and incorporated the WASC Core Competencies. All of the work is thoroughly documented on the Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages (LJML) Assessment Wheel and the DQP pages:

- <http://assessment.pointloma.edu/academic-assessment/department-of-literature-journalism-modern-languages/>
- <http://assessment.pointloma.edu/institutional-assessment/degree-qualifications-profile/>
- **Quality of Program Outcomes**
MISSION: Our Mission Statement was drafted and adopted in 2011-12. No changes were made in 2012-13 or 2013-14.
 - <http://assessment.pointloma.edu/academic-assessment/department-of-literature-journalism-modern-languages/mission/>

OUTCOMES: Our Department Learning Outcomes (DLOs) were revised in 2011-12. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) were drafted, implemented, assessed, reviewed, and revised over the 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14 academic years. In spring 2014 we eliminated our Department Learning Outcomes (DLOs) at the recommendation of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee after its review of our wheel. We have made revisions to all of our PLOs to (1) retain the key concepts that were central from DLOs, (2) embed all five WASC Core Competencies into the language of our PLOs, and (3) bring outcomes into closer alignment with what we are actually doing in current instruction. All outcomes were written and revised with Bloom's Taxonomy in mind. Alignment of our Program Learning Outcomes to Institutional Learning Outcomes are indicated in the documents loaded on our Assessment Wheel-Student Learning. Documents for 2011-12 and 2012-13 are archived on our wheel.

Please see the 2013-14 Student Learning Outcomes under current documents:

- [07. LJML Outcomes 2013-14, 2014-15 PLOs LIT](#)
- [08. LJML Outcomes 2013-2014, 2014-2015 PLOs LIT Aligned](#)
- [11. LJML Outcomes 2012-2014 Course Learning Outcomes](#)

MAPS: Differentiated Curriculum Maps drafted and adopted in 2011-12. Revisions were made in 2012-13 or 2013-14 for the same reasons described for outcomes. Please see the current Curriculum Maps for our program on our Assessment Wheel:

- [LJML Map 2013-2014 Curriculum Map LIT-LIT](#)
- [LJML Map 2013-2014 Curriculum Map LIT-EE](#)

PLAN: Our Assessment Plan was written in two stages: (1) three-year cycle, and (2) full assessment plan. Plans were reviewed and revised at multiple points across each fall and spring semester to identify gaps in our assessment and to close them. Please see our current Assessment Plan page of the Assessment Wheel

- [09. LJML Plan 2013-2014 Assessment Plan Literature \(LIT & EE\)](#)
- [10. LJML Plan 2013-2014 Assessment 3YR Cycle Literature](#)

EVIDENCE: For each of the past three academic years we have written an Annual Assessment Report for all levels of our program assessment. Annual Reports include discussion of all key assignments used, data gathered and analyzed, and decisions made by program faculty.

Please see the current Assessment Report on the Evidence page of the Assessment Wheel

- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Assessment Report LIT](#)
- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Assess Report LIT ETS Field Test](#)
- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Assess Rpt LIT ETS Comparative](#)
- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 LIT Alum Survey June Blank](#)
- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 LIT Alum Survey June Results](#)

USE OF EVIDENCE: APC proposals for 2011-12 are archived on the Assessment Wheel. No formal APC proposals for curricular changes were submitted for the Literature Program during 2012-13 or 2013-14. As a result of our assessment work and university mandates that arose in 2013-14, we made and implemented the following changes in our assessment work for the close of 2013-14 and going forward.

1. Revised Graduating Seniors/Alumni Survey to correct errors in survey questions and logistics
2. Reviewed and confirmed assessment results from LIT 250, Senior Literature Portfolio, and ETS Field Test in Literature—including means of assessment, performance targets, and data collection
3. Revised Senior Literature Portfolio Assignment Guidelines sheet
4. Added the Linguistics Prompt in Dr. Phil Bowles' second linguistics course this year
5. Created a new Key Assignment for the Senior Portfolio to assess PLO 1 and used a Student Focus Group to help us design this assignment and select the two AAC&U rubrics to be used to assess it
6. Confirmed a routine calibration and assessment meeting to assess all Senior Literature Portfolios during or immediately following finals week 2014.
7. Assessed all Senior Literature Portfolios
8. Reviewed assessment results of Senior Literature Portfolios in a debriefing meeting after assessment is complete and before faculty depart for summer
9. Embedded WASC Core Competencies into the language of our PLOs, and added competencies that were missing (Oral Communication, Quantitative Reasoning/Literacy)
10. Added to our Assessment Plan and indication of formative or summative for our key assignments
11. Created Google Drive documents to facilitate and streamline annual revisions to our assessment practices

12. Created a Google Drive document for tracking the post-graduation outcomes (graduate school acceptance rates and employment) of our alums and have begun collecting data
13. Drafted a tentative plan for our redesign of the Literature major (LIT-LIT & LIT-EE) in response to our ongoing Program Review and to university prioritization decisions.
14. Completed revisions to our web pages and presence that feature employability and student testimonials for Literature majors

We plan to take the following actions in 2014-15:

1. Review the Annual Assessment Report, the ETS Field Test Results and Report, and our Literature Program Survey results at our opening Literature Section meeting in August.
2. Determine final curricular changes for the Literature major and minor/s to be proposed in our Program Review Self-Study Report.
3. Draft APC Proposals for curricular changes to the Literature major or minor and submit these as part of our Program Review Self-Study Report and to APC. We expect that those changes mandated by Prioritization will need to be submitted as APC proposal to meet Fall 2014 deadlines:
 - **October 10**-Abstract to APC for curricular proposals
 - **November 7**-Last Day to submit curricular proposals to APC
4. Continue revisions to our web pages to best feature employability and student testimonials for Literature majors.
5. Continue to populate our Google Drive document, "LJML Grad School and Employment Rates for Alums" for tracking the post-graduation outcomes

Results from assessment were gathered, compiled, assessed, and revised by literature faculty (Blessing, Bowles, Martin, Pedersen, and Wicks) and were shared and discussed with the Literature Section faculty via the annual Assessment Report during our opening meetings in August each year. We will review all results and reports in our ongoing Literature Section and/or department meetings over the course of 2014-15.

- **Curriculum**

In addition to the general education proposal summarized above in section II.2, the literature faculty have worked together to restructure the literature program to attempt to boost enrollment so that courses offered in the major consistently enroll more than ten students when they are offered. We have employed two primary strategies: the limiting of menu options and the combination of course content into consolidated courses that will be offered less frequently. Examples of the first strategy are the trimming of the menu of upper division courses available for English Education majors and the trimming of the British period menu from six courses to four courses. Examples of the second strategy are the combining of course content in the upper division American literature courses so that only one upper division American literature course will be offered annually rather than two and the development of a course in the novel that can house material currently taught in three of four different courses. A full delineation of all these changes may be found in our forthcoming APC proposals.

- **Program Faculty**

Literature faculty were hired for their specialties in British, American, and World literatures. They have active publication and conference presentation records. Several have presented at international conferences and been the recipients of various research grants and sabbaticals. For a full delineation of their professional accomplishments, please see the faculty vita in Appendix B.

For a discussion of faculty degrees, ranks, tenure, please see sections II.3 and II.6 above.

When adjuncts or part time faculty are employed to teach literature courses, the LJML Chair oversees and mentors those faculty and keeps them apprised of department information and requirements for courses (including syllabi, class meetings, final exam periods, grade submission, textbook ordering, etc.).

- **Credit Hour Policy and Monitoring**

The credit hours are in line with university standards which are based on the Carnegie unit. In 2012-13 our curriculum was audited and necessary adjustments were made, mostly to our MWF class times. Credit hours are monitored by the Dean of Arts and Science.

- **Recruitment, Retention, and Student Services**

Our recruitment practices and admission criteria are not different from the standard university practices. We do, however, include in our Preview Day packets for visiting inquiring students a document highlighting the kinds of careers our graduates have successfully entered. On our LJML web pages, we also spotlight alumni at work in some of these various careers. Please see our Career Paths document and our webpages:

- <http://assessment.pointloma.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/LJML-career-paths.pdf>
- <http://www.pointloma.edu/experience/academics/schools-departments/department-literature-journalism-modern-languages/careers-humanities>

- **Disciplinary, Professional, and Community Interactions**

The literature program does not require an internship; however, literature majors are often involved in co-curricular activities through the university, local churches, and other avenues. English education majors are encouraged to enroll in the first two or three education courses while still undergraduates; thus, they become involved in at least observing in local public schools.

- **Post-Graduation Outcomes and Alumni Satisfaction**

- A. Focus Groups—We have used informal focus groups of alumni to help us design assessment key assignments, to determine curricular requirements, and to give us feedback about the prioritization process and decisions
- B. Tracking Graduates—In 2013-14 we created a document in Google Drive to record actual quantitative (not anecdotal) data from all graduates of our LJML programs. The current document includes graduates from the past seven years most completely, but we are adding information from graduates further back as we receive it. This will continue to be an evolving document.
- C. Exit Surveys—We have revised these into a standard template that is more directly aligned with our Program Learning Outcomes, Employability Goals, and Lifelong Learning Goals.
- D. Graduate School Acceptance Rate—We revised our Exit/Alumni Survey questions about graduate school and credentialing program acceptance rates. Using this revised survey, our data from the survey respondents in 2014 shows a 100% acceptance rate to graduate school and a 75% acceptance rate to credentialing programs.

Educational Effectiveness: Analysis of Evidence about Academic Program Quality and Viability

Key Findings	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We do not have a quantitative record of our students' placement rates in graduate schools and jobs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have created and are building a Google Drive spreadsheet where a systematic, quantitative, and ongoing record our students' placement rates in graduate schools and careers will be kept.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We do not have a quantitative record of graduate & credentialing program placement acceptance rates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have revised our exit/alumni survey to capture this data. We plan to continue distributing this survey to graduating seniors and alumni.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our Literature--English-Education Program is not currently written to meet California State Credentialing Standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should an increase in the demand for secondary school English teachers warrant it, we could write our English-Education concentration to California State Standards once again and increase the amount of informational literature in some of our courses, such as GE literature and Children's Literature, to meet the Common Core Standards in Education.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low enrollment in some courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor enrollments especially as proposed changes are implemented to assess whether or not our enrollment and pedagogy goals are achieved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

PART IV – Comparative Position and National Standards

- Comparison with comparable programs at comparator and aspirant programs at other universities

All of the university's aspirant universities offer a program in literature--the English, and English-Education tracks. To aspire to these universities, PLNU needs to retain its literature program. Further, to prepare students to become single-subject, credentialed, secondary school teachers, PLNU needs to retain its literature program.

Comparison of our program with comparator and aspirant schools is somewhat tenuous since many of those schools are also undergoing a prioritization process which is affecting their program course offerings and requirements. Compared to information posted on their websites and online catalogs, our list of literature course offerings is shorter than many. It is hard to determine, however, just how many of their courses are actually offered on a regular basis. We have also learned that we require more units in our program than most of these schools, and that these schools have thinner requirements in the literary periods component of their majors than we do.

Some of these schools have much more extensive course work and programs in linguistics than we do. A few of these schools also have an Honor's Program; whereas, we do not.

The modifications we have proposed in the Prioritization Process will further streamline our course offerings but will not diminish our preparation of graduates who are able to score competitively on the national ETS Field Test in Literature and are able to gain acceptance into graduate schools in a variety of programs. For results on this nationally benchmark means of assessment, please see our LIT ETS Field Test Report on the Assessment Wheel--Evidence of Student Learning:

- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Assess Report LIT ETS Field Test](#)
- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Assess Rpt LIT ETS Comparative](#)

- **Best Practices in the Field**

Best practices in curriculum continues to include survey courses and specialized literary period and/or diversity literatures courses in American, British, and World literature canons. This practice aligns well with our university core values of diversity and global perspectives.

As well best-practice curriculum in literature programs includes an introduction to literary study course and in-depth study of literary theory and criticism.

Some exposure to linguistics study is also best practice. As is encouragement to study a second language. Proficiency in a second language continues to be a requirement of graduate programs in literature as well.

Current best practices also seek to give students an opportunity to present at conferences for undergraduate research. While our students and faculty have consistently participated in the PLNU Honor's Project Program, only a few of our students have had opportunities to present their research in literature or in teaching at a conference. We would like to identify undergraduate research conferences at which our students could present their research, and/or we would like to host an annual event at which our capstone students could present their research.

- **Unique features**

The interdisciplinary nature of our department allows cross-over between students of literature, creative writing, and journalism since all of these programs include courses from the literature

curriculum. Such cross-over enriches students' curricular and co-curricular experience over the course of their program of studies. Both the Writing and the Journalism Programs are deeply grounded in the Literature Program because of our faculty's belief in the centrality of literature and reading to the craft of writing. Our literature curriculum also provides students with a strong grounding in British, American, and World literature which prepares them for a wide range of options in graduate study.

Our annual Poetry Day and Writer's Symposium offer students the experience of hearing and interacting with well-known professional writers. Our study abroad opportunities in the London Term and the United Kingdom Summer Study Abroad offer students the chance to explore the actual places connected to the Irish, Scottish, and English writers and works they have studied.

The active publication records of program faculty allow students to see the integration of teaching and scholarship modeled.

Comparative Position and National Standards

Key Findings	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of our comparator and aspirant schools have literature programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain PLNU's Literature Program
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our curriculum is well in line with our comparator and aspirant schools, and leaner than several 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain or slightly shrink our list of course offerings Retain the basic types of courses we have in our curriculum
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our program requires more units than many of our comparator and aspirant schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider reducing the requirements by two or three units in LIT-LIT and LIT-EE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of our majors score competitively on the ETS Field Test in Literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to use this nationally benchmarked assessment to measure the success of our students and our program
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our annual literary events and study abroad opportunities are consistent with, and in some cases exceed, similar distinctives at comparator and aspirant schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain these events and study abroad opportunities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our students are not actively involved in presenting their scholarship at undergraduate research conferences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify one or two national undergraduate research conferences in which our students may participate Sponsor and host an undergraduate research conference for literature of for the humanities here at PLNU

PART V – Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats Analysis

1. Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiality of the Program(s)

The program is one of the core humanities programs that have historically been an essential part of Point Loma Nazarene's participation in and commitment to a liberal arts tradition. Our founders resisted the pressure to create a pre-professional school only—a Bible college existing primarily to prepare pastors. Instead they were committed to educating students for the breadth of life not only career—a breadth requiring the intellectual, psychological, emotional, and spiritual dimensions carried in the liberal arts. Employers today as well as our alumni—who are working in myriad fields—continue to recognize and value the skills and breadth of learning that are the hallmarks of a liberal arts education: writing and speaking skills, critical thinking skills, analytical skill, and the ability to understand and interpret differing cultures, ideologies, and perspectives. Indeed these skills equip our graduates with a flexible and versatile education with which to meet an increasingly diverse, complicated, and information-inundated world. Further, these skills and abilities are fundamental to the development, growth, and sustainability of our democracy, and to Christians' informed participations in all levels of our civic and community life.

Internal Capability Strengths

The active conference presentation and publication records of Literature faculty are a strength to the program in the way that they model Christian scholarship to our students. They are also a strength in the contribution they make to Christian higher education and academia in general. Our faculty have been involved in planning and hosting professional conferences in partnership with the Christianity and Literature conference of the Modern Language Association in 2004, and gender conferences in partnership with the CCCU and other CCCU schools (Abilene Christian, Trinity Western, Messiah) in 2008 and 2010. Faculty have been invited chapel and international conference speakers.

Since 2006, literature majors have taken the ETS Major Field Test in Literature as part of the capstone course. The program's target goal is for all students to score more than 5% above the national average in all eight subcategories. Over the eight-year time span students have met our performance target at an 83.33% success rate overall.

Their subcategory results indicate that our literature majors are strong in British Literature, Literary History, and Literary Theory. In the two categories testing British Literature prior to 1900, students met the target 88% of the time, and in the Literary History subcategory, students met the target 100% of the time. Our program's commitment to five upper-division period courses in British Literature (LIT 444, 445, 446, 447, and 448), four lower-division historical survey courses in British and American Literature (LIT 254, 255, 256, and 257), and to both the introductory and capstone courses dealing with literary theory (LIT 250 and 495) seem to undergird these strengths in their performance. In addition, 53% of the tested students scored above the 70th percentile on the entire exam.

Students' success on this test may also factor into the strong graduate school acceptance rate we have. Although past data on this has been largely anecdotal, with a revised Exit/Alumni Survey, we can report that our acceptance rate was 100% in the 2013-14 survey respondents.

The caution we would offer in reading this data is that with a fairly small sample size results are highly variable.

Weaknesses

The low enrollments in some of our courses are concerning and we are implementing changes to curriculum identified through the prioritization process to address this. We do not currently offer our students many opportunities to present the undergraduate research that they do in our upper-division and capstone classes. We continue to find it challenging to manage the ongoing and continually expanding demands of assessment and Program Review.

Other weaknesses we hope to address for increased growth in our program are

1. creating an Honor's Program to attract students who now go elsewhere for such programs.
2. increasing opportunities for our students to present their work at undergraduate research conferences to gain notice of our program's outstanding students.
3. having Admissions to partner with us to sustain direct communication with inquiring students from Preview Day through acceptance to enrollment. These efforts could be coordinated with all programs in the humanities.
4. having Marketing and Creative Services partner with us to design online and print marketing materials to communicate the top skills (written communication, critical thinking, information literacy) our students acquired through humanities study.
 - a. We have redesigned our department web pages and Preview Day materials to better communicate these strengths to inquiring students and families and received excellent support on our web redesign from Sharon Ayala (a literature graduate) in Marketing and Creative Services.
 - b. Unfortunately, we received fettered support from Admissions and virtually no support from Marketing and Creative Services with the redesign of our Preview Day print materials.
5. getting established a regular column in PLNU's *Viewpoint* magazine that would highlight the careers of our humanities graduates
6. having Administrators emphasize, when they are communicating with constituents, the specific and adaptable top skills that literature majors acquire in our program.

Other PLNU programs in the humanities would also benefit from these strategies.

2. Opportunity Analysis of the Program(s)

The preparation our program gives students--to become skilled writers, researchers, critical thinkers, and close readers in our text-saturated world--is outstanding. Employers seek these skills in business, law, government, education, international development, health care, and many other careers. Our graduates find employment in all these fields.

Internal Capability

Opportunities

Growth in the Literature Program may be supported externally by

1. a stabilizing economy which will begin to reverse the decline in humanities students nationwide.
2. an increasing demand for teachers due to early retirement incentives in San Diego Public School District--an opportunity for employment for our LIT-EE majors.
3. more deliberate communication with area high schools guidance counselling offices to share information (from our Preview Day materials) about our Literature Program

Threats

External factors that threaten maintenance of and growth in our program are

1. the economic downturn of 2008 causing a decline in the study of humanities and arts nationwide
2. cuts in California funding for education causing a decline in the number of students seeking majors in English Education.
3. more affordable B.A. degrees offered by our comparator/aspirant schools in southern California especially

PART VI - Program Review Themes for Future Inquiry

THEMES FOR FUTURE INQUIRY: Based on the current program review and analysis, discuss any future lines of inquiry the Academic Unit wants to pursue for continuous improvement of the program? Such future lines of inquiry might include revision to mission learning outcomes, goals, grant opportunities, revised assessment plan, specialized accreditation, etc.

- Alignment of PLOs and CLOs to newly adopted (11/19/14) ILOs and GELOs
- Review and revise CLOs for the course redesign mandated by prioritization and determined via this Program Review
- Maintain our annual assessment procedures and review as reported in our Assessment Wheel documents
- Review Literature major (LIT and LIT-EE) and scheduling of courses to insure that course enrollments reach or exceed target enrollments; menu-elective ratios stay near 1.5 target established in prioritization and that cost per credit hour remains at or below the Delaware Data benchmark
- Monitor the demand for secondary school English and Language Arts teachers to assess whether or not to write our LIT-EE curriculum to meet California State Standards for teacher credentialing
- Found a chapter of Sigma Tau Delta, the International English Honor Society as a step toward elevating the stature of the Literature Program; several of our Aspirant/Comparator schools have a chapter in their English/Literature departments
- Develop a strong undergraduate research culture and provide avenues for our majors to present their scholarship here and at other undergraduate research conferences
- Identify grant writing opportunities (for Poetry Day, Writer's Symposium, support for literary magazine, etc.) and pursue them

**Program Review Committee Feedback on Literature Self-study
(for complete PR committee report see the end of this document)**

- a. Literature Feedback: The committee felt that the Literature section of the self-study was very well researched and written and demonstrated significant reflection and analysis with good use of evidence. This may be tied to the fact that the assessment plan and infrastructure for literature was the most highly developed of the LJML programs. The one area of weakness in the Literature section was that the curriculum analysis against comparator programs was missing key benchmark information regarding the enrollment/size of the comparator programs. It is recommended that this information be included in the final version of the self-study.

PLNU Program Review

External Reviewer Report for the Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages Department

By Beth Martin Birky, Ph.D.

Professor of English, Women's and Gender Studies

Goshen College, Goshen Indiana

<https://www.goshen.edu/faculty/bethmb/>

Department Level Analysis

A) Introduction

Thank you for this opportunity to review the Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages Department Self-Study. I've been blessed by looking through this window of thoughtful self-reflection by committed Christian scholars in my field. I'm encouraged by our shared commitment to faith, academic excellence, service and social justice, as well as interdisciplinary and intercultural learning.

For the past 23 years, I have worked at Goshen College, a small, Christian liberal arts college. Like many professors in similar institutions, I've taught courses that in my specialization of Eighteenth-century British fiction, as well as those that have fulfilled institutional needs and those growing out of my passions. So my review your curriculum with experience teaching courses within my discipline, for General Education, for our international study program, and Women's and Gender Studies. Each teaching opportunity has helped me grow intellectually and spiritually, as well as pedagogically.

I also brought a range of administrative roles to my review. In my various stints as English department chair, GE director, Interim Associate Academic Dean, Writing Center director, and Women's and Gender Studies program director, I've written three reports for accreditation, two "prioritization" reports, and numerous annual reports. I also am the departmental liaison to our Secondary Education program, since I taught high school English for four years right after graduating from Goshen College. Most recently, I've been assisting with Title IX initiatives on our campus.

In co-curricular activities, I have also been adviser for our departmental publishing initiative, Pinchpenny Press, as well as editor of our annual departmental newsletter, adviser of the Goshen Student Women's Association and a more recent annual performance project called the Goshen Monologues.

As I read the LJML Self-Study reports, I resonated with your interdisciplinary approach, your commitment to student learning, your diligent efforts to assess your programs with both qualitative and quantitative measures. Like PLNU, Goshen College is facing significant changes in higher education and in society, particularly around issues of media, gender, diversity, and faith. I empathize with your clear desire for quality instruction and resources in the face of economic constraints. At the heart of each report, I felt your commitment to teaching with integrity, guiding students as they develop intellectually, as well as spiritually, emotionally, socially, and professionally.

What follows is by no means a comprehensive analysis of your extensive review. In addition to the reports, I examined your institutional and departmental web sites, several annual assessment reports, catalog descriptions of programs and some courses, and full-time faculty profiles. What follows is a synthesis of my observations of these materials in the format prescribed by the PLNU program review template.

While I recognize the limitations of my report, I offer my comments from the perspective of someone in a similar academic and denominational environment, who cares deeply about literature, language, intercultural learning and understanding and who believes that a holistic education is holy work.

I have been fortunate to complete this review in the context of my personal experience with Point Loma. Because I visited your campus in 2008 for a CCCU conference on gender, I had memories of the intensely blue sky, the ocean breeze (which isn't accessible, I understand, to those of you working in the BAC), and the remarkable beauty of the Point Loma campus. I've also had a chance to work with some of wonderful PLNU faculty members like Dr. Bettina Tate Pedersen and Dr. Linda Beail. I first met Dr. Beail in New Orleans in 2003 when the National Women's Studies Association (NWSA) conference combined our separate submissions into one session titled, "Striving or Thriving: Women's Studies and Gender Programs in Christian Colleges and Universities." I was pleased to work with her again for a 2014 NWSA conference panel that included Point Loma professors Dr. Kelli McCoy, Dr. Kara Lyons-Pardue, and Ms. Heather Ross. Our conversations and collaborations have given me additional context for the ethos and spirit, as well as the commitment and care PLNU faculty bring to their work.

Thank you again for this opportunity. God bless your continued work.

Sincerely,

Beth Martin Birky

B) Alignment with Mission

Please review and evaluate the academic unit's response to the questions regarding mission alignment of their unit with the university mission from both an academic and Christian faith perspective. Are there any suggestions for how they might better articulate and demonstrate their alignment to the university mission and purpose?

The LJML Self Study Introduction demonstrates how the department's mission aligns very well with PLNU's mission and core values. Through their large role in PLNU's GE program, the LJML department contributes significantly to each PLNU student's education, providing them with the content, skills, and dispositions needed to live out their faith in service. The LJML department also impacts student learning through important collaborative and interdisciplinary teaching across its academic units as well as other disciplines. The Self-Study documents, program descriptions, assessment materials, and proposals for the future, all demonstrate the department's overall success in "addressing varied global perspectives and diversity in the texts, languages, and theoretical approaches we study, employ, and produce" (LJML Self-Study Report: Introduction & Part I, page 8). As the Journalism report indicates, their work extends beyond *what* they study and *how* they teach and learn (Journalism/Broadcast Journalism: Parts II-VI, page 15). Their goal is to help students understand *why* language, writing, and literature matter and *why* stories of all kinds are essential to our individual lives, to human communities and culture, and to our relationship with God.

C) Quality, Qualifications and Productivity of Department Faculty

Based on all the evidence and responses provided in the program review report, provide a summary analysis of the qualifications of faculty associated with the program. Identify the degree to which scholarly production aligns with the expectations of the degree level of the program offered (undergraduate, master's) at this type of institution. Are there any strengths or distinctives that should be noted? Are there any gaps or weaknesses that should be noted?

The high percentage of full-time faculty with PhDs indicates PLNU's commitment to high quality instruction. Each department has faculty skilled in classic, traditional, and canonical scholarship, as well as contemporary and interdisciplinary expertise, such as photography, cinema, popular culture, media blogs, sustainability and social justice work. A review of full-time faculty C.V.s also reveals a commitment to scholarship, presentations, publications, and leadership related to issues in Christian higher education in areas like pedagogy, community and global service, intercultural study, gender, theology, and the Wesleyan tradition. Faculty model the integration of faith, scholarship, and service for their students.

Review and comment on the scholarship of the faculty. Identify the degree to which scholarly production aligns with the expectations of the degree level of the program offered (undergraduate, master's) at this type of institution. Where appropriate, suggest improvements that may be necessary to increase the quality and/or quantity of scholarship produced by the faculty in this program.

See comments above. I trust that individual department reviews have a better understanding of improvements in quality or quantity of scholarship needed for their programs and for the development of individual faculty members.

D) Progress on Recommendations from Previous Program Review

Review the narrative supplied for this section. Discuss whether it provided a good accounting and rationale for what changes have or have not been made based on the previous program review and/or any circumstances that have arisen since? Where appropriate, identify any insights or questions that you might have stemming from this narrative.

Although the LJML department's last program review was in 2004, they have undertaken reviews in the last 8 years when developing the Writing Program and French Program and when restructuring the Literature and English Education Programs, as they intersect with GE. The rationale for these changes is well-articulated in the Self-Study reports, but further developed in proposals to the Academic Policies Committee (APC) and in annual assessment reports. They are clearly in touch with broader contextual changes (i.e., shifts in Journalism and Writing into multiple media formats, the decline in demand for Humanities with the 2008 economic crisis, and changing demographics), in their respective disciplines (shifts in topics, skills, and experiential learning projects), and in PLNU's prioritization and assessment processes. Their changes are clearly grounded a variety of external and internal measurements, and I trust that they will continue to assess the quality of these changes.

E) GE and Service Classes

Identify any program response to GE or service classes that may be associated with this program. Review and discuss the quality of the program's responses to the questions in this section of the Self-Study. Identify any insights or suggestions that program might consider based on your knowledge of courses like these at other institutions.

The LJML department plays an important role in PLNU's GE program, and their courses are too numerous to consider individually. The Literature Self-Study report describes well their combined goal:

to prepare students for any career requiring the ability to communicate well in writing and in speaking, to consider issues from multi-cultural perspectives, and to thoughtfully consider others' perspectives and experiences, to critically analyze texts and structures, and to engage in deep reflection on our individual and communal lives. (LJML Self-Study Report: Introduction & Part 1, page 4)

The LJML courses in writing, literature, and language study contribute toward valuable skills, content, and dispositions articulated in PLNU's learning outcomes. PLNU students also receive a high quality education through the superbly qualified, full-time faculty who teach in the GE program with a high level of expertise and investment in a rigorous Christian liberal arts curriculum.

In reviewing LJML department's proposal for changes to the literature requirements in GE, I was pleased to see that they proposed revising the "Great Works" and "Masterpieces" model to include offerings that connect literary study to a diverse, global context. A new course, LIT 200—Literature and Culture, and departmental courses related to diversity (under "Seeking Cultural Perspectives") incorporate important shifts in the global literary culture into PLNU's core values of "Global Perspective and Experience" and "Ethnic and Cultural Diversity." This change also contributes to a broader understanding of "Excellence in Teaching and Learning" and a valuable redefinition of the role of literature in shaping an "Intentional Christian Community" and in the "Development of Students as Whole Persons."

F) Program Level Analysis

1. Trend and Financial Analysis

Based on data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the effectiveness of the program's recruitment and matriculation efforts as it relates to enrollment. Are there any suggestions or insights that you might have that can help to increase the demand for the program and/or improve the enrollment yield?

The LJML department is clearly strong, productive, resourceful, and successful. Data show that its programs attract students with excellent academic credentials. Their exceptionally high retention rates attest to engaging curricula, varied co-curricular opportunities, supportive faculty, and effective pedagogy.

With strong overall retention and matriculation rates that surpass PLNU averages, they are aware that they need to expand their recruiting strategies to address an overall drop in majors and minors. Some internal variation in headcount can be attributed to the creation of the Writing Program, but my sense is that the Writing Program may attract new majors and minors.

As I reviewed the Writing Self-Study report, for example, I was struck by the strong profile of majors (high SAT scores, better male/female ratio than campus average, increasing diversity). I was intrigued by the observation about building community through Wri 216 Literary Magazine Workshop and the collaborative environment that it fosters. I wonder whether there would be a way to market this collaborative learning model both internally and externally to recruit students.

As I reviewed the institutional web site, I also sensed that one way to increase demand might be through additional interdisciplinary collaborations, particularly the way the language (Spanish) and communication (Writing and Journalism) majors and minors could combine with many majors on campus. The LJML programs could enhance students' critical thinking, writing, and speaking skills, making them more marketable, as well as more well-rounded and adaptable employees.

Writing and speaking a second language could be particularly appealing for students in the Sustainability Studies minor, the Cross Disciplinary Studies major, as well as International Studies, International Development, Economics, Environmental Studies, and Science Business and Marketing.

I would also like to see clearer articulation of the English Education major outcomes and requirements. When I looked at the School of Education's website, I found a little more clarity, but I had to drill down quite far to locate what one might need for English Education. The titles of the Education programs—Cross Disciplinary Studies: Integrated Education B.A. and Teacher Education, B.A.—did not help me determine which program trained elementary and which secondary education teachers. Although California credentialing of teachers may be completely different than Indiana's, I see room to enhance visibility of this program and recruit potential majors. This could precede efforts to revise the English Education curriculum "to meet California State Standards for teacher credentialing" (Literature: Parts II-VI, page 31). I would have a similar recommendation related to clearer articulation and visibility of outcomes, curriculum, and opportunities for Spanish Education. All of this is said with an awareness that our political climate has severely impacted the number of students pursuing Education.

Each program within the LJML department provided a thorough analysis of recruitment and matriculation rates. They articulate well the centrality of their programs to institutional mission, values, and outcomes.

Based on data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the program's role in GE and Service functions and identify any opportunities or challenges from this that could have positive or negative impacts on the program itself.

Overall these are excellent. I don't have anything specific to suggest, as I described above.

Based on data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the efficiency of the program based on its overall and course enrollment trends along with the external benchmarking use of

the cost per student credit hour data (Delaware). Are there any suggestions or insights that you might have that can help to increase the efficiency of the program without having a negative impact on quality?

Each program has a few upper-level courses with low enrollment patterns, but their Self-Study reports demonstrate an assessment of causes and well-reasoned solutions. They also respond to recommendations made by the prioritization process and, I believe, have made wise choices to reduce the number of low enrollment classes by eliminating the Romance Language program, combining courses, and shifting offering patterns. I trust that ongoing assessment of these efforts will help identify whether or not they achieve their goals or whether other strategies are needed. The Self-Study reports demonstrate a careful consideration of multiple measures of success and models for best practice.

One area to consider further might be the differences between requirements for Spanish and French majors.

1. The two programs vary significantly in the number of units required (Spanish 53 units, French 41-44). I would recommend finding ways to combine or reduce upper-level literature requirements in Spanish.
2. Only Spanish has a Linguistics requirement. I would recommend adding a Linguistics requirement for French, perhaps a Linguistics course that could serve both.
3. Only Spanish has a capstone requirement. I would recommend adding a capstone course for French, or offer a capstone course that could work for both Spanish and French majors.

The Literature Self-Study report demonstrates solid awareness of the broader shifts in the Humanities disciplines, driven in part by economic dynamics, but also shifts in the literary canon. Their course offerings align well with the diversity and global scope in contemporary literature and criticism (Post-Colonial, Literature and Culture, World Cinema).

One area to explore further would be formalizing the co-curricular activities of literature majors through an internship requirement (Literature: Parts II-VI, page 23) or expanded service learning opportunities (Literature: Parts II-VI, page 14).

In assessing internal weaknesses, the Literature Self-Study report mentions that an Honor's Program could attract some students "who now go elsewhere for such programs" (Literature: Parts II-VI, page 29). While I value opportunities for in-depth research and writing as preparation for graduate school, I would encourage the department to explore further evidence for this observation.

2. Findings from Assessment

After reviewing the program's responses to their assessment findings, do you think the program is effectively using their assessment activities and data? Are there suggestions that you might make to improve their assessment plan or insights from their data that you might offer in addition to their analysis? Discuss the quality of their analysis and identify elements of their analysis that you think could be strengthened.

I looked at several assessment reports: Self-Study reports, The Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) overview from 2012-2013, their curriculum maps, and assessment reports. In each I saw appropriate methods for assessment, clear assignments and rubrics, as well as evaluation of the data for its implications for their programs. With small numbers (such as those from the ETS major field test), they are understandably cautious about using quantitative measures to determine major areas for revision. I believe they are doing a good job at drawing reasonable conclusions about areas for improvement and adjustment. For example, the Literature Annual Assessment report identifies collaborative assessment of senior portfolios, as well as longitudinal analysis of critical thinking measures for GE Learning Outcomes (GELOs). These strategies allow for input at multiple stages and for collaborative analysis of results.

3. Curriculum Analysis

After reviewing the program's curricular analysis, student learning outcomes (SLOs), and curricular map, characterize the quality and appropriateness of the program's curriculum for meeting the learning outcomes expected of students within this discipline. Identify any possible changes to the curriculum or to the SLOs that would result in an improved program.

Several hallmarks demonstrate LJML's excellence in providing a high quality teaching and learning environment inside and outside the classroom.

- They provide several popular and **successful co-curricular opportunities** that are supported by faculty leadership and instruction. Signature programs connect their students to the campus community: Poetry Day, The Writer's Symposium by the Sea, *The Point Weekly* (newspaper), *Driftwood* (literary arts journal), and *The Mariner* (yearbook).
- *The Writer's Studio* also offers an integrated teaching and learning environment where a **peer education model** connects students across disciplines, strengthening a key GE skill of writing and providing valuable training and experience for the tutors themselves.
- The **study abroad** opportunities in the United Kingdom are unique and are a valuable strategy for combining disciplinary learning through traditional coursework and experiential learning.
- The LJML department offers **shared courses and requirements** in an effort to deepen student learning. At the same time, they expose their students to diverse instructional styles and content.
- Another hallmark of the LJML department is their **collaboration outside their department** with courses in Communication, Theater, Cinema, Public Relations, Education, Women's Studies, and International Studies. Because their disciplines provide essential communication, research, and critical thinking skills, I see even more possibilities for interdisciplinary collaborations (see above).
- Student learning and departmental assessment are enhanced by **capstone courses** in most of the majors.
- All of the programs include **internship or practicum** options and requirements, and I encourage them to continue exploring ways that these experiences can be pathways to careers, as well as bridges to the larger community and church.

A review of the curriculum for each LJML program reveals rigorous and up-to-date disciplinary structures and requirements that align well with disciplinary trends. Below are a few suggestions to consider, although they may not be appropriate for your context. I trust any program changes will continue to be grounded in your own informed assessment of internal and external influences.

Journalism: The combination of two courses (Wri 310 Advanced Reporting and Wri 350 Writing for Mass Media) is a good idea. I would suggest that elements of these courses, or the new course that results, could be appealing to other disciplines that find a growing need within professions to communicate effectively, particularly utilizing social media. Perhaps this course could be marketed to strong writers in other disciplines who might be involved in media promotion or communication in their fields. Perhaps the Wri 430, Multimedia Journalism course could also be attractive to students from other disciplines. I also see a need for including a capstone course for the Journalism major. One thing to consider might be having a combined capstone course for Journalism and Writing majors.

Another area for potential development of the curriculum could be in developing internships that could help students connect to community news agencies. The department notes that most students work on campus website, newspaper, radio and televisions stations but do not generally report to “audiences beyond our campus” (Journalism/Broadcast Journalism: Parts II-VI, page 13). Although I am not familiar with your community or regional resources, I know that our Broadcast and Journalism departments have an ongoing relationship with local newspapers and television news stations that allow students to intern and even do freelance work. Our Journalism professor has also collaborated with a local community development organization called “The Good of Goshen” to write a series of features that were linked to their website. Such examples might suggest similar possibilities in your region.

Under the Journalism analysis of opportunities, I also affirm their vision for a “multimedia education.” I hope they prioritize courses, internships, and instruction that creatively meet the changing dynamics between media and content, style, and audience.

Writing: I affirm the decision to require Wri 220 Intro to Creative Writing, which establishes foundational workshop skills for other writing courses. Before requiring Wri 370 Writing Theory and Pedagogy, I encourage the department to consider how it will impact a range of students with interdisciplinary interests. On our campus, we are moving toward more flexibility and choice, primarily because of student demand for options. Your campus may have different student expectations.

I do hope that the department can meet the growing demand for Wri 365 Writing for Professional Careers. This course, or a version of it, could help the department connect with other disciplines, in addition to supporting the Managerial and Organizational Communication program.

After reviewing the program’s curricular analysis through a guild or comparator lens, summarize and discuss the quality of their analysis and comparison and offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider regarding their curriculum content and structure.

Languages: I was interested to note that the comparative analysis of aspirant schools for Spanish showed that few had a Mexican-American literature course. I support the inclusion of this important course because of its relevance to your student population (22.5% Hispanic, Fall 2015) and wonder if the four Peninsular and Latin American literature surveys could be combined to make space for the this class. Another option would be to offer the Mexican-American literature course in English so that it could be a part of the GE offerings or could be marketed to other disciplines like International Studies or Women's Studies.

I also noted that few programs in your comparative analysis have a Spanish linguistics course. At my college, all language majors and English majors take the same linguistics courses. Another alternative to consider is offering a linguistics course that is required for Spanish and French majors.

Literature: In response to the department's observations about their comparative position in the number of units required for the major, I would concur that the major might benefit from reducing requirements to make it more accessible and flexible.

After reviewing the program's curricular analysis through an employability lens, summarize and discuss the quality of their analysis and narrative and offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider regarding their curriculum content and structure as a preparation for future employment.

All programs within the LJML department have begun tracking alumni data and exit surveys that will provide an important data set for programmatic review of this area.

After reviewing the program's curricular analysis through a pedagogy lens, summarize and discuss the quality of their analysis and narrative and offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider regarding the delivery of their curriculum in ways to enhance the student learning experience.

I did not note discussion of specific pedagogical strategies as part of the Self-Study reports. The LJML department overview articulates a commitment in their mission statement to "the texts, languages, and theoretical approaches we study, employ, and produce" (LJML Self-Study Report: Introduction & Part I, page 8). This demonstrates their of pedagogy and practice, as well as curriculum and content.

All programs have an effective balance of lower and upper-level courses, which suggest a concern for a progression of curricular depth as well as breadth. The capstone course is important for outcomes of research, speaking, and writing.

The number of co-curricular opportunities and special events also enrich the student learning environment and should be supported and maintained. I was not sure if all co-curricular activities had release time for faculty advisers working with the Wri 215 Newspaper Workshop, Wri 216, Literary Magazine Workshop, or Wri 217 Yearbook Workshop. This would be an important element to include in order to ensure strong faculty support and instruction in these valuable programs.

4. Potential Impact of National Trends

After reviewing the program's discussion of possible impacts from national trends, discuss the quality of their response and identify if there are trends in the discipline that the Self-Study has missed or not adequately addressed based on your expertise and opinion.

The LJML department seems to have been pro-active in weathering significant changes in their disciplines in the last 8 years.

Journalism: The disciplinary changes in Journalism have been significant, and the department appears to have examined and addressed expanding dynamics of reporting (Journalism/Broadcast Journalism: Parts II-VI, page 15) and the shifting forms and skills required in the field. I appreciate the need to balance “traditional” journalism and “multimedia” or “interactive” journalism, and I encourage the department to consider ways that the two are in continual and evolving relationship, rather than competition.

Languages: The department has addressed the shift away from Romance Languages and embraced the growing significance of Spanish in the U.S. overall and southern California, in particular. I encourage them to consider potential connections to Education. Another consideration would be a Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL) program, which would align well with your institutional mission and values, particularly service in a diverse and global context. The service learning component mentioned in the themes for future inquiry is also an excellent idea to pursue.

Literature: The Literature program acknowledges the cultural shifts related to the Humanities and brings that awareness to their proposals and revisions. The long-term impact of this shift is uncertain, but the department has been responsive to these shifts and will most certainly face future change effectively.

Writing: This program developed in response to the demand for an interdisciplinary writing program that crosses between journalism and creative writing. The initial years of the program have been successful and clearly meet an important need.

5. Quality Markers

After reviewing the program’s discussion of its quality markers and the questions posed in this section of the Self-Study, discuss the quality of their response to these questions and identify any particular strengths and/or weaknesses that you might see in this section of the Self-Study. Please offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider relating to these quality markers.

While each department has specific concerns related to faculty expertise, gender, and racial/ethnic diversity, they all consider the way future staffing opportunities relate to ongoing developments in their discipline and goals for their programs.

6. Infrastructure and Staffing

After reviewing the program’s discussion of its infrastructure and staffing, discuss the quality of their analysis and reflection in this important area and offer any suggestions or insights that you might suggest they consider.

Each of the Self-Study reports mentioned the importance of revising the job description and training of a department assistant to better meet the evolving computer, publicity/marketing, and data needs of the programs.

7. Challenges and Opportunities

Do you feel the report adequately identified the challenges and opportunities that they face based on your understanding of the discipline? Why or why not. Are there other challenges or opportunities that you see based on your review of the Self-Study and your understanding of the discipline in today's higher education context?

This section of each Self-Study report grows out of careful assessment and collaborative reflection. Some of their concerns and recommendations are addressed above. I am certain that their themes for future inquiry will lead them to new opportunities. I appreciated that most Self-Study reports include pursuing grant writing opportunities. I also am intrigued by the benefits of an alumni advisory group mentioned in the Writing Self-Study report. This could be valuable for the LJML program as a whole.

8. Recommendations for Program Improvement

Do you feel the recommendations being made for this program are supported by the analysis and evidence provided in the Self-Study document and narrative? Discuss why or why not. Are there other recommendations or suggestions that you would make that the academic unit should consider? If so, please give a brief rationale for why?

I did not see significant consideration of online courses, but that may be something to consider given the direction of higher education in general. Such programs are most successful when they are integrated into each program's curriculum and when their development has strong institutional support. They may also provide a means for other disciplines to access your programs.

G) External Reviewer Feedback on PLNU Program Review Process:

We recognize that there are many ways to approach a program review. We would value your feedback on our process so that that we can continue to make it better and more helpful to the programs undergoing review. Are there areas that were confusing or sections that you felt were unhelpful? Are there areas that you were not asked about where you feel you could have provided useful information? Is there anything about the process that you would recommend we change or consider changing that could make it better?

The template was helpful in structuring my responses, although the responses boxes did create some formatting difficulties. The curriculum analysis section of the Self-Study reports was not structured like the template and did not really address issues of employability and pedagogy.

**LIT Response to PR Committee and External Reviewer
Literature/English Education Program
April 2016**

Plan for Improvement: Recommendations from the Program Review:

List the recommendations that emerged from the program review that will be pursued to improve the programs housed in the academic unit.

The Program Review Committee had only one recommendation for the Literature/English Education Program. The Committee noted that the curriculum analysis against comparator programs was missing key benchmark information regarding the enrollment/size of the comparator programs.

Action Steps for Implementing Improvements:

Indicate the actions steps and timeline that will be followed to implement the recommendations being pursued. Note – not all recommendations listed need to be implemented.

Since receiving the committee’s feedback, a comparative study has been done. The results printed below can also be found in the Writing Program response.

The Program was asked to more fully compare its program to other programs. We chose to begin the process by comparing the program to the aspirant schools provided to us. The LJML Department Chair contacted all ten aspirant programs via email and received responses from seven (USD, Occidental, Santa Clara, Seattle Univ., Univ. of Portland, Redlands, and Wheaton). This comparative work is challenging because most aspirant schools do not have a separate Writing program but instead have an English major with concentrations in Literature and Writing. So we compared our Literature and Writing programs together to the English programs at the aspirant schools. The results reveal that PLNU compares favorably in terms of the program’s productivity. Because many of the aspirant schools are much larger than PLNU, the most useful comparison is the percentage of the English majors related to the overall student body. The results can be seen in the chart below:

School	Undergrad Enrollment	English Majors (at PLNU Writing and Literature majors combined)	% of the Undergraduate Population
PLNU	2556	61	2.4%
USD	5647	121	2.1%
Santa Clara	5486	123	2.2%
Occidental	2040	45	2.2%
Portland Univ.	3741	95	2.5%
Redlands	3779	112	3.0%
Seattle Univ.	4712	148	3.1%
Wheaton	2400	151	6.3%

As the chart indicates, with the exception of Wheaton, PLNU’s Literature and Writing Programs combined compare favorably to the productivity of English programs at an aspirant school roughly our size (Occidental) as well as much larger schools. We draw the percentage of the undergraduate population we would be expected to draw.

Comparing the productivity of faculty (measured by how many majors the faculty serve) is much harder to do. The aspirant schools reported widely divergent numbers—from five at USD to thirty-four at Santa Clara. Clearly, the schools interpret “full-time faculty teaching in the program” very differently from one another.

Assessment Measures:

What assessments will be done to determine if the recommendations are leading towards the desired improvements? How will we know if we have been successful?

Success in this measure has been achieved with the inclusion of the information listed above.

Financial Implications of the Action Steps:

Are there any financial implications associated with the actions steps coming from the program review recommendations? If so, what is the timeline and estimated scope of each need listed?

The action steps have been completed with no financial implications.

Areas of Accountability:

Are there areas identified by the administration that need particular attention during the next review cycle period? If so, indicate what they are and how and when they will be addressed.

The one area of accountability identified by the administration is addressed in the information above.

Response to the External Reviewer's Comments

The external reviewer commented not only on the Literature/English Ed Program but on other programs in the department. Her comments were generally favorable, especially regarding the revisions to the Literature GE offerings as a way to restructure the major.

WRITING

PART II – Core Commitment to Institutional Integrity, Sustainability, and Accountability

1. External Demand for the Program(s): Analysis of enrollment trends and retention data

For full data from the Office of Institutional Research on all university measures for the Writing Program, please see

- <https://my.pointloma.edu/ICS/Departments/Administrative Offices/Institutional Research/Program Review.jnz>

The Noel-Levitz research schema put all three majors-- Broadcast Journalism/Journalism/Writing programs—together into one grouping. Noel-Levitz High School Market Demand Share data for Broadcast Journalism/Journalism/Writing programs indicates that our Broadcast Journalism/Journalism/Writing Programs attract interest at a rate of 1.4% regionally (above the PLNU median).

Noel-Levitz PLNU Share of Regional Degrees Awarded data (based on the total number of bachelor's degrees awarded between 2003-04 and 2010-11 from institutions within a 150-mile radius of San Diego) shows that PLNU's share of Broadcast Journalism/Journalism/Writing degrees awarded out of all such degrees awarded in the region is 1.3% (above the PLNU median).

It is difficult to compare the percentages of interest and shares of degrees awarded across our literature, language, broadcast journalism, journalism, and writing majors since they were not identified as the individual majors they are in our university. Additionally, such comparisons are made difficult since the data for Broadcast Journalism was halved between the departments of LJML and Communication and Theater. Nevertheless, the Writing Program analysis is provided below.

The past five-year enrollment trends for the Writing Program show stability in the program. The Writing Program began to enroll students in the Fall of 2008 with 9 students. It increased to 27 students in the Fall of 2009 and remained at or above that level through the Fall of 2013.

Writing Major	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
Headcount	9	27	28	33	28	35

The curricular metrics indicate the health of the Writing program.

First Time Freshmen Admissions

		Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012
Inquiries	Number	5	44	48	44	80
Applications	Number	5	40	29	22	39
	Conversion	100%	90.9%	60.4%	50%	48.8%

	Rate					
Admitted	Number	5	36	20	15	27
	Selection Rate	100%	90%	69%	68.2%	69.2%
Matriculated	Number	4	9	3	10	4
	Yield	80%	25%	15%	66.7%	14.8%

Because the program is still growing, a wide swing in the percentages of FTF yield can occur based on the decisions of just a few potential students. With that caution in place, we can examine the FTF data for the program in relationship to the university as a whole. The yield for the fall of 2013 is encouraging, but no discernable trend can be identified.

FTF	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
App Conversion Rate	100%	88.6%	47.9%	43.2%	43.8%	35.6%
Admission Rate	100%	92.3%	87%	78.9%	77.1%	92.3%
Yield	80%	25%	15%	66.7%	14.8%	45.8%
PLNU Yield	37.2%	27.5%	29.4%	26.5%	29.2%	31.6%

Because of the recent addition of the program, graduation and retention rates do not yet provide meaningful data, but the 3-Year Combined Cohort data below indicates stability in the program.

Year	Unduplicated University Total	Rolling 3-Year Combined Cohorts: Writing
2006-2008	84.7%	85.7%
2007-2009	83.8%	80%
2008-2010	83.1%	78.9%
2009-2011	82.7%	79.2%

2. Internal Demand for the Program(s)

Support of University Programs: Writing courses represent five units of the typical general education experience of PLNU students. This will decrease to four units with the changes mandated by the process of establishing priorities for the academic sector but remains a significant source of internal demand.

In addition, writing major courses fulfill requirements in the following programs: Literature, Journalism, Education, Communication, Business, and Liberal Studies. Non-majors generate about a third of the units.

Share of Undergraduate Headcount: Both the major and minor are trending upward in internal demand. And the share of the undergraduate population has remained fairly constant.

Writing Major	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
Headcount	9	27	28	33	28	35
Headcount Share	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
	0.4%	1.2%	1.2%	1.5%	1.2%	1.4%

Retention Rates and Migration: Students tend to migrate into the Writing major from other majors, rather than out to other majors. In the past five years the program has absorbed former journalism, literature, science, business, and consumer science majors.

3. Size, Scope, and Productivity of the Program(s)

Faculty Profile: As of the fall of 2014, two full-time faculty have their primary teaching responsibilities in the program. Both are tenured full professors. Both teach full loads with no administrative load credits for running the program. One faculty member is actually only teaching in the program on the Point Loma campus half time. The other half is spent teaching in the London Semester general education program. A third faculty member left the university at the end of the 2014 spring semester leaving a significant hole. Both full-time faculty members are in the same basic demographic in regard to age, gender, race/ethnicity, and academic preparation. Both also produce similar creative and academic work. Therefore, the program faculty lacks diversity.

Teaching Assignments: The two full-time faculty with primary responsibility for the Writing Program (Hill and Winderl) teach nearly all the courses required for the major. The primary exception would be the courses taught by the Journalism full-time faculty and journalism adjuncts. Both have advised honors projects. Both faculty also teach College Composition courses and general education literature courses. And both actively support study abroad programs. Hill has led the way in taking groups to the UK during the summer, and Winderl participates in the London Semester.

Student Profile: The enrollment numbers of Writing majors indicate stability in the program.

Writing Major	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
Headcount	9	27	28	33	28	35

The enrollment status data indicates the diversity represented by students in the program.

Writing Major	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
Gender						

Male	2 (22.2%)	12 (44.4%)	13 (46.4%)	16 (48.5%)	12 (42.95)	NA
Female	7 (77.8%)	15 (55.6%)	15 (53.6%)	17 (51.5%)	16 (57.1%)	NA
Avg. Load	16.78	15.78	15.52	15.12	14.61	NA

4. Revenue and Other Resources Generated by the Program

The program does not generate revenue beyond tuition.

5. Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program(s)

The Literature Program budget is included in the budget for the Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages department; thus, it does not have a stand alone budget.

LJML Department budget totals for the past three years are in the table below and include all costs for departmental needs for all LJML programs.

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Annual LJML Budget	\$60, 979	\$60.979	\$60,970
Closing LJML Balance	\$6,810.39	\$3,997.95	-\$3480.58

The cost of combined programs (Journalism, Broadcast Journalism, and Writing) fell outside of the optimal range as defined by the Delaware Data for the academic years 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. The cost per unit for Journalism and Writing was \$261.00 per unit in the 2010-2011 year and \$268.00 for the 2011-2012 year. The cost for the 2012-2013 year fell to \$241.00 per unit and moved the programs into the 63%-75% range. This percentile ranking may be more of an indicator of the way the Delaware Data is set up rather than it is of the actual cost per unit comparison it purports to be. There are no peer schools in the data for this program. The journalism and writing courses were grouped together. This schema is not accurate to our programs in two areas: we have writing courses that serve GE, and then we have writing courses that serve four distinct programs--Broadcast Journalism, Journalism, Writing, and English Education. The data is quite preliminary and certainly reflects the fact that many of the faculty in the programs hold the rank of full professor and command higher salaries than their junior colleagues.

6. Quality of Program Inputs and Processes

- **Faculty**

All courses except Editing and Electronic Journalism are taught by full time faculty, as has been the case since the creation of the program. Upper division writing courses are occasionally taught by full-time faculty in Journalism. Linguistics courses are taught by a full-time faculty member in LJML who does not have primary placement in the Writing Program as is the case for WRI 370 Writing Theory and Pedagogy.

We have two full-time writing professors with specialties in writing but only one is on campus every semester. The other teaches half-time in the London Semester program. Both are tenured full professors with more than ten years of teaching at PLNU. Neither has announced plans to retire. A third full-time professor left the university at the end of the spring semester 2014. The faculty member's departure has created a significant challenge to the program, for the faculty member helped anchor the program and had significant input in student advising (including the advising of honors projects), innovative pedagogy, and the program's assessment work.

Please see section II.3 above for Faculty Profile information already discussed.

Please see faculty vita in Appendix B.

- **Adequacy and Availability**

Our faculty has experience teaching in all creative writing areas. The program has support from faculty in journalism and broadcast journalism and a strong pool of adjuncts.

For our last Writing program position opening, we had success in hiring a professor with experience in all the areas we needed and extensive background in Christian higher education. We have attracted women and minority applicants in our last several department and major job searches. However, with two male faculty members and more than 50% of the majors in the program female, we do not have the optimal gender balance among faculty members.

- **Professional Development/ Travel Support**

The faculty in the program enjoy the same development opportunities and support for travel that faculty across campus enjoy.

- **Technology**

The program faculty make use of the provided technology on campus and find that technology adequate for their work.

- **Information and technology resources**

Technology and library resources are adequate for the program's needs.

- **Facilities and other**

The facilities are adequate for the program's needs.

- **Staff**

The program shares a departmental assistant with other programs in the department. The entire department is adjusting to the decision to move from 1.5 full time support staff to 1.

- **Student Profile**

Since the fall of 2009, the non-white percentage of students in the major has remained between 20-30% and appears to be higher than this with the incoming class of the fall of 2014. In the same time period, the percentage of female students has remained over 50%, reaching a high of 57% in the fall of 2012. Over the life of the program since 2008, the program has enrolled Hispanic/Latino, Native American, and Asian American students.

In general, the incoming student profile for the three consolidated programs (Writing, Journalism, and Broadcast Journalism) in terms of SAT scores is at or above the median level

for the university. This is particularly true in the verbal portion of the test and the composite scores. The same is true in terms of incoming students' High School GPAs. In general terms, and particularly in the Writing program, the sections attract very qualified students who go on to be successful undergraduates.

Students who enroll in Wri 216 Literary Magazine Workshop experience a strong sense of community as they work together to design and publish *The Driftwood*, the campus literary magazine. In addition, the major fosters community by the very structure of the workshop nature of much of the instruction. Students regularly read each other's work in class.

Since 2008, both SAT scores and GPAs have trended up. We can focus on apparent sharp fluctuations in some years, but since numbers are so small, the averages can be easily skewed by one or two low- or high-achievers. Likewise, we see apparent fluctuations in minority enrollment, but with the general low numbers overall and low minority enrollment, the addition or loss of one minority student can appear, at least statistically, as a significant gain or loss. Thus it is difficult to draw any realistic conclusions from the data at this point.

	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
SAT Composite	sm	1180	sm	1207	sm	1258
SAT Reading	sm	608	sm	650	sm	670
SAT Math	sm	573	sm	557	sm	588
High School GPA	sm	3.63	sm	3.80	sm	3.82

- **Course Profile:**

The courses in the programs in the LJML Department are designed to be interconnected. Thus, drawing conclusions regarding courses offered in a particular program is difficult. All courses in the Writing Program aside from Wri 420 Advanced Writing Workshop can be used to meet requirements in other majors. Writing courses in the program tend to be small as is fitting courses taught in a workshop format. Of the courses in the major, only Wri 321 Creative Writing: Poetry consistently enrolled fewer than ten students when offered in the regular fall and spring semesters in the time period measured by the Delaware Data. The capstone course at times registered fewer than 10--even at times fewer than 5--but the enrollment in this required capstone course will fluctuate according to enrollment in the major.

The following table summarizes enrollments for the last three years (General education literature courses that also meet requirements in the major are omitted as are the literature courses Writing majors take to fulfill requirements but in which they represent a small percentage of the total course enrollment. The enrollments in the internship course are also omitted. Enrollment in the literature courses is reported in the Literature/English Education portion of this report):

Course #	Course Name	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
----------	-------------	------	--------	------	--------	------	--------

		2011	2012	2012	2013	2013	2014
Wri 215	Point Weekly	20	15	17	16	24	18
Wri 216	Driftwood	14	13	15	16	10	17
Wri 217	Yearbook	9	11	10	12	7	15
Wri 220*	Intro to Creative Writing	12		9		8	
Wri 250.1	Intro to Journalism	11	13	17	27	20	10
Wri250.2	Intro to Journalism	11		17		17	14
Wri 313	Electronic Journalism		8		9		11
Wri 315	Adv. Comp.	15		7		13	
Wri 321	Writing: Poetry		9		5		12
Wri 322	Writing: Fiction		20	10		20	
Wri 323	Writing: Creative Non Fiction	11	13	16	18	9	16
Wri 345	Editing	6		12		18	
Wri 350	Writing for the Mass Media	2		4		12	
Wri 365	Writing for Professional Careers		22		22		
Wri 370	Writing Theory and Pedagogy	12		8		4	
Wri 420	Adv. Writing Workshop		6		9		10
Wri 430	Multi Media Journalism		4	13	1		

* 15 are enrolled in the fall of 2014

This table tracks enrollment in non "Wri" courses taken for the major.

Course #	Course Name	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014
Lit 250	Intro to the Study of Literature	11	15	11	13	12	12
Lin 312	Intro to Linguistics	9		6		11	
Lin 365	English Grammar and Usage		12		9		8
Lin 404	Linguistics Seminar				2		

- **Resource Profile:**

The resources provided by the university are adequate for the needs of the program and its students.

Capacity and Resource for Academic Quality

Key Findings	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Since its inception as a major program in 2008, the Writing Program has maintained steady enrollments and attracted well qualified students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The university should maintain its current level of support for the program.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● With the departure of one of the three full time faculty members with primary responsibility for teaching and advising students in the program after the spring semester of 2014 and with the expansion of the London Semester into an annual rather than a semi-annual program, the number of faculty in the program have decreased to a level where quality instruction may be difficult to maintain. In addition, if the next hire were to be female, a more appropriate gender balance between faculty in the program and students in the program would be achieved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The university should support the hiring of a third faculty member with primary responsibility for teaching in the program. By action of the President's Cabinet, the search has been authorized. As of Nov. 12, the position has been posted on the PLNU website.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Enrollments in the Creative Writing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Alter the program to make Wri 220 a

sequence (Wri 220, 321, 322, and 323) are lower than desired.	required course in the major and offer Wri 321, 322, and 323 less frequently and do not allow students to repeat the any of the courses in order to boost enrollment and provide students with a wider range of experiences.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enrollments in Wri 370 Writing Theory and Pedagogy are low and sometimes barely adequate to staff the Writers' Studio program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider making Wri 370 a required course in the program. This would require the prerequisite (Lin 365) to become a required course as well.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wri 365 Writing for Professional Careers is a menu option for the Managerial and Organizational Communication program and has been filled to capacity when it is offered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This puts enrollment pressure on Wri 365 making it a challenge for Writing majors to enroll in the course during the appropriate semester. We should consider offering this required course more frequently.

PART III – Educational Effectiveness: Analysis of Evidence about Academic Program Quality and Viability

- Quality of Program Outcomes**

MISSION: Our Mission Statement was drafted and adopted in 2011-12. No changes were made in 2012-13 or 2013-14.

- <http://assessment.pointloma.edu/academic-assessment/department-of-literature-journalism-modern-languages/mission/>

OUTCOMES: Our Department Learning Outcomes (DLOs) were revised in 2011-12. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) were drafted, implemented, assessed, reviewed, and revised over the 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14 academic years. In spring 2014 we eliminated our Department Learning Outcomes (DLOs) at the recommendation of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee after its review of our wheel. We have made revisions to all of our PLOs to (1) retain the key concepts that were central from DLOs, (2) embed all five WASC Core Competencies into the language of our PLOs, and (3) bring outcomes into closer alignment with what we are actually doing in current instruction. All outcomes were written and revised with Bloom's Taxonomy in mind. Alignment of our Program Learning Outcomes to Institutional Learning Outcomes are indicated in the documents loaded on our Assessment Wheel-Student Learning. Documents for 2011-12 and 2012-13 are archived on our wheel.

The program in Writing began in 2008, so it is still relatively new. The program has also gone through some turnover in faculty with the departure of a full-time faculty member at the end of the spring semester, 2014. The disruption has led to a delay in the development of a full assessment plan. The assessment plan is now in place but still needs to be further developed and implemented. Program faculty have opted for a three year cycle of assessment activities with different PLOs assessed in different years. All of the work is thoroughly documented on the Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages (LJML) Assessment Wheel and the DQP pages:

- <http://assessment.pointloma.edu/academic-assessment/department-of-literature-journalism-modern-languages/>
- <http://assessment.pointloma.edu/institutional-assessment/degree-qualifications-profile/>

In the 2013-2014 academic year, PLO 4 was assessed in Wri 315. The summary is that in all but very select cases, students are meeting the goals of PLO 4 at a more than adequate level and that they are doing so as a cohort in a fairly uniform manner. The use of evidence calls for further development of a subjective measure to complement the subjective and objective measures currently in use. This will be employed the next time Wri 315 assessed in the three year cycle.

MAPS: The curriculum map are in place and available for review on the LJML Assessment Wheel:

- [LJML Map 2013-2014 Curriculum Map WRI](#)

PLAN: The assessment plan has been adopted and can be reviewed on the Assessment Wheel.

- [11. LJML Plan 2013-2014 Assessment Plan Writing](#)
- [12. LJML Plan 2013-2014 Assessment 3YR Cycle Writing](#)

EVIDENCE: A variety of reports regarding the evidence gathered are available on the Assessment Wheel.

- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Assessment Report WRI](#)
- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Assessment Report WRI 315](#)
- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Assessment Report WRI Sr Port](#)
- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Assess Rpt WRI420 Sr Port Rubric](#)
- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Assessment Report WRI 321 Rubric](#)
- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Assessment Report WRI 322 Rubric](#)
- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Assessment Report WRI 323 Rubric](#)
- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Assess Rpt WRI Internship Instructions](#)
- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Assess Rpt WRI Internship Form](#)

USE OF EVIDENCE: The program faculty have no plans to propose further revisions to the program at this time with one exception. We plan to make WRI 220 a required course rather than a menu option. The course provides an important introduction to the major. Aside from minor adjustments to the frequency of course offerings in order to insure healthy enrollments, the plan is to stay the course and gather further data regarding the effectiveness of the program.

- **Curriculum**

Modest curricular changes were instituted in the fall of 2011. WRI 315 enrollments were strong and the course met requirements for other majors on campus. COM 460 was removed as a menu option.

As seen in the chart in the Course Profile section above, courses drawing fewer than ten students are fairly rare and often are the options available primarily to Journalism majors but that meet a requirement in a menu for the Writing program. Other low enrolled courses are essential to the program. The poetry course, for example, may not draw as consistently as the other courses in the menu, but it is an essential option for a writing program. Enrollments in Wri 321, 322, and 323 should be aided with the plan to make Wri 220 a required course in the major and by offering 321, 322, and 323 less frequently. These changes are in line with the changed called for in the prioritization plan and have been reviewed by the area dean and the provost.

- **Program Faculty**

The qualifications and achievements of the program faculty are available in their vitas included in the Appendix B. Both full-time faculty in the program are active professional writers and editors.

- **Credit Hour Policy and Monitoring**

The credit hours are in line with university standards which are based on the Carnegie unit. In 2012-13 our curriculum was audited and necessary adjustments were made, mostly to our MWF class times. Credit hours are monitored by the Dean of Arts and Science.

- **Recruitment, retention, and student services**

Our recruitment practices and admission criteria are not different from the standard university practices. We do, however, include in our Preview Day packets for visiting inquiring students a document highlighting the kinds of careers our graduates have successfully entered. On our LJML web pages, we also spotlight alumni at work in some of these various careers.

- **Disciplinary, Professional, and Community Interactions**

As indicated on the program of study, an internship is required of all majors in the program.

- **Post-Graduation Outcomes and Alumni Satisfaction**

Graduate School Acceptance Rate— In 2013-14 we created a document in Google Drive to record actual quantitative (not anecdotal) data from all graduates of our LJML programs. The current document includes graduates from the past seven years most completely, but we are adding information from graduates further back as we receive it.

Exit Surveys—We have revised these into a standard template to more directly align with our Program Learning Outcomes, Employability Goals, and Lifelong Learning Goals

**Educational Effectiveness: Analysis of Evidence about
Academic Program Quality and Viability**

Key Findings

Recommendations

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The program, though fairly young, is stable. The addition of a capstone course has strengthened the major and has provided a convenient location for the development of an assessment portfolio. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require Wri 220 for the major and offer fewer sections of Wri 321, 322, and 323 in line with the changes called for in the prioritization report but make no additional changes to the program.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment plan is sound. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement the assessment plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We do not have a quantitative record of our students' placement rates in graduate schools and jobs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have created and are building a Google Drive spreadsheet where a systematic, quantitative, and ongoing record our students' placement rates in graduate schools and careers will be kept.

PART IV – Core Commitment to Quality and Continuous Improvement

- Comparison with comparable programs at comparator and aspirant programs at other universities**

The comparator schools offer either a major in writing/creative writing or a concentration in writing/creative writing as an emphasis in the English major. No consistent pattern is available.

Of the eleven aspirant universities, only the University of Portland does not offer either the major in writing/creative writing or an emphasis in writing/creative writing within the English major.

Seven aspirant schools offer writing/creative writing as an emphasis in the English major. Three schools (Calvin, Pepperdine, and USD) offer a major in writing/creative writing. The requirements are quite similar regardless of the name of the degree.

- Best Practices in the Field**

PLNU's writing program compares well with the best practices within the field. Three examples of "best practices" are as follows: 1) Including an internship as part of the program of study. The writing program is in line with this best practice. 2) Providing a business and technical writing class in the program of study to enhance the marketability of the degree recipients. The writing program requires all students to complete Wri 365 Writing for Professional Careers. 3) Tracking alumni of the program to demonstrate an acceptable rate of employment in appropriate careers. The writing program has begun this process but needs to establish more consistent contact with alumni.

- Unique features**

The most distinctive feature of the program is its placement in a department with a well-established and highly regarded journalism program. Writing majors have access to professional journalists and students preparing for careers in journalism. This greatly enhances

their education as writers. Programs at aspirant universities give their students access to English majors who are primarily studying literature. The LJML department provides writing majors this exposure as well as exposure to journalism students.

The required Wri 365 mentioned above is another distinctive feature of the writing program.

Comparative Position and National Standards

Key Findings	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The writing program compares favorably with the programs offered as comparator and aspirant universities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain the quality of the writing program.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The placement of alumni in careers involving writing has not been well documented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue the process of remaining in contact with writing program alumni.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Writing Program lacks visibility due to its exclusion from the department's name. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider changing the name of the department to Literature, Writing, Journalism, and Modern Languages.

PART V - Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats Analysis

● Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiality of the Program(s)

The expression of ideas through the writing program is one of the ways our students live out the mission of the university. Writers are the culture's storytellers. The training our students receive at PLNU helps them prepare for professional careers and become those who bear witness to the stories that need to be told. They are trained in truth telling, creativity, verification, and the human story. A verse that exemplifies how our students live out the mission is from Proverbs 31:8-9: "Speak up for those who cannot speak for themselves, defend the rights of those who have nothing. Speak up and judge fairly, and defend the rights of the poor and needy."

The writing program is critical to PLNU in that it is one of the distinctive elements of the experience here. Further, while the writing faculty teach several service courses for the university, it is also integral to the community due to consistent growth and external interest. PLNU's writing program is a distinctive for the university simply because it exists in a form not supported by most of our comparators but one that is very similar to programs in ten of the eleven schools list as aspirant universities.

Strengths include:

- strong and consistent enrollments since the institution of the major in 2008

- support for the General Education program from core and secondary faculty members associated with the program
- consistent publication activity from the two faculty members most closely associated with the program
- alignment with the mission of the university and direct support of for the institutional learning outcome regarding the acquisition of written communication skills
- strong enrollment in nearly all course required for the major over the last three years
- the annual publication of a very high quality creative arts journal

Weakness include:

- adequate staffing with the departure of a key faculty member after the spring of 2014.
- lack of diversity in our writing faculty
- tracking of graduates to demonstrate their employment in contexts where the skills and dispensations developed are used

- **Opportunity Analysis of the Program(s)**

Opportunities

The opportunities for the program are many. For a fairly recent humanities major to have weathered the storm of a rapidly changing environment for liberal arts education is impressive in and of itself.

Enrollment in the program and demand for the program held steady during very tumultuous times for the humanities. In retrospect, 2008 was an inauspicious time to launch a new major in the humanities. That the program has grown into a distinctive program is a credit to the quality of the instructors in the program, the solid design of the curriculum, and the students it attracts.

Threats

The primary threat to the program is inadequate staffing. The departure of the youngest and most pedagogically innovative faculty member in the writing program means that the faculty member with the greatest chance of still teaching in the program in ten years has been removed. Maintaining the quality of the program with only one faculty member on the San Diego campus during both the fall and spring semesters (assuming the continuing involvement of the other faculty member in the London Semester program) will be very difficult.

PART VI - Program Review Themes for Future Inquiry

THEMES FOR FUTURE INQUIRY: Based on the current program review and analysis, discuss any future lines of inquiry the Academic Unit wants to pursue for continuous improvement of the program? Such future lines of inquiry might include revision to mission, learning outcomes, goals, grant opportunities, revised assessment plan, specialized accreditation, etc.

- Alignment of CLOs to newly adopted GELOs

- Establish an alumni advisory group to advise the program faculty
- Identify and pursue grant writing opportunities (for Poetry Day, Writer's Symposium, support for Driftwood literary magazine)
- Consider ways to better integrate Writing majors into the Writers' Studio Program

**Program Review Committee Feedback on Literature Self-study
(for complete PR committee report see the end of this document)**

Writing Feedback: The committee felt that the Writing section of the self-study was generally good but did contain a few gaps in the analysis and depth of reflection on the programs data. It was unclear whether or not the Writing program was tracking the success of their students post-graduation or not since this was not referenced or discussed in any significant way in the report. If the program is not collecting and tracking this kind of information, it is recommended that they put a plan in place to ensure that they do this moving forward as it is a significant part of the program review process and the program is in its 7th year. Like the Literature section, the curriculum analysis against comparator programs was missing key benchmark information regarding the enrollment/size of the comparator programs. It is recommended that this information be included in the final version of the self-study. Finally, there seemed to be a gap around the understanding of the connection between the increase in enrollment in the Writing program and the decrease in enrollment in the Journalism program. Given these programs recently separated, the committee expected the analyses of these programs to be done in this context. The Writing analysis emphasized the significant increase in enrollment without acknowledging it was primarily due to a decrease in Journalism and by not looking at the combined data between the two programs, failed to recognize the overall decreasing enrollment trend.



External Reviewer Report

Rev 12-4-15

Department Level Analysis

A) Introduction

B) Alignment with Mission

Please review and evaluate the academic unit's response to the questions regarding mission alignment of their unit with the university mission from both an academic and Christian faith perspective. Are there any suggestions for how they might better articulate and demonstrate their alignment to the university mission and purpose?

No suggestions. The department provides an apt defense for mission alignment under "Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiality of the Program(s)." A vibrant writing program is a critical component to any Christian college or university—who'll nurture the next generation of culture-shaping writers and artists if not places like PLNU?

C) Quality, Qualifications and Productivity of Department Faculty

Based on all the evidence and responses provided in the program review report, provide a summary analysis of the qualifications of faculty associated with the program. Identify the degree to which scholarly production aligns with the expectations of the degree level of the program offered (undergraduate, master's) at this type of institution. Are there any strengths or distinctives that should be noted? Are there any gaps or weaknesses that should be noted?

I have the highest regard for Dr. Hill's work, which I was introduced to 15 or so years ago. It's obvious that his and Dr. Winderl's qualifications, as well as their creative and academic output, meet expectations for PLNU's writing program. As mentioned in the report, the loss of a third faculty member has created short-term challenges, but it appears that PLNU has approved a plan to address the vacancy.

Review and comment on the scholarship of the faculty. Identify the degree to which scholarly production aligns with the expectations of the degree level of the program offered (undergraduate, master's) at this type of institution. Where appropriate, suggest improvements that may be necessary to increase the quality and/or quantity of scholarship produced by the faculty in this program.

Scholarly production aligns with the expectations. A need for a third faculty member in the area of fiction or creative nonfiction would be the most pressing need for the program.

D) Progress on Recommendations from Previous Program Review

Review the narrative supplied for this section. Discuss whether it provided a good accounting and rationale for what changes have or have not been made based on the previous program review and/or any circumstances that have arisen since? Where appropriate, identify any insights or questions that you might have stemming from this narrative.

From what I can tell, the last program review is no longer relevant. The self-study mentions a 2008 “cut-off” date.

E) General Education and Service Classes

Identify any program response to GE or service classes that may be associated with this program. Review and discuss the quality of the program’s responses to the questions in this section of the self-study. Identify any insights or suggestions that program might consider based on your knowledge of courses like these at other institutions.

From what I understand, WRI365: Writing for Professional Careers functions as a service course to other programs, and due to high numbers, writing majors sometimes have had a hard time enrolling in the course. Should the problem persist, the department might consider opening additional sections or, a little more tedious, a system in which students register by “permission of the instructor”—so that writing majors can be assured of seats.

F) Program Level Analysis

1. Trend and Financial Analysis

Based on data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the effectiveness of the program’s recruitment and matriculation efforts as it relates to enrollment. Are there any suggestions or insights that you might have that can help to increase the demand for the program and/or improve the enrollment yield?

For a school the size of PLNU, the enrollment numbers look good. “Stability” was a word that came up often in the report. I agree. The program, particularly one as relatively young as the writing program, looks very stable to me. Increasing demand? At the institution where I teach, we’ve successfully used summer writing camps for high school students as a recruiting tool. Last summer we had 26 in the camp. We’ve also had success in raising the visibility of our writing program through our capstone course, which requires that students organize and promote readings of their work. For the past three years, we’ve also published an anthology of the best work from our first-year composition course. The top three “winners” of the contest are given recognition during chapel. Last but not least, we annually bring visiting writers to campus. When we do so, we reach out to area high school English teachers. We invite them and their classes to a special, exclusive reading and q/a session with the visiting writer. We’ve had as many as 200+ high school students on campus for those readings. If nothing else, those events have built a great deal of goodwill between our department and area schools and homeschool co-ops.

Based on data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the program's role in GE and Service functions and identify any opportunities or challenges from this that could have positive or negative impacts on the program itself.

I saw nothing out of the ordinary. The writing courses serve as "five units" of the gen ed experience for PLNU students, and the courses satisfy requirements in other programs. Writing faculty teach in the general education program, as well as the honors program, and the program attracts students who migrate from other PLNU programs. If there's a negative impact, it's this: the faculty carry sizeable teaching loads. W/a young, growing program, I wonder if PLNU might not consider release time for a faculty member to administrate the program—someone who has a designated role to lead the program.

Based on data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the efficiency of the program based on its overall and course enrollment trends along with the external benchmarking use of the cost per student credit hour data (Delaware). Are there any suggestions or insights that you might have that can help to increase the efficiency of the program without having a negative impact on quality?

I didn't find the data compelling one way or another. The writing program is combined with other programs and isn't a standalone in the department. Some of the writing courses serve GE; others serve Broadcast Journalism, Journalism, and English Education. The most compelling data point for me is this: strong enrollment numbers.

2. Findings from Assessment

After reviewing the program's responses to their assessment findings, do you think the program is effectively using their assessment activities and data? Are there suggestions that you might make to improve their assessment plan or insights from their data that you might offer in addition to their analysis? Discuss the quality of their analysis and identify elements of their analysis that you think could be strengthened.

The assessment is thorough and the response is appropriate. Requiring WRI 220 is logical. Offering fewer sections of 321, 322, 323 also makes good sense. Developing a database of placement rates and career destinations should help w/recruitment. Again, the quality of the program is strong. I don't see the need for any sudden movements. Keep on keeping on.

3. Curriculum Analysis

After reviewing the program's curricular analysis, student learning outcomes (SLOs), and curricular map, characterize the quality and appropriateness of the program's curriculum for meeting the learning outcomes expected of students within this discipline. Identify any possible changes to the curriculum or to the SLOs that would result in an improved program.

Quality and appropriateness of the program's curriculum are in line with learning outcomes. If I had one suggestion, it might be this: the program lacks a clear capstone course. Such a course, particularly if it included student readings or presentations or seminars, could further raise the visibility of the program and could be an effective end-point for evaluating student learning outcomes.

After reviewing the program's curricular analysis through a guild or comparator lens, summarize and discuss the quality of their analysis and comparison and offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider regarding their curriculum content and structure.

See above?

After reviewing the program's curricular analysis through an employability lens, summarize and discuss the quality of their analysis and narrative and offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider regarding their curriculum content and structure as a preparation for future employment.

Again, the program looks strong to me. As for an "employability lens," the program will benefit from the plan to create a database that tracks placement rates and career destinations.

After reviewing the program's curricular analysis through a pedagogy lens, summarize and discuss the quality of their analysis and narrative and offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider regarding the delivery of their curriculum in ways to enhance the student learning experience.

The program has strong faculty and a curriculum that addresses student learning outcomes. The program continues to attract students. More than once, the report makes mention of a departed third faculty member and the challenge that has presented. There is a clear (and approved) plan in place to address that need.

4. Potential Impact of National Trends

After reviewing the program's discussion of possible impacts from national trends, discuss the quality of their response and identify if there are trends in the discipline that the self-study has missed or not adequately addressed based on your expertise and opinion.

I found the opportunities analysis to be on target. As noted in the report, "2008 was an inauspicious time to launch a new major in the humanities." It speaks to the quality of the program that it has flourished in a challenging period for the humanities. Other opportunities? If PLNU were interested in expanding into grad programs, the location alone seems ideal for a low-residency MA or MFA in creative writing.

5. Quality Markers

After reviewing the program's discussion of its quality markers and the questions posed in this section of the self-study, discuss the quality of their response to these questions and identify any particular strengths and/or weaknesses that you might see in this section of the self-study. Please offer any

suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider relating to these quality markers.

The findings and recommendations for quality and viability were appropriate.

6. Infrastructure and Staffing

After reviewing the program's discussion of its infrastructure and staffing, discuss the quality of their analysis and reflection in this important area and offer any suggestions or insights that you might suggest they consider.

Staffing needs are being addressed re: the departure of the third faculty member in the program. Also, as mentioned earlier, as the program continues to grow, it would make sense to give release time for a director of the writing program.

7. Challenges and Opportunities

Do you feel the report adequately identified the challenges and opportunities that they face based on your understanding of the discipline? Why or why not. Are there other challenges or opportunities that you see based on your review of the self-study and your understanding of the discipline in today's higher education context?

Yes. See above #4.

8. Recommendations for Program Improvement

Do you feel the recommendations being made for this program are supported by the analysis and evidence provided in the self-study document and narrative? Discuss why or why not. Are there other recommendations or suggestions that you would make that the academic unit should consider? If so, please give a brief rationale for why?

Yes. The recommendations are supported by the analysis and evidence. It's a good, healthy, young program that should continue to capitalize on its strengths—quality faculty, a well-designed curriculum, and a proven record of attracting students, both externally and internally, to the program.

G) External Reviewer Feedback on PLNU Program Review Process:

We recognize that there are many ways to approach a program review. We would value your feedback on our process so that that we can continue to make it better and more helpful to the programs undergoing review. Are there areas that were confusing or sections that you felt were unhelpful? Are there areas that you were not asked about where you feel you could have provided useful information? Is there anything about the process that you would recommend we change or consider changing that could make it better?

The form was clear. It would have helped to see another reviewer's completed form to have a better sense of PLNU's desired quality/quantity, but I understand that the format is new and as such, "models" of successful/helpful review aren't yet available. Thank you for the opportunity to review the program. It's encouraging to see a good writing program, and the review has helped me think through what we're doing at CU.

Writing Program

Response to the External Review and Program Review Committee’s Report

The Program Review Committee asked the Writing Program to address three areas in greater depth. The responses are presented below. This is followed by a response to the external reviewer.

1. The Program was asked to further comment on its tracking the success of alumni. In the fall of 2015, the Program reached out to alumni via their PLNU email addresses and via social media. This effort resulted in updates from at least eight Program alumni. While these results are partial, they have allowed us to further update the Google Docs spreadsheet the Program is maintaining to track alumni. The good news is that alumni expressed satisfaction with the program and that all who had applied to a graduate program indicated that they had been accepted into graduate school. Alumni are currently studying at Chapman University, the New School in NYC, and PLNU’s MA program in Education. The Program will conduct a more formal alumni survey prior to the next round of Program Review and, in the meantime, will continue to update the alumni spreadsheet.
2. The Program was asked to more fully compare its program to other programs. We chose to begin the process by comparing the program to the aspirant schools provided to us. The LJML Department Chair contacted all ten aspirant programs via email and received responses from seven (USD, Occidental, Santa Clara, Seattle Univ., Univ. of Portland, Redlands, and Wheaton). This comparative work is challenging because most aspirant schools do not have a separate Writing program but instead have an English major with concentrations in Literature and Writing. So we compared our Literature and Writing programs together to the English programs at the aspirant schools. The results reveal that PLNU compares favorably in terms of the program’s productivity. Because many of the aspirant schools are much larger than PLNU, the most useful comparison is the percentage of the English majors related to the overall student body. The results can be seen in the chart below:

School	Undergrad Enrollment	English Majors (at PLNU Writing and Literature majors combined)	% of the Undergraduate Population
PLNU	2556	61	2.4%
USD	5647	121	2.1%
Santa Clara	5486	123	2.2%
Occidental	2040	45	2.2%
Portland Univ.	3741	95	2.5%
Redlands	3779	112	3.0%
Seattle Univ.	4712	148	3.1%
Wheaton	2400	151	6.3%

As the chart indicates, with the exception of Wheaton, PLNU’s Literature and Writing Programs combined compare favorably to the productivity of English programs at an aspirant school roughly our size (Occidental) as well as much larger schools. We draw the percentage of the undergraduate population we would be expected to draw.

Comparing the productivity of faculty (measured by how many majors the faculty serve) is much harder to do. The aspirant schools reported widely divergent numbers—from five at USD to thirty-four at Santa Clara. Clearly, the schools interpret “full-time faculty teaching in the program” very differently from one another.

3. The Program was asked to reflect on the growth of the Writing Program in relationship to the decline in the numbers in the Journalism program. With all due respect to the Program Review Committee, we must challenge an assumption. In the committee’s memo, we read: “The Writing analysis emphasized the significant increase in enrollment without acknowledging it was *primarily due* to a decrease in

Journalism and by not looking at the combined data between the two programs, failed to recognize the overall decreasing enrollment trend” (emphasis added). To claim that the growth was “primarily” due to a decrease in the enrollment in Journalism is to make a claim for which no evidence is offered. While it is true that PLNU once offered a Writing concentration within the Journalism program, it is quite possible that students opting for the Writing concentration were choosing between Writing and Literature rather than between Writing and Journalism. Just because the Writing program grew at a time when Journalism enrollments were falling does not mean that the first was the primary cause of the second. And the question is somewhat irrelevant because Journalism enrollments have increased (without a significant decline in Writing enrollments since the process of the Program Review began). Moreover, the Writing, Journalism, and Literature programs have been designed to complement one another rather than to be in competition with one another. If all three programs are “productive” as administrators define the term, they need not be placed in competition with one another. In significant ways, the programs share faculty and students. And all three programs are now showing solid enrolment numbers. According to the latest information in the Student Success Collaborative database (Spring 2016), the Writing Program is enrolling 33 majors, Journalism 29, Broadcast Journalism 23, and Literature 27. These 112 majors are being taught in programs with 11 “full-time” faculty. But two of these faculty members (Winderl and Bowles) are not truly full-time due to involvement in PLNU International and the retirement program. Another (Martin) is only half-time in the programs due to administrative responsibilities. Another (Pate) has primary responsibility in the College Composition Program. We would encourage the Program Review Committee, when evaluating program productivity, to consider lumping Journalism, Writing, and Literature programs together and treating them as an English Department with 112 majors. Looking at the FTE of the faculty of those three programs will yield more informative results than examining the programs individually.

Response to the External Review’s Report

Program faculty were pleased with the external reviewer’s response to the program and found many of the reviewer’s suggestions helpful. In the reviewer’s response to Program Level Analysis, he wrote, “For a school the size of PLNU, the enrollment numbers look good. ‘Stability’ was a word that came up often in the report. I agree. The program, particularly one as relatively young as the writing program, looks very stable to me.” The reviewer went on to make several suggestions on ways to raise the visibility of the program. Program faculty plan to implement one suggestion very soon by making the capstone course final assignment, a reading, public rather than simply for the course’s students. The other suggestions will also be given consideration.

JOURNALISM

Significant uncertainty surrounds the future of the Broadcast Journalism program. Key LJML faculty have been asked to work in conjunction with the faculty in Communication to develop a sustainable program for the education of students interested in careers in broadcast journalism. Some of what is detailed below may need to be altered depending upon the future shape and/or existence of the Broadcast Journalism program. LJML faculty remain in conversation with Communication Department faculty, both area deans, and the provost in regard to this issue.

PART II – Core Commitment to Institutional Integrity, Sustainability, and Accountability

1. External Demand for the Program(s): Analysis of enrollment trends and retention data

For full data from the Office of Institutional Research on all university measures for the Journalism Program, please see

- <https://my.pointloma.edu/ICS/Departments/Administrative Offices/Institutional Research/Program Review.jnz>

The Noel-Levitz research schema put all three majors-- Broadcast Journalism/Journalism/Writing programs—together into one grouping. Noel-Levitz High School Market Demand Share data for Broadcast Journalism/Journalism/Writing programs indicates that our Broadcast Journalism/Journalism/Writing Programs attract interest at a rate of 1.4% regionally (above the PLNU median).

Noel-Levitz PLNU Share of Regional Degrees Awarded data (based on the total number of bachelor's degrees awarded between 2003-04 and 2010-11 from institutions within a 150-mile radius of San Diego) shows that PLNU's share of Broadcast Journalism/Journalism/Writing degrees awarded out of all such degrees awarded in the region is 1.3% (above the PLNU median).

It is difficult to compare the percentages of interest and shares of degrees awarded across our literature, language, broadcast journalism, journalism, and writing majors since they were not identified as the individual majors they are in our university. Additionally, such comparisons are made difficult since the data for Broadcast Journalism was halved between the departments of LJML and Communication and Theater. Nevertheless, the data provided does provide limited insight into the program.

Below are the enrollment numbers for the last six years:

Journalism Major	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
Headcount	62	43	34	21	32	25

The drop in enrollment in the journalism major in 2009 is the result of numerous factors. Two factors are as follows: a). The department added a Writing major that enrolled 27 in the fall of 2009; and b). The interdepartmental Broadcast Journalism major became stronger, averaging more than 10 from the

fall of 2008 through the fall of 2011. This is then reflected in the smaller number of degrees granted in the next few years.

Persistence in the major reflects strength and stability. Three of the four cohorts performed at or above the university total. The only time the rate dropped below the university total was during the most challenging years of the dramatic changes in the profession of journalism. And then the program nearly held its own in relationship to the university total.

Year	Unduplicated University Total	Rolling 3-Year Combined Cohorts: Journalism
2006-2008	84.7%	84.6%
2007-2009	83.8%	81.3%
2008-2010	83.1%	90.5%
2009-2011	82.7%	82.6%

2. Internal Demand for the Program(s)

Support of University Programs: Both full-time faculty members (Nelson and Goforth) teach College Composition as well as teaching courses in the major program.

In addition, Journalism courses serve the needs of majors in Broadcast Journalism, Writing, English Education, Media Communication, and Communication.

Share of Undergraduate Headcount: The share of the undergraduate headcount dropped with the advent of the Writing Program. It continues to fluctuate somewhat. The percentage of non-white students in the program remains high.

Headcount Share	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
	2.8%	1.9%	1.5%	0.9%	1.4%	1.0%
Gender						
Male	17 (27.4%)	10 (23.3%)	6 (17.6%)	6 (28.6%)	9 (28.1%)	NA
Female	45 (72.6%)	33 (76.7%)	28 (82.4%)	15 (71.4%)	23 (71.9%)	NA
Avg. Load	15.23	14.60	15.60	15.45	15.78	NA
Ethnic Origin:						
Non-White	Headcount	11	11	9	7	9
	Percent	17.70%	25.60%	26.50%	33.30%	28.10%
White/ Unknown	Headcount	51	32	25	14	23
	Percent	82.30%	74.40%	73.50%	66.70%	71.90%

3. Size, Scope, and Productivity of the Program(s)

Faculty Profile and Teaching Assignments: As of the fall of 2014, two faculty members have primary responsibility for teaching in the Journalism Program. One is a tenured full professor. The other is a non-tenured assistant professor hired in 2012. The teaching load for both faculty members include either WRI 110 College Composition or WRI 120 Honor in College Composition. Goforth was hired in part because of his expertise in new media and broadcast news; therefore, his teaching more consistently features responsibilities for these areas. Both teach only undergraduates. Both have the normal departmental and university-wide committee assignments.

Student Profile:

The enrollment numbers of Journalism majors from Fall 2006 through Fall 2013 is indicated in the table of institutional data below. The decline in the numbers coincides with the department's decision to begin a writing major that drew students who might earlier have majored in journalism.

Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
68	85	62	43	34	21	32	25

The curricular metrics indicate the health of the Journalism Program

First Time Freshmen Admissions

		Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012
Inquiries	Number	161	155	227	209	184
Applications	Number	38	56	64	51	61
	Conversion Rate	23.6%	37.4%	28.2%	24.4%	33.2%
Admitted	Number	32	42	38	32	36
	Selection Rate	84.2%	72.4%	59.4%	62.7%	59%
Matriculated	Number	6	13	11	7	15
	Yield	18.8%	31%	28.9%	21.9%	41.7%

4. Revenue and Other Resources Generated by the Program

The Journalism Program does not generate additional revenue for the university beyond the tuition dollars its students provide. However, through the program's commitment to the Writer's Symposium, it provides the university with one of its highest profile annual events. The value of the name recognition the university receives through the Symposium would be difficult to quantify but is certainly significant. Approximately 4,000 people attended Writer's Symposium events in 2014, and interviews from the Symposium have been downloaded more than 2.1 million times, with the PLNU name prominent throughout.

5. Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program(s)

The Literature Program budget is included in the budget for the Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages department; thus, it does not have a stand alone budget.

LJML Department budget totals for the past three years are in the table below and include all costs for departmental needs for all LJML programs.

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Annual LJML Budget	\$60, 979	\$60.979	\$60,970
Closing LJML Balance	\$6,810.39	\$3,997.95	-\$3480.58

The cost of combined programs (Journalism, Broadcast Journalism, and Writing) fell outside of the optimal range as defined by the Delaware Data for the academic years 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. The cost per unit for Journalism and Writing was \$261.00 per unit in the 2010-2011 year and \$268.00 for the 2011-2012 year. The cost for the 2012-2013 year fell to \$241.00 per unit and moved the programs into the 63%-75% range. This percentile ranking may be more of an indicator of the way the Delaware Data is set up rather than it is of the actual cost per unit comparison it purports to be. There are no peer schools in the data for this program. The journalism and writing courses were grouped together. This schema is not accurate to our programs in two areas: we have writing courses that serve the general education program, and then we have writing courses that serve four distinct programs--Broadcast Journalism, Journalism, Writing, and English Education. The data is quite preliminary and certainly reflects the fact that many of the faculty in the program hold the rank of full professor and command higher salaries than their junior colleagues. Indeed, the drop in the cost per units corresponds with the departure of a full professor who retired and the hiring of an assistant professor who commanded a lower salary.

6. Quality of Program Inputs and Processes

Faculty

The journalism major requires courses from other areas of the LJML department such as Literature and Writing, and most of those courses are taught by full-time, tenure-track professors with terminal degrees. There are two specific full-time professors who teach primarily journalism courses. One of those professors is tenured with a terminal degree. The other came out of the journalism profession recently and has a master's degree. He plans to pursue a Ph.D. Of the 17 courses required in the journalism major, three are taught by adjunct professors. All three of those professors are practicing professionals in the journalism world and have master's degrees. In recent years more of the courses have been taught by full-time professors. At one point there were five courses taught by adjuncts. There are no known retirements pending.

Adequacy and Availability

The current faculty is adequate for the needs of the majors. Supplemented by journalism professionals in key classes, the faculty adequately meet the demands of the courses offered. The multi-media skills of one faculty member nicely complement the more traditional skill set of the other.

Recruitment of faculty is not difficult; however, both current hires came from the field of journalism with only an MA degree. One pursued the PhD after employment and the second has plans to do the same. This pattern is one that is common in disciplines closely related to a professional field and can be compared to the university's hiring of nursing faculty, for example.

Professional Development/ Travel Support

The faculty in the program enjoy the same development opportunities and support for travel that faculty across campus enjoy.

Technology

The program faculty make use of the provided technology on campus and find that technology adequate for their work.

Information and technology resources

Technology and library resources are adequate for the program's needs.

Facilities and other

The facilities are adequate for the program's needs.

Staff

The program shares one department assistant with the programs in modern languages, writing, and literature. In addition, the department assistant serves as BAC building coordinator. With the increased assessment demands for reporting and tracking data on our majors and program, with the increased use of online platforms for virtually all daily university business, and with the increased growth of our annual Writer's Symposium by the Sea, the job description of our department assistant needs to be significantly amplified. It now needs to identify specific computing, clerical, and publicity/marketing proficiencies and test for each of these competencies during the hiring process, and more importantly, a key points throughout the first three years of employment.

Specific to assessment demands, the job description needs to include knowledge of compliance matters (WASC, DOE, etc.) so that our department assistant can complete a significant portion of the clerical work required in all this reporting.

Student Profile

Over the past five years the Freshman class of journalism majors had an average GPA of about 3.80 and an average SAT Reading score of around 600. The average SAT Math score was around 550, and the average ACT score was around 25. White students had slightly higher GPAs on average than the non-white students. There were 5 non-white students who were journalism majors in 2012, the highest number in the past five years. Other years the number has ranged from 1 to 4. The number of white students in 2012 was 10, also the highest in five years, although it was at 10 in 2009 also. The fewest has been 4. The number of men in the program was at 6 in 2012, the highest number in the past five years. The number of women in 2012 was 9, down slightly from its high of 11 in 2009.

The number of Hispanic students in the journalism major has doubled in the five years ending in 2012, making up 22% of the total. The percentage of white students has dropped from 81 percent in 2008 to 69 percent in 2012. On average, African American, Asian American and Native American students make up approximately 3% each. White women made up 61 percent of the major in 2008, and now are at 50 percent. Non-white women have doubled, going from 11 percent in 2008 to 22 percent in 2012. The other categories have been steady on average. The number of students with double majors dropped from 21 percent in 2008 to 12.5 percent in 2012.

	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
SAT Composite	1102	1154	1136	1155	1199	1143

SAT Reading	592	602	593	595	637	578
SAT Math	510	552	543	560	563	565
High School GPA	3.74	3.70	3.80	3.94	3.86	3.75

Course Profile:

The courses in the programs in the LJML Department are designed to be interconnected. Thus, drawing conclusions regarding courses offered in a particular program is difficult. Nevertheless, some observations may be helpful. Courses required for the Journalism major are also required or meet a menu option in the Communication and Media Communication programs as well as the Public Relations minor.

The following table summarizes enrollments for the last three years (General education literature courses that also meet requirements in the major are omitted as are the literature courses Writing majors take to fulfill requirements but in which they represent a small percentage of the total course enrollment. The enrollments in the internship course are also omitted. Enrollment in the literature courses is reported in the Literature/English Education portion of this report):

Course #	Course Name	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014
Wri 215	Point Weekly	20	15	17	16	24	18
Wri 216	Driftwood	14	13	15	16	10	17
Wri 217	Yearbook	9	11	10	12	7	15
Wri 250	Intro to Journalism	11/11	13	17/17	27	20/17	10/14
Com 150	Intro to Media Communication	25		19		28	
Com 243	Intro to TV and Film Production	11	9	16	14	17	11
Wri 310	Advanced Reporting		4		3		12
Wri 313	Computer-Assisted Reporting		9		9		11
Wri 340	Media Ethics and Law	8		8		8	
Wri 345	Editing	6		12		18	
Wri 350	Writing for Mass Media	2		4		12	
Wri 430*	Multimedia Journalism		4	13		1	

Wri 440	Magazine Editing and Concepts		11		10		9
---------	-------------------------------	--	----	--	----	--	---

* Enrollment in Wri 430 has rebounded in the Fall of 2014--12 students are currently enrolled.

Resource Profile:

The resources provided by the university are certainly adequate for the needs of the program and its students.

Capacity and Resource for Academic Quality

Key Findings	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The size and ratio of full-time to adjunct instructors is sufficient to maintain the quality of the program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain the current size of the faculty.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The program serves the needs of other programs across campus and provides the university with significant name recognition through the Writer’s Symposium. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain the program.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enrollments in some courses are lower than desired. And the program lacks a capstone course. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow the plan put forth in the establishing of priorities for the academic sector by combining Wri 310 and Wri 350 into one course. This will address the low enrollment in those two courses. In addition, this will make room in the program for the development of a capstone course.

PART III – Educational Effectiveness: Analysis of Evidence
about Academic Program Quality and Viability

- **Quality of Program Outcomes**

MISSION: Our Mission Statement was drafted and adopted in 2011-12. No changes were made in 2012-13 or 2013-14.

- <http://assessment.pointloma.edu/academic-assessment/department-of-literature-journalism-modern-languages/mission/>

OUTCOMES: Our Department Learning Outcomes (DLOs) were revised in 2011-12. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) were drafted, implemented, assessed, reviewed, and revised over the 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14 academic years. In spring 2014 we eliminated our Department Learning Outcomes (DLOs) at the recommendation of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee after its review of our wheel. We have made revisions to all of our PLOs to (1) retain the key concepts that were central from DLOs, (2) embed all five WASC Core Competencies into the language of our PLOs, and (3) bring outcomes into closer alignment with what we are actually doing in current instruction. All outcomes were written and revised with Bloom's Taxonomy in mind. Alignment of our Program Learning Outcomes to Institutional Learning Outcomes are indicated in the documents loaded on our Assessment Wheel-Student Learning. Documents for 2011-12 and 2012-13 are archived on our wheel.

Please see the 2013-14 Student Learning Outcomes under current documents:

- [03. LJML Outcomes 2013-14, 2014-15 PLOs JRN](#)
- [04. LJML Outcomes 2013-14, 2014-15 PLOs JRN Aligned](#)

MAPS: Differentiated Curriculum Maps drafted and adopted in 2011-12. Revisions were made in 2012-13 or 2013-14 for the same reasons described for outcomes. Please see the current Curriculum Maps for our program on our Assessment Wheel:

- [LJML Map 2013-2014 Curriculum Map JRN](#)

PLAN: Our Assessment Plan was written in two stages: (1) three-year cycle, and (2) full assessment plan. Plans were reviewed and revised at multiple points across each fall and spring semester to identify gaps in our assessment and to close them. Please see our current Assessment Plan page of the Assessment Wheel

- [03. LJML Plan 2013-2014 Assessment Plan Journalism](#)
- [04. LJML Plan 2013-2014 Assessment 3YR Cycle Journalism](#)

EVIDENCE: For each of the past three academic years we have written an Annual Assessment Report for all levels of our program assessment. Annual Reports include discussion of all key assignments used, data gathered and analyzed, and decisions made by program faculty. Please see the current Assessment Report on the Evidence page of the Assessment Wheel

- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Assessment Report JRN](#)
- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Assess Rpt JRN Internship Ins](#)
- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Assess Rpt JRN Internship Form](#)

USE OF EVIDENCE: The most glaring weakness in the Journalism program that we discovered from the assessment work we have done is the lack of a capstone course for program. We plan to propose a capstone course for the major and will combine the content currently covered in two courses into a single course in order to add the capstone without increasing the size of the major.

In addition, if the university administrators decide to cancel the Broadcast Journalism program, LJML will need to consider significant changes to the structure of the Journalism Program in order to educate students who wish to work for a portion of their career in the field of broadcast journalism. Faculty from LJML and Communication have discussed the broad outline of a major in Multimedia Journalism.

- **Curriculum**

As can be seen in the chart listed above in the Course Profile section, enrollments in most Journalism courses have been at acceptable levels over the last three years. As a part of the agreement between the department and the provost detailed in the prioritization memo, two of the lowest enrolled courses, WRI310 and WRI 350, will be combined into one course in an effort to boost enrollment. This will also allow room in the program for the development of a capstone course without increasing the number of units required for the major.

Further alterations to the curriculum may be needed. If enrollment numbers drop in required courses, some of them may need to be offered in an alternate year schedule rather than annually. These decisions must be made thoughtfully, for we do not want students to lose access to the qualified professionals who have taught as adjunct faculty in the program.

- **Credit Hour Policy and Monitoring**

The credit hours are in line with university standards which are based on the Carnegie unit. In 2012-13 our curriculum was audited and necessary adjustments were made, mostly to our MWF class times. Credit hours are monitored by the Dean of Arts and Science.

- **Recruitment, retention, and student services**

Our recruitment practices and admission criteria are not different from the standard university practices. We do, however, include in our Preview Day packets for visiting inquiring students a document highlighting the kinds of careers our graduates have successfully entered. On our LJML web pages, we also spotlight alumni at work in some of these various careers.

In the past, program faculty have sponsored a summer workshop for minority students interested in majoring in journalism. The program has raised the profile of the journalism program but have not led to a large number of students enrolling in the program.

- **Disciplinary, Professional, and Community Interactions**

As indicated on the program of study, an internship is required of all majors in the program.

- **Post-Graduation Outcomes and Alumni Satisfaction**

While program faculty have kept in close contact with many alumni, we have not documented that contact as formally as we should have. Initiatives are now in place to make that contact more

formal. We have also revised the alumni survey that will also allow us to document our contact with alumni.

Educational Effectiveness: Analysis of Evidence about Academic Program Quality and Viability

Key Findings	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The program has weathered the storm that came with the very disruptive state of the journalism profession and the department's development of a Writing program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the minor changes agreed upon in the prioritization memo, maintain the program in its current form.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment plan is sound. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement the assessment plan, especially by establishing a capstone course that will allow students to more easily compile a portfolio that program faculty can assess.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We do not have a quantitative record of our students' placement rates in graduate schools and jobs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have created and are building a Google Drive spreadsheet where a systematic, quantitative, and ongoing record our students' placement rates in graduate schools and careers will be kept.

PART IV – Comparative Position and National Standards

- Comparison with comparable programs at comparator and aspirant programs at other universities, Best Practices in the Field, and Unique features**

Thirteen of the twenty-one schools provided by the program review committee have journalism programs or concentrations in journalism within the English or Communication programs. All aspirant universities from the list provided offer journalism instruction in one form or another. Many house the journalism courses within a Communication department.

Very few comparator schools have a distinct Journalism major program. Most have journalism courses within broader Communication programs. Where PLNU's program is distinctive is in its placement of the journalism program in the LJML Department, which is a statement that reading and writing are the fundamentals to good journalism education. The faculty are well aware of the changes in technology that have forced monumental changes in the journalism industry. And while we feel strongly that we need to keep up with those technological changes (that's why we added a

multimedia journalism course to the requirements for our major, along with a computer-assisted reporting course), we feel even more strongly that writing must be at the core of what we teach.

So rather than compare ourselves to schools similar to ours, which are largely communication programs that focus more on the tools rather than on the content, we prefer to look to schools such as the University of Missouri’s Journalism School and Arizona State University’s Journalism School. While Missouri has committed significant resources to digital media, it has also retained its distinctive feature, which is to have working newsrooms on its campus. We attempt a similar effort by channeling our journalism students into our campus website, newspaper, radio station and television station. Arizona State takes its journalism program in a slightly different direction by following a “Teaching Hospital” model, where journalism students are connected with professional journalists to produce content for major news organizations around the world. We attempt something similar at our own level by having working journalists teaching as adjuncts in some of our specialty courses. In addition, we require that all of our majors have internships at legitimate publishing/broadcasting/online organizations so that they experience the most current practices in the professional world.

Where we are not yet similar is that our students are typically not producing news for audiences beyond our campus. Our small size and lack of resources keep us restricted in that regard. But they are producing content for an audience, not just for their classroom professors. That means they get feedback from that audience, which is part of the real world experience. And they have to be able to discern what the audience is interested in, and in what form the messages are most desirable to that audience.

Comparative Position and National Standards

Key Findings	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most comparator and aspirant universities provide journalism education. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain the journalism program.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The model for journalism instruction at PLNU is in line with what is practiced at some of the finest universities preparing students for careers in journalism. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain the current model of journalism instruction that requires student journalists to provide media content for their peers at PLNU.

PART V - Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats Analysis

- **Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiality of the Program(s)**

Because of the way the field of journalism continues to evolve at a breakneck pace, the potential for fragmentation of information and audiences, as well as for misinformation and the dissemination for rumors and half-truths, there is more need than ever for an educational effort that promotes depth, complexity, nuance, accuracy, morality, and commitment to telling multiple sides to stories. In other words, there is an opportunity for educating our students as thinkers, not just people who can react quickly with their ever-evolving communication tools. That said, we also know that we must be able to train our students in how to use those tools responsibly.

At no other time in history has there been as great a need for verifiable information as there is now. A focus on speed and tools without a commitment to verification, ethics, and contextual storytelling only serves to fragment audiences further and leaves them open to manipulation by forces such as politicians, businesses, and radio talk show bullies. Our opportunity is to stay committed to our fundamentals of reading and writing, while keeping up with the myriad of ways audiences receive information. The threat is that those means of receiving information will change so rapidly, and audience demand will change so rapidly, that we don't keep up.

Journalism is no longer a one-way communication model where the journalist tells the reader/viewer/consumer a story, and the reader/viewer/consumer can then make decisions about how to go about one's day. Journalism now involves the audience at a much more interactive level, and depends on the audience for information. Events such as the Arab Spring, the Syrian Civil War, the killing of Osama Bin Laden, were all covered by citizens using social media before any journalists were in the area. If that is the ONLY way audiences are informed, then it is the equivalent of reading headlines only, and being exposed to only the most sensationalized accounts.

As we compare ourselves to other schools with deeper pockets, we are not keeping up with them in their commitment to expanding education in the use of digital and social media. But we are also not getting waylaid from our commitment that those media still need to be carrying a message. It's not just the "how" of getting a message out. The "what" and the "why" are still crucial.

Storytelling is fundamental to civilization. The narratives we tell ourselves help us understand the world and our place in it and what we should be doing while we're here. Journalism provides the first draft of that narrative. If Ezra Pound is right, that "Literature is News that stays News," then the need for news in our society is as great as ever.

- **Opportunity Analysis of the Program(s)**

The clearest opportunity is for the journalism program to remain in conversation with the broadcast journalism program to make the modifications necessary for the development of a multimedia education for journalism students at PLNU who will move into careers where they will be expected to produce content for print, web-based, radio, and television news outlets. Working with our colleagues in the Communication Department, we are committed to continuing to develop a program of study that will prepare students to work in the field of journalism in its many forms.

PART VI - Program Review Themes for Future Inquiry

THEMES FOR FUTURE INQUIRY: Based on the current program review and analysis, discuss any future lines of inquiry the Academic Unit wants to pursue for continuous improvement of the program? Such future lines of inquiry might include revision to mission, learning outcomes, goals, grant opportunities, revised assessment plan, specialized accreditation, etc.

- Redesign the Journalism program in conversation with colleagues in the Communication department in the event that the university administrators decide to cancel the Broadcast Journalism program
- Create a Journalism capstone course
- Identify grant writing opportunities (for Poetry Day, Writer's Symposium, support for literary magazine, etc.) and pursue them

**Program Review Committee Feedback on Journalism Self-study
(for complete PR committee report see the end of this document)**

Journalism Feedback: The committee felt that the Journalism section of the self-study was had some good areas but contained several gaps in the analysis, use of evidence and depth of reflection on the programs data and curriculum analysis. It was unclear whether or not the Journalism program was tracking the success of their students post-graduation or not since this was not referenced or discussed in any significant way in the report. It was also unclear if the program is collecting and using information from current students as part of its assessment plan. If the program is not collecting and tracking these kinds of information, it is recommended that they put a plan in place to ensure that they do this moving forward as it is a significant part of the program review process. The committee felt that the main gap in the Journalism report was that the curriculum analysis was inadequate to warrant the “status quo” recommendations contained in the report. Even accounting for the decline in enrollment due to the formation of the Writing major, there is a significant drop off in Journalism majors which was not acknowledged or addressed. Additionally, there have been significant changes in the industry since the last program review and these were only addressed tangentially in the report and led to no significant recommendations. Finally, the comparison of the curricular model of Journalism at PLNU to two other programs from large universities gave a good philosophical argument for the model but lacked any detailed analysis of curriculum or use of data to demonstrate its adaptability to a school of our size and resources. It is recommended that the department work with the Dean and external reviewers to make sure that a more in depth analysis occurs to determine if the recommendations in the report are adequate for ensuring the success of the Journalism program moving forward.



POINT LOMA
NAZARENE UNIVERSITY

PLNU Program Review

External Reviewer Report

Rev 12-4-15

Department Level Analysis

H) Introduction

I) Alignment with Mission

Please review and evaluate the academic unit's response to the questions regarding mission alignment of their unit with the university mission from both an academic and Christian faith perspective. Are there any suggestions for how they might better articulate and demonstrate their alignment to the university mission and purpose?

- The mission statement aligns well with the university mission from both an academic and Christian faith perspective.
- The phrase "create texts" is limiting to all majors, but more so in relation to the Journalism, Broadcast Journalism and/or Multimedia Journalism majors. The creative output of journalists can be any medium: audio, video, photography, visualizations, web pages, etc. I suggest this be made more inclusive. In the sentence, the other elements from Bloom's taxonomy also refer to "texts" (understand texts, interpret texts, etc.) and I hope the study required across the majors includes other media elements in addition to texts.
- I have a question about students reflecting on their internship experience with these goals in mind. If not currently required, I suggest a requirement for majors to write reflections on their experience in the field in reference to the most relevant university core values: Global Perspective and Experience, Ethnic and Cultural Diversity, Stewardship of Resources, and Service as an Expression of Faith.

J) Quality, Qualifications and Productivity of Department Faculty

Based on all the evidence and responses provided in the program review report, provide a summary analysis of the qualifications of faculty associated with the program. Identify the degree to which scholarly production aligns with the expectations of the degree level of the program offered (undergraduate, master's) at this type of institution. Are there any strengths or distinctives that should be noted? Are there any gaps or weaknesses that should be noted?

- There is a reference in the Self Study document to Appendix B for professor vitas, but I did not receive this attachment.
- The ratio of Latino faculty to white faculty across LJML is 16%, including full- and part-time members, which is less than half of the ratio of Latinos in California (38%). https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Demographics_of_California In the Journalism and Broadcast Journalism programs, the key faculty members are both white men. What efforts are in place to track and report the diversity of visiting guests or authors of material presented in class? Where are students challenged and asked to reflect on diversity issues during their academic careers?

Review and comment on the scholarship of the faculty. Identify the degree to which scholarly production aligns with the expectations of the degree level of the program offered (undergraduate, master's) at this type of institution. Where appropriate, suggest improvements that may be necessary to increase the quality and/or quantity of scholarship produced by the faculty in this program.

- More detailed assessment of faculty productivity is needed for me to complete this section.

K) Progress on Recommendations from Previous Program Review

Review the narrative supplied for this section. Discuss whether it provided a good accounting and rationale for what changes have or have not been made based on the previous program review and/or any circumstances that have arisen since? Where appropriate, identify any insights or questions that you might have stemming from this narrative.

- The narrative for Journalism summarizes the history of the program's development, but did not specifically reference previous program reviews.
- The introduction of social media to the introductory courses is a wise move. I encourage finding ways to integrate elements like these into the core of the Journalism program. To a degree, the Multimedia Journalism course seems like a "catch all" course to fix the lack of these elements in the core of the Journalism program. If possible, I suggest looking for additional ways to integrate media elements into the core of the program.

L) General Education and Service Classes

Identify any program response to GE or service classes that may be associated with this program. Review and discuss the quality of the program's responses to the questions in this section of the self-study. Identify any insights or suggestions that program might consider based on your knowledge of courses like these at other institutions.

Faculty members are well-integrated into the university's General Education Program. This should continue and the load seems appropriate. One key advantage is the ability to attract students to LJML majors based on their experience with its faculty and courses.

M) Program Level Analysis

1. Trend and Financial Analysis

Based on data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the effectiveness of the program's recruitment and matriculation efforts as it relates to enrollment. Are there any suggestions or insights that you might have that can help to increase the demand for the program and/or improve the enrollment yield?

- The narrative anecdotally references the Writing Program and a shift in the industry for the decrease in majors. The impact of these are unclear without data to confirm. Is it possible to survey students to confirm what may have affected their choices?
- Adding the document on careers in journalism to Preview Day packets should continue. This helps students relate their interests with the outcomes of the program.
- Are minority students attending summer workshops tracked or targeted with specific recruiting messages? There are a few reasons I can imagine affect whether or not the presence of these workshops on campus and/or led by Journalism faculty lead to increased enrollment.
1) Include direct recruitment messaging in some portion of the workshop 2) Expose them to more than just a classroom where the workshop is held by touring more of campus 3) Lack of diversity among faculty can also lead to a lack of connection for some students.
- Meet with the recruitment team for the university. Host them for lunch. They have a lot of programs and departments to represent and you want to make sure you have a good relationship and the "boots on the ground" understand your programs well.

Based on data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the program's role in GE and Service functions and identify any opportunities or challenges from this that could have positive or negative impacts on the program itself.

The numbers are not sliced to indicate the specific contributions of Journalism faculty in General Education. Several courses are omitted and included in a separate program assessment, but leaves me with an unclear picture of any trends related to GE and Journalism faculty. Are the COM numbers only Journalism/Broadcast majors or do these include Media Communication majors as well? I think this could be clearer if the numbers were purely Journalism/Broadcast majors. If they are, perhaps just note that in the description to clarify.

Based on data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the efficiency of the program based on its overall and course enrollment trends along with the external benchmarking use of the cost per student credit hour data (Delaware). Are there any suggestions or insights that you might

have that can help to increase the efficiency of the program without having a negative impact on quality?

- The budget table in the Journalism "Costs" section could be cleaned up for standardizing the values. One number uses a period instead of a comma and another doesn't use a comma where it should.
- It's unclear if these budget numbers refer to non-salary expenses or only some portion of salary. It looks much too small to include faculty but otherwise seems larger than I would expect for supplemental needs. If Literature is separated, then this includes Journalism and Modern Languages? The description could use more clarity as to what portion of the budget is included.
- The department I teach in at Abilene Christian University saw a similar drop in enrollment around the same time your numbers drop. We didn't launch a new program during that time but we did discover our university reduced out-of-state recruiting at the same time our numbers decreased. To correlate whether the Writing program was indeed a reason the numbers dropped, it should be shown with data to see the number of enrolled students in each program side-by-side to clarify the shift in numbers. Our department was quick to blame the economic downturn, but there were other factors at play as well.
- Increased exposure for co-curricular activities like Point Weekly and Driftwood should help recruit students.

2. Findings from Assessment

After reviewing the program's responses to their assessment findings, do you think the program is effectively using their assessment activities and data? Are there suggestions that you might make to improve their assessment plan or insights from their data that you might offer in addition to their analysis? Discuss the quality of their analysis and identify elements of their analysis that you think could be strengthened.

It weakens the assessment to not have any data comparison between peer institutions. One key problem is the way data is collected, and what is in one statement a strength (Journalism combined with Literature/Writing) is also a problem. You can't determine if the program has "weathered the storm" without showing other institutions with similar shifts in enrollment. The program is very effective at retaining majors, but the rationale of industry and internally competitive programs isn't demonstrated in the assessment with evidence.

3. Curriculum Analysis

After reviewing the program's curricular analysis, student learning outcomes (SLOs), and curricular map, characterize the quality and appropriateness of the program's curriculum for meeting the learning outcomes expected of students within this discipline. Identify any possible changes to the curriculum or to the SLOs that would result in an improved program.

- The file linked as "03. LJML_Outcomes_2013-14, 2014-15_PLOs_JRN" included the same file as "04" for the Aligned version. I was unable to distinguish a difference between these documents. None of the linked documents opened correctly and I needed to save and rename each of them to correct the extension to be able to open the documents. After some searching, I was able to find all of the intended documents on the assessment.pointloma.edu site. An index directing me to specific documents would be helpful here.
- Student Learning Outcomes are appropriate to the discipline.
- I wonder about the lack of photography as a course in the curriculum. I see WRI430 projects include this, but it seems like a relevant course to include for majors of both Journalism and Broadcast Journalism.

After reviewing the program's curricular analysis through a guild or comparator lens, summarize and discuss the quality of their analysis and comparison and offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider regarding their curriculum content and structure.

- If 13 of 21 schools have journalism programs or concentrations in the English or Communication department, how many of these are journalism programs? It is stated that "very few" but doesn't substantiate that with evidence. There seems to be pride taken in having a program within the LJML department because of its focus on writing, but that has a flip side: being so unique makes it difficult to assess or create strategy based on market trends. With data split between departments and majors, it leaves you light on substance when making decisions. The assessment also disregards Communication-based programs (which are the majority per your assessment) because of what is described as focus on "tools rather than content." I've seen this kind of "us versus them" language in other organizations and it tends to breed insular thinking. You aren't training students to use typewriters in LJML. The craft of production is an integral part of how ideas are expressed in other media. The key is to focus on content and the quality of expression in the respective media. Not one or the other. Not us versus them. The assessment leaves out any analysis of comparator programs when it should be included.
- The aspirational comparison is useful to show how you view yourselves and what you hope to become.

After reviewing the program's curricular analysis through an employability lens, summarize and discuss the quality of their analysis and narrative and offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for

the program to consider regarding their curriculum content and structure as a preparation for future employment.

- The program offers substantial employability. In my view, the Broadcast program is a stronger model in that it prepares students for other jobs in addition to the field of writing. This makes students more diverse and more attractive in the marketplace. Video is an increasingly important medium for communication and the language of expression in video should be retained and improved to meet expectations in the job market.
- I think the model of Computer-Assisted Reporting as a specialty is effective. I don't think the model of Multimedia Journalism as a separate class is quite as effective. I believe the elements of the course could be integrated into the Journalism curriculum as a whole. Storytelling is at its core a writing skill, but expresses itself in imagery, visualizations, photography, video, audio and integrated web applications. Journalists are expected to be versatile in all areas and I'm not sure if one class can accommodate these needs. We live in a visual society. The earlier students are challenged to think visually, the more they will hone their abilities.

After reviewing the program's curricular analysis through a pedagogy lens, summarize and discuss the quality of their analysis and narrative and offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider regarding the delivery of their curriculum in ways to enhance the student learning experience.

The narrative summarizes Key Findings and Recommendations but does not assess the wider curriculum or its effectiveness. The recommendations to combine WRI310 with WRI350 and create a capstone course both seem appropriate. The Annual Assessment Reports for Journalism/Broadcast indicate outcomes were met. I suggest a summary be included in the narrative rather than in the external documents.

4. Potential Impact of National Trends

After reviewing the program's discussion of possible impacts from national trends, discuss the quality of their response and identify if there are trends in the discipline that the self-study has missed or not adequately addressed based on your expertise and opinion.

- The narrative correctly assesses the pace of change in consumption and production trends in journalism. I agree on the importance of educating students as "thinkers," but suggest "learners" is also a critical component to their success in an evolving media landscape. The specific tools used in class or in the media today will not be the same tools five or 10 years from now. Much of their success will be based on how well their education taught them how to learn. The concepts embedded in how a story should look and sound are independent of technology. They must be highly literate with both language and technology to thrive.
- I see a couple of references in the Journalism assessment about PLNU administrators questioning the Broadcast Journalism major. It's not clear if the suggestion is to close the Broadcast Journalism major and create a Multimedia Journalism major in its place, or if closing the Broadcast Journalism major means converting the core Journalism major into a Multimedia Journalism major. This should be made more clear in the narrative.
- I would like to know more about why administrators identified the Broadcast major over the Journalism major for revisions. The marketplace for broadcast television journalists has been relatively unaffected by the economic downturn when compared to newspaper journalists. It would seem logical to me based on the narrative that the Journalism major be more closely questioned as to how it teaches students how to be adaptive in a changing environment. It appears the Broadcast degree already includes many of these elements successfully.
- Without knowing all of the background, I think it makes sense to invigorate the core Journalism degree to better equip students to tell stories and make editorial decisions in multimedia contexts. If this means the two degrees become one as Multimedia Journalism, I would support that line of thinking. I don't know if "multimedia" is necessary to include in the degree title. If consolidating, I think keeping the core focused on writing is a strength of the program (i.e., WRI312 could be required of all Journalism majors). I also think presentation skills are often overlooked. It is becoming more and more difficult to avoid being interviewed on television or radio about a story. Many newspapers are partnering with other media outlets to extend their reach (TRE250 might serve Journalism majors well). There is a delicate balance between requiring a specific path and allowing a menu of options for students to create a focus area of their own. After looking at the Multimedia Journalism degree plan, I noticed the concentration areas in print and media. This confirms to me the intent to reframe the entire degree rather than just the Broadcast degree. This could be made clearer in the narrative.

5. Quality Markers

After reviewing the program's discussion of its quality markers and the questions posed in this section of the self-study, discuss the quality of their response to these questions and identify any particular strengths and/or weaknesses that you might see in this section of the self-study. Please offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider relating to these quality markers.

I don't see analysis in the narrative about "Quality Markers." The term "quality" is in several section headings, but none discuss the program's quality on its own.

6. Infrastructure and Staffing

After reviewing the program's discussion of its infrastructure and staffing, discuss the quality of their analysis and reflection in this important area and offer any suggestions or insights that you might suggest they consider.

The suggestion to amplify the department assistant seems reasonable. The Journalism faculty seems adequate to support the program.

7. Challenges and Opportunities

Do you feel the report adequately identified the challenges and opportunities that they face based on your understanding of the discipline? Why or why not. Are there other challenges or opportunities that you see based on your review of the self-study and your understanding of the discipline in today's higher education context?

- One element that isn't discussed in the narrative is the presence of Web publishing throughout the curriculum. Social media are mentioned as being now included in some introductory courses, but I would like to hear more about how courses are adapting to changes in Web and mobile publishing. The concentration on print and video still leave out an important, and soon to be dominant, delivery platform. It is noted that things are changing, but not how those changes are addressed in the curriculum.
- I think the lack of comparative analysis to other programs makes it unclear why the suggested changes to Multimedia Journalism will be successful, satisfy demand and increase enrollment.
- The narrative doesn't specify which Journalism courses are included in other programs like Media Communications or their respective enrollments. I think integrating more with other related programs can help recruit others who may prefer the Journalism path over another focus.

8. Recommendations for Program Improvement

Do you feel the recommendations being made for this program are supported by the analysis and evidence provided in the self-study document and narrative? Discuss why or why not. Are there other

recommendations or suggestions that you would make that the academic unit should consider? If so, please give a brief rationale for why?

- I support the recommendation to consolidate the Broadcast and Journalism programs together as one degree with concentrations in print and media (if I understand it correctly -- there's a void in the narrative on this). Print and video are only two of many media methods of delivering storytelling. I suggest more concentration areas should be considered, even if outside the subject matter expertise of the faculty. Adjuncts were mentioned as a strength because they bring more diverse experiences to students. I suggest researching concentrations in data analysis (could involve math, psychology, research methodologies) or online (visualization, photography, community engagement). Much would need to be determined as to how other areas could be sliced, or if they are needed.
- I'm pleased to see broadcast storytelling remains part of the proposed Multimedia Journalism program. While print advertising revenue has fallen dramatically in the past decade, television advertising revenue has remained stable. Likewise, layoffs disproportionately affected print journalists and television journalists have been much less affected by this change. Media consumption trends also continue to show strong support for video viewing over other media. The tenets of good broadcast writing and production remain relevant in the marketplace.
- I suggest a new emphasis be given to race and cultural communication in the program. Seeking a diverse pool of adjuncts is a good place to start. I understand the two full-time Journalism faculty will remain in place, though any changes there should generate a heavy search for diverse applicants. White men have, intentional or not, become the standard for what it means to lead a media organization. We're just now seeing changes in the landscape to be more inclusive. Having two white men as faculty members continues that expectation for students. Much can and should be done to diversity the content of courses to compensate for this.

N) External Reviewer Feedback on PLNU Program Review Process:

We recognize that there are many ways to approach a program review. We would value your feedback on our process so that that we can continue to make it better and more helpful to the programs undergoing review. Are there areas that were confusing or sections that you felt were unhelpful? Are there areas that you were not asked about where you feel you could have provided useful information? Is there anything about the process that you would recommend we change or consider changing that could make it better?

- Many of the links provided in the Word documents were inaccessible, either requiring a login or "dead" in the sense that when opened in the browser the content was unreadable (ä9-^É®'Á÷g ÎÓ,,ã³ÃËBªì). Specifically, the Outcomes documents appeared to have an issue either with my computer/browser or the encoding of the PDF files. I needed to save the document and rename the file extension to be able to open them. After some experimentation, I was able to open them. This is abnormal and I have no other issue opening PDF files on a regular basis. I'm not sure what to advise but to double check how they're being created/uploaded.
- The order of responses requested in the External Review Report does not match the order or headings in the Journalism assessment. This made it difficult to match the specific questions with the specific content of the narrative. I suggest using the same headings and order to make these align for the efficiency of future analysis.

**Response to Program Review Committee and External Reviewer
Journalism Program
April 2016**

Plan for Improvement: Recommendations from the Program Review:

List the recommendations that emerged from the program review that will be pursued to improve the programs housed in the academic unit.

1. The committee wanted the Journalism Program to demonstrate that it was tracking the success of its graduates.
2. The committee wanted the program to explain why input from current students was not included in the Program Review.
3. The committee noted that the “main gap” in the report was the lack of a plan to address the need to alter the Journalism Program and noted that the information did not call for a “status quo” response.
4. The committee encouraged the program to conduct a more complete comparative study of journalism programs elsewhere.

Action Steps for Implementing Improvements:

Indicate the actions steps and timeline that will be followed to implement the recommendations being pursued. Note – not all recommendations listed need to be implemented.

1. Program faculty have long remained connected to alumni, but mostly in informal ways. The faculty are now tracking alumni in a more orderly manner. Information about alumni is regularly being entered into a departmental shared Google document and will be included in all future program review reports. In addition, the program intends to work more closely with the Alumni Office to avoid duplicated efforts in tracking alumni. Updates from 2013-2015 are listed here.

Journalism/Broadcast Journalism Graduates 2013-2015

Only two out of 24 are in jobs unrelated to their journalism degrees: 2 are enrolled in graduate school while 21 out of are in media-related jobs. 8 of these are specifically working in the news business. Names have been removed for alumni privacy.

GRADUATED 2013

Job	Employer	Role
Media coordinator	Dixon Enterprises (LA)	PR
Anchor/Reporter	KHBS/KHOG-TV	TV news
Landscaper	PLNU	landscaping
Videographer/social med	Take Heart Films	videography
Public communication sp.	Americorps VISTA	PR
Graduate student	UCLA	law school
Community relations	LA Clippers	PR
No data on one graduate		

GRADUATED 2014

Producer/editor	Fox-5 San Diego	TV news
Reporter	San Diego Union Tribune	digital news
Reporter	Fox21 (Colorado Springs)	TV news
Writing and social media	Benefunder	business
Marketing director	Ember Arts	marketing
Editorial Assist/ writer	Bridgepoint Education	business
Assist. Bookings Editor	W Magazine (New York)	magazine
Graduate student	California seminary	Counseling Psych

Social Media Manager	LikeMinded Ministries	marketing
Communications spec.	University of Arizona (Tucson)	PR
Social Media Specialist	1st Advantage Business	digital PR

GRADUATED 2015

Reporter	San Diego Business Journal	print news
Anchor	One America Now	TV news
Writer	One America Now	TV news
Customer service rep.	PT Logistix (Orange County)	PR
Sales Associate	Kate Spade (LA area)	retail
Account Manager	San Diego Union Tribune	print, PR
No data on one student		

2. Program faculty did not include formal input from current students in the Program Review process but will incorporate such information in the future and will consult current students as we prepare an APC proposal for next fall.
3. The program never planned to take a “status quo” approach; however, because the LJML Program Review process did not align with the process in Communication and Theater, we could not address the plan to merge the Journalism Program and the Broadcast Journalism Program into a Multimedia Journalism Program without feeling as though we were infringing on the plans of the Communication and Theater Program. An additional complexity came with the fact that the memo given to LJML from the Provost at the end of the process of establishing priorities for the academic sector called on LJML to support the conversation in Com and Theater to address the overlap between the Broadcast Journalism Program and the Media Communication Program. Conversations between LJML faculty and Com and Theater faculty were ongoing while the Program Review process was also ongoing, but we had no way to report on that conversation with the template provided. We did, however, complete a draft of a new Multimedia Journalism Program in consultation with the Com and Theater faculty and included the draft of the new program in the information we sent to the external reviewer. The reviewer was generally favorable of the plan to combine the two programs. One additional piece of information may be helpful. In the years during which the Program Review processed has gone on, enrollment in the Journalism Program has rebounded nicely. According to the latest data on the Student Success Collaborative, PLNU currently has 28 Journalism majors and another 24 Broadcast Journalism majors. During the 2015-16 academic year, only one course taught by the two full-time faculty and no courses taught by the program’s adjuncts dipped below five students. And that one small course was added to the course offerings late to accommodate the needs of four graduating seniors.
4. The comparative study has been done and has yielded interesting results that support the direction the program is headed and confirms the productivity and financial stability of the program. Comparative studies, however, continue to pose a challenge.
 - A. *Comparator Schools.* Of the twenty schools given to LJML as comparators, only eleven offer majors in journalism. We reached out to these eleven programs and heard from six of them. Three programs are very small. Anderson University has only six majors, Union only nine, and George Fox only sixteen. Abilene Christian has forty majors in their Convergence Journalism program. The total undergraduate enrollment at Abilene Christian is much larger than Point Loma (3,650 students). The same can be said for Azusa Pacific. They have fifty-nine majors in an undergraduate enrollment of 5,918 (1% of the total undergraduate population). This compares favorably to the percentage of Point Loma journalism majors (twenty-eight) to PLNU’s undergraduate population. Bethel’s program, designed in consultation with Dean Nelson, has forty majors in an undergraduate population of more than 3,000.
 - B. *Aspirant Schools.* Of the ten schools provided as aspirant schools, only three have journalism programs—Gonzaga, Pepperdine, and Seattle University. As one would expect, all three have larger programs than PLNU. Gonzaga has thirty-seven majors (.76% of the undergraduate

population), Pepperdine had sixty-eight majors (nearly 2% of the undergraduate population), and Seattle has fifty-one majors (a little more than 1% of the undergraduate population). If we combine the Journalism majors and the Broadcast Journalism majors at PLNU (fifty-two total majors), they represent 2% of the undergraduate population. We compare well with Pepperdine, a school that serves their majors with five full-time faculty. All three of the programs at aspirant universities offer some form of a combined journalism/broadcast journalism program and, therefore, confirm the direction program faculty propose to take the Journalism and Broadcast Journalism programs at PLNU (see the appendix with the rough draft of the proposed new major in Multimedia Journalism).

Assessment Measures:

What assessments will be done to determine if the recommendations are leading towards the desired improvements? How will we know if we have been successful?

1. Success has been demonstrated already in the information provided regarding recent alumni and the ongoing data collection by the department. Continued success can be measured by the maintaining of alumni information.
2. Success regarding input from students can be measured by inclusion of student input in the upcoming APC proposal.
3. Success can be measured by the completion of the APC proposal in the fall of 2016 and the implementation of a new curriculum in the fall of 2017 with sustainable enrollments.
4. Success has been demonstrated in this report with the information from comparator and aspirant schools.

Financial Implications of the Action Steps:

Are there any financial implications associated with the actions steps coming from the program review recommendations? If so, what is the timeline and estimated scope of each need listed?

The financial implications of the proposed plan should be greater financial viability for the Multimedia Journalism program and reduced cost for the Com and Theater Department because of a reduced duplication of the Media Communication and Broadcast Journalism Programs as called for in the prioritization memo.

Areas of Accountability:

Are there areas identified by the administration that need particular attention during the next review cycle period? If so, indicate what they are and how and when they will be addressed.

The areas identified by the administration are embedded in the above answers.

Response to the External Reviewer's Comments

The external reviewer asked interesting questions and suggested modifications that should be considered. In the "Alignment With Mission" section, the reviewer asked about student reflection on their internship experience. This can be easily added to the portfolio requirement as we develop a capstone course. In the capstone course portfolio we can also ask students if they were "challenged and asked to reflect on diversity issues during the academic careers" as the reviewer suggests in Department Level Analysis, Level C. The literature requirements in the Journalism Program represent one place where students in the program encounter diversity. They also encounter diversity in the general education program.

The reviewer's suggestions regarding comparison to other programs has been addressed in the work done and reported above.

The reviewer wrote favorably in Section 3 of the plan to combine WRI310 and WRI350 in order to create a capstone course and was generally favorable of the plan to develop one Multimedia Journalism Program from the two existing Programs (Journalism and Broadcast Journalism).

The reviewer notes the lack of ethnic diversity in the program faculty. This lack of diversity is, of course, obvious to all involved and is prevalent across the PLNU faculty generally. Gender diversity is stronger in the program than is ethnic diversity because the program routinely relies upon some female adjunct instructors.

Appendix: Draft APC Proposal

ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE LONG FORM PROPOSAL TEMPLATE
--

- Proposals should use this long form if they:
 - Need faculty and/or WASC approval;
 - Request elimination, addition or revision of multiple courses and/or courses impacting other departments or schools.
 - Request elimination, addition or revision of a major, minor, concentration or credential program.
- All submitted proposals need to adhere to the following template in order to facilitate the work of the Academic Policies Committee.
- **Please read the attached “APC Proposal Reference Information” before completing this form.**
- **For ease of APC Committee reading, please submit your responses in BLUE text.**

SECTION ONE: WHO

1. **Academic Unit Name:** [Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages in cooperation with Communication and Theater](#)
2. **Recorded Department/School Vote** (Please provide the number and percentage of department/school faculty who voted in approval for this proposal):

[Click here to enter text.](#)

3. **Impact on Other Department(s)/School(s)** (Are there other departments/schools impacted by this proposal? If so, how did the other department[s]/school[s] vote on this proposal?): [The Communication and Theater Department will be impacted because the Journalism and Broadcast Journalism programs are being combined.](#)

4. **Impact on Services:**

- a. Ryan Library:

- i. What new library acquisitions, if any, will be needed to support the proposed changes (if none, please state that): [No library acquisitions are needed.](#)

- ii. Person and Date of Contact: [Frank Quinn, January 15, 2016](#)

- b. Instructional Technology:

- i. How many new online/hybrid courses does this proposal include:

[None](#)

- ii. How many instructors will need online training or course development assistance over the first two sessions if this proposal is approved:

[None](#)

- iii. Person and Date of Contact: [Since no additional training is required, I have no one to contact.](#)

SECTION TWO: WHAT

1. **Overall Proposal Description** (In one sentence, describe the nature of the proposed changes or the proposed new academic offering): [In the prioritization memo, the](#)

Department of Communication and Theater was instructed to examine the overlap between the Media Communication program and the Broadcast Journalism program (a program shared with LJML) and LJML was instructed to support Com and Theater in that conversation; the result has been the decision to combine the Broadcast Journalism program with the Journalism program (the two programs were combined until 2001).

2. **Items** (Please describe each item of the proposal with a phrase or one-sentence abstract. Examples might be, "Item 1: To drop XXX course from XX program. Item 2: To add XX course as a requirement", etc. Some proposals will only have 1 item. Add item lines as needed.):
 - a. Item 1: Eliminate the programs in Journalism and Broadcast Journalism
 - b. Item 2: Add the program Multimedia Journalism
 - c. Item 3: Drop WRI 350 Writing for the Mass Media from the curriculum
 - d. Item 4: Drop WRI 490 Special Studies in Writing/Journalism
 - e. Item 5: Add JRN 360 Special Topics in Journalism to the curriculum
 - f. Item 6: Add JRN 440 Capstone Course (need a title) Sent in separate email

SECTION THREE: WHY

1. **General Rationale** (Please provide a one-sentence rationale for this proposal.):
The rationale is two-pronged: 1) to keep pace with changes in the profession of journalism, and 2) to respond to the PLNU president's cabinet's concern about the overlap between the Media Com and Broadcast Journalism programs and the cost of those two programs.

2. **Mission** (How do the proposed changes support the mission of the university?):
To the extent that the Broadcast Journalism and Journalism programs align with the university's mission, the new Multimedia Journalism program will align with the university's mission. The program will strive to continue to graduate students prepared to enter the various careers available in journalism and contribute to the Christian formation of these graduates.

3. **Internal Factors** (Please provide additional rationale by answering the following questions as applicable: How does the proposal(s) ...address the PLNU strategic plan? ...address factors arising from assessment data or program review findings? ...accommodate the department or school's learning outcomes for the major, minor, concentration, etc.? ...increase departmental effectiveness/efficiency? ...enhance enrollment or generate new revenue? What impact will it have on the size of the major, minor, etc.? Other internal rationale?): The proposal supports the strategic plan by aligning with the prioritization memo from the cabinet. Assessment data suggests that both programs have been graduating students well-prepared to enter the field of journalism; the new program will enhance that preparation. In addition, it should address costs concerns by functioning with one fewer faculty member than has been the case for the last few years. The learning outcomes for the two programs can be easily combined and aligned. Departmental efficiency will be enhanced in a number of ways. Advising majors can now be consolidated so that LJML faculty are doing all of the advising. With the departure of a key faculty member in Com and Theater and with no plans to replace that faculty member, this consolidation is essential to continue to provide majors with coherent advising and a coherent program. The combined major programs will have greater visibility which may result in increased ability to recruit students into the major.

4. **External Factors** (Please provide additional rationale by answering the following questions as applicable: To what extent have external factors motivated this proposal, for example what comparable colleges and universities are doing? ...improvements suggested by alumni or outside reviewers? ...stipulations imposed by outside accrediting agencies? ...other external rationale?.): The field of journalism has gone

through tremendous changes in the last twenty years. Gone are the days when a strong line exists between those journalists who work solely for newspapers and magazines and journalists who work exclusively for television and radio stations. Now all journalists are expected to produce web-based journalism as well. The alumni of the two programs provide ample evidence of these changes. **Need help with other schools offering multimedia journalism degrees** All top journalism schools are doing this, even if they aren't changing the name of the degree to Multimedia Journalism as we are. Missouri, USC, Northwestern, NYU, and others have made this shift in emphasis.

SECTION FOUR: HOW

- A. Course Learning Outcomes** – For each new course, please provide the course learning outcomes. (If not needed, please state as such.) **We need CLOs for the Special Topics course and the Capstone course. Just emailed those to you**
- B. Assessment Plan** – For new programs, please provide an assessment plan. (If not needed, please state as such.) **With the addition of the capstone course, the assessment plan can be altered so that all assessment can be tied to the portfolio. Yes, we agree.**
- C. Teach-Out** – Provide a plan detailing how students who begin this program will be able to finish if the institution determines that the program is to be closed. (If not needed, please state as such.) **No teach-out strategy is needed beyond advising continuing students. With the removal of only one course from the curriculum, this should not be a problem.**
- D. Catalog Copy** – In this section, please demonstrate in a two-step process how the department/school would like the change to be made. Keep in mind academic policies with regard to number of units for major, minors, certificates, etc. See Academic Proposal Resource Information at the end of this template.
 - **Step 1:** In the applicable set of boxes below:
 - For revision, addition or elimination of courses only, complete Section 1-A, entering current and/or proposed catalog text as indicated in the section instructions.
 - For revision, addition or elimination of majors, minors, concentrations or certificates, complete Section 1-B, entering current and/or proposed catalog text as indicated in the section instructions.

Section 1-A--Courses Only: Proposals for course elimination should complete the shaded (left) side only, proposals for course addition should complete the unshaded (right) side only, and proposals for course revision should complete both sides of Section 1-A.

Current course code and description (including units, prerequisites and grade type):

Change the prefix of the following courses from WRI to JRN

WRI 250 Introduction to Journalism (3)

WRI 310 Advanced Reporting (3)

WRI 312 Television News Writing (3)

WRI 313 Computer-Assisted Reporting (3)

WRI 340 Media Ethics and Law (3)

WRI 345 Editing (3)

WRI 355 Public Relations Writing (3) (do we want to include this? Yes – this is a useful course, and draws students to our major)

WRI 430 Multimedia Journalism (3)

WRI 440 Magazine Editing and Concepts (3)

Proposed new course code and description (including units, prerequisites and grade type):

Change the prefix of the following courses from WRI to JRN

JRN 250 Introduction to Journalism (3)

JRN 310 Advanced Reporting (3)

JRN 312 Television News Writing (3)

JRN 313 Computer-Assisted Reporting (3)

JRN 340 Media Ethics and Law (3)

JRN 345 Editing (3)

JRN 355 Public Relations Writing (3) (do we want to include this?) Yes, this is a useful course, and draws students to our major.

<p>Change the prefix of the following courses from COM to JRN (we will need to consult with Com and Theater on this part)</p> <p>COM 312 Television News Writing (3) COM 313 Television News Production (3) COM 413 Advanced Television News Production (3) COM 414 Long-Form Broadcast News (3)</p>	<p>JRN 430 Multimedia Journalism (3) JRN 440 Magazine Editing and Concepts (3)</p> <p>Change the prefix of the following courses from COM to JRN</p> <p>JRN 312 Television News Writing (3) JRN 313 Television News Production (3) JRN 413 Advanced Television News Production (3) JRN 414 Long-Form Broadcast News (3)</p>
<p>Course 1: Click here to enter text.</p>	<p>Course 1: Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>Course 2: Click here to enter text.</p>	<p>Course 2: Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>Course 3: Click here to enter text.</p>	<p>Course 3: Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>Section 1-B--All Other Proposals: Proposals for elimination of a major, minor, concentration or certificate should complete shaded (left) side of this section only, proposals for addition of any of these should complete the unshaded (right) side only, proposals for revision of any of these should complete both sides of Section 1-B.</p>	
<p>Current Program (or major, minor, concentration, certificate) Name and Introductory Text: Broadcast Journalism</p>	<p>Proposed Revised or New Program (or major, minor, concentration, certificate) Name and Introductory Text: Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>Current Program Learning Outcome: Students who complete the program in Broadcast Journalism will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify and articulate the historical development, content, audiences and function of U.S. media. 2. Write news copy clearly and accurately, demonstrating quantitative and qualitative reasoning. 3. Create and edit a news story based on accepted industry standards and values. 4. Employ aural and delivery skills appropriate to various news performance situations. 5. Demonstrate professional socialization skills in various news media environments. 6. Identify major ethical theories and professional codes, apply them critically to ethical dilemmas, and defend the application of the theory and code to a given situation as a Christian communicator. 	<p>Proposed Revised or New Program Learning Outcomes (needed for new majors only): Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>Current Lower Division Requirements and Unit Numbers for Majors. All requirements for minors, concentrations or certificates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COM 150 - Introduction to Media Communication (3) • COM 243 - Introduction to TV and Film Production (3) • COM 275 - Audio Production (2) 	<p>Proposed Revised or New Lower Division Requirements and Unit Numbers for Majors requirements for minors, concentrations or certificates: Click here to enter text.</p>

- TRE 250 - Voice and Diction (2)
- WRI 215 - Newspaper Workshop (1)
- WRI 250 - Introduction to Journalism (3)

Current Total Lower Division Units:

Total: 14 Units

Proposed Total Lower Division Units:

Click here to enter text.

Current Upper Division Requirements and Unit Numbers for Majors.
(Highlight new or revised classes in red.)

- COM 313 - Television News Production (3)
- COM 413 - Advanced Television News Production (3)
- COM 414 - Long-Form Broadcast News (3)
- COM 425 - Advanced Television Workshop (1) 2 Units required
- WRI 312 - Television News Writing (3)
- WRI 340 - Media Ethics and Law (3)
- WRI 430 - Multimedia Journalism (3)
-
- WRI 470 - Internship in Writing (2) OR
- COM 421 - Internship in Communication (3)

Proposed Upper Division Requirements and Unit Numbers for Majors. (Highlight new or revised classes in red.)

Click here to enter text.

Current Total Upper Division Units:

Total: 22-23 Units

Proposed Total Upper Division Units:

Click here to enter text.

Current Elective Options (Highlight new or revised classes in red.):

Take two (2) courses from the following:

- WRI 310 - Advanced Reporting (3)
- WRI 313 - Computer-Assisted Reporting (3)
- WRI 323 - Creative Writing: Creative Nonfiction (3)
- WRI 350 - Writing for the Mass Media (3)
- One literature course beyond general education: (3)

Proposed Elective Options (Highlight new or revised classes in red.):

Click here to enter text.

Current Total Required Elective Units:

Proposed Total Required Elective Units:

Click here to enter text.

<p>Total: 5-6 Units</p>	
<p>Current Names and Course Titles of Concentration #1 (if any—use additional boxes for each concentration.): Click here to enter text.</p>	<p>Proposed Names and Course Titles of Concentration #1 (if any—use additional boxes for each concentration.): Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>Current Total Program Units:</p> <p>Major Total: 41-43 Units</p>	<p>Proposed Total Program Units: Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>Current Notes (if any) at the bottom of program catalog copy: WRI 312 and COM 313 are corequisites and must be taken in the same semester.</p>	<p>Proposed Notes (if any) at the bottom of program catalog copy: Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>Section 1-B--All Other Proposals: Proposals for elimination of a major, minor, concentration or certificate should complete shaded (left) side of this section only, proposals for addition of any of these should complete the unshaded (right) side only, proposals for revision of any of these should complete both sides of Section 1-B.</p>	
<p>Current Program (or major, minor, concentration, certificate) Name and Introductory Text: Journalism</p>	<p>Proposed Revised or New Program (or major, minor, concentration, certificate) Name and Introductory Text: Multimedia Journalism</p>
<p>Current Program Learning Outcome: Students who complete the program in Journalism will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exhibit effective research and reporting practices. 2. Display strong interpretive, analytic, quantitative reasoning, and critical thinking skills in their assignments. 3. Communicate ideas clearly and accurately in forms appropriate to the purpose, medium, and audience. 4. Employ appropriate ethical and legal standards and professional codes in their service to their communities and cultures. 	<p>Proposed Revised or New Program Learning Outcomes (needed for new majors only): Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>Current Lower Division Requirements and Unit Numbers for Majors. All requirements for minors, concentrations or certificates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WRI 215 - Newspaper Workshop (1) * 3 units total • WRI 250 - Introduction to Journalism (3) • COM 150 - Introduction to Media Communication (3) • COM 243 - Introduction to TV and Film Production (3) 	<p>Proposed Revised or New Lower Division Requirements and Unit Numbers for Majors or minors, concentrations or certificates: JRN 215 Newspaper Workshop (3x1) Two units can be substituted from WRI216, WRI217, and COM425 Do we also want to include COM275 Audio</p>

<p>One course from the following:</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LIT 254 - British Writers I (3) LIT 255 - British Writers II (3) LIT 256 - American Writers I (3) LIT 257 - American Writers II (3) 	<p>Production? We don't need this as a requirement, but would like it as an option.</p> <p>JRN 250 Introduction to Journalism (3) COM150 Introduction to Media Communication (3) COM 243 Introduction to TV and Film Production (3)</p> <p>One Course From: (3) LIT 254 British Writers I LIT 255 British Writers II LIT 256 American Writers I LIT 257 American Writers II</p>
<p>Current Total Lower Division Units: Total: 15 Units</p>	<p>Proposed Total Lower Division Units: 17 Units</p>
<p>Current Upper Division Requirements and Unit Numbers for Majors. (Highlight new or revised classes in red.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WRI 310 - Advanced Reporting (3) WRI 313 - Computer-Assisted Reporting (3) WRI 340 - Media Ethics and Law (3) WRI 345 - Editing (3) WRI 350 - Writing for the Mass Media (3) WRI 430 - Multimedia Journalism (3) WRI 440 - Magazine Editing and Concepts (3) WRI 470 - Internship in Writing (2) Two additional upper-division courses beyond GE in literature listed under Literature, Spanish, or French. (6) 	<p>Proposed Upper Division Requirements and Unit Numbers for Majors. (Highlight new or revised classes in red.)</p> <p>JRN 313 Computer Assisted Reporting (3) JRN 340 Media Ethics (3) JRN Special Topics in Journalism (3) JRN 430 Multimedia Journalism (3) JRN 470 Internship (2) JRN 440 Capstone (3) We need a title. I'm suggesting the 440 number because WRI440 is the capstone in Writing 1 Additional Upper Division Literature Course beyond GE (3)</p>
<p>Current Total Upper Division Units: Total: 29 Units</p>	<p>Proposed Total Upper Division Units: 20 Units</p>
<p>Current Elective Options (Highlight new or revised classes in red.):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WRI 220 - Introduction to Creative Writing (3) WRI 315 - Advanced English Composition (3) WRI 321 - Creative Writing: Poetry (3) WRI 322 - Creative Writing: Fiction (3) WRI 323 - Creative Writing: Creative Nonfiction (3) 	<p>Proposed Elective Options (Highlight new or revised classes in red.): Click here to enter text.</p>

<p>Current Total Required Elective Units:</p> <p><i>Total: 3 Units</i></p>	<p>Proposed Total Required Elective Units: Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>Current Names and Course Titles of Concentration #1 (if any—use additional boxes for each concentration.): Click here to enter text.</p>	<p>Proposed Names and Course Titles of Concentration #1 (if any—use additional boxes for each concentration.):</p> <p>Concentration #1 (12 Units) Print JRN 310/350 Advanced Reporting (3) JRN 345 Editing (3) JRN 440 Magazine Editing and Concepts (3) WRI 32X Creative Writing (3)</p> <p>Concentration #2 (12 Units) Media JRN 312 Television News Writing (3) JRN 313 Television News Production (3) JRN 413 Advanced Television News Production (3) JRN 414 Long-Form Broadcast News (3)</p>
<p>Current Total Program Units:</p> <p><i>Major Total: 47 Units</i></p>	<p>Proposed Total Program Units: 49 Units</p>
<p>Current Notes (if any) at the bottom of program catalog copy: <i>*Three units of Newspaper Workshop. WRI 216 or WRI 217 may substitute for two of those units.</i></p>	<p>Proposed Notes (if any) at the bottom of program catalog copy: <i>*Three units of Newspaper Workshop. WRI 216, WRI 217, or COM 425 may substitute for two of those units.</i></p>

- **Step 2:**
 - Arrange a meeting: Arrange a meeting with the APC chair to review the completed portion of the proposal and to receive assistance from the Records liaison in submission of current and/or draft proposed catalog copy called for.
 - Attach Catalog copy:
 - For proposed revisions to existing programs, majors, minors, courses, etc, after this page attach the following supplied by Records: 1) The current year catalog copy for that program, major, etc, and 2) the proposed revised catalog pages for your proposal, based on the information from Step One.

- For entirely new programs, majors, minors, courses, etc, after this page attach the draft new catalog pages for your proposal supplied by Records based on the information in Step One.

STEP TWO: ATTACH CURRENT AND/OR PROPOSED CATALOG COPY AFTER THIS PAGE AS SEPARATE PAGES.

STEP TWO: ATTACH CURRENT AND/OR PROPOSED CATALOG COPY BEFORE THIS PAGE AS SEPARATE PAGES.

SECTION FIVE: SUMMARY CHECKLIST

5-A: Review course and staffing impact with your academic unit's direct report (College Dean or Provost).

- **Total course additions:** Click here to enter text.
- **Total course deletions:** Click here to enter text.
- **Total unit additions:** Click here to enter text.
- **Total unit deletions:** Click here to enter text.
- **Staff impact (increase or decrease):** Click here to enter text.
- **Rotation of courses or deletions of sections to accommodate additions:**

Click here to enter text.

I have reviewed this proposal and the items above and believe the proposal meets all university requirements and is ready for APC review.

Department or School Direct Report:

_____ Date _____

College Dean or Provost as applicable

APC Proposal Reference Information

DEADLINES:

1. Review any Long Form proposal drafts in person with your College Dean or appropriate administrator by **October 2**, prior to submitting the proposal to APC;
2. Submit a short narrative to the APC chair highlighting the proposed changes by **October 9**;
3. Final Long Form proposals are due no later than **November 6** ..., **MEETING THE APPROPRIATE DEADLINES WILL ENSURE THAT APC WILL HAVE ENOUGH TIME TO PROCESS YOUR PROPOSAL(S). PROPOSALS SUBMITTED AFTER THAT DATE MOST LIKELY WILL BE CONSIDERED FOR THE 2017-2018 CATALOG.**

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS:

1. May be generated by any faculty member within a department;
2. Are made as a result of a department or school program review and assessment data or due to external requirements made by outside accrediting agencies (provide appropriate documentation);
3. Are voted on and approved by all full time department members;
4. Will be thoroughly discussed with other departments who are directly affected by the proposed changes (a written response must be received by affected schools or departments and included in the proposal);
5. Will be reviewed by the dean of the College of Arts & Humanities or the Dean of Natural and Social Sciences or appropriate administrator before the proposal is sent to APC;
6. APC chair will consult with Institutional Research and Institutional Effectiveness to determine any potential external reporting problems;
7. Will be recommended for consideration by APC to the faculty at large;
8. Are finally voted on by the entire faculty.

ACADEMIC POLICIES INFORMATION:

Majors:

1. Maximum number of units for a B.A. major: **49 units beyond G.E.**
2. Maximum number of units for a B.S. major: **59 units beyond G.E.**
3. Minimum number of upper division units in any major: **24 units**, half of which must be completed in residency.

Minors:

1. Minimum number of units for a minor: **16 units**

2. Minimum number of upper division units: **12 units**
3. Minimum number of units completed in residency: **9 units**
4. Of the 16+ units in the minor, **9 units** must be distinct from the major.

Certificates:

1. Only academic certificates are acceptable for approval.
2. Certificates vary in size: **6-15 units** when associated with a major but up to **24 units** when not aligned with a major.
3. 50% of the units must be unique to that certificate.

LANGUAGES: FRENCH, ROMANCE LANGUAGES, SPANISH

PART II – Capacity and Resource for Academic Quality

Throughout the report, more data is presented for the Spanish major than the new French major and the cancelled Romance Languages major.

1. External Demand for the Program(s): Analysis of enrollment trends and retention data

For full data from the Office of Institutional Research on all university measures for the Journalism Program, please see

- https://my.pointloma.edu/ICS/Departments/Administrative_Offices/Institutional_Research/Program_Review.jnz

The Noel-Levitz High School Market Demand Share data for language programs indicates that our Language Programs attracts interest at a rate of 0.7% regionally (less than the PLNU median).

Noel-Levitz PLNU Share of Regional Degrees Awarded data (based on the total number of bachelor's degrees awarded between 2003-04 and 2010-11 from institutions within a 150-mile radius of San Diego) shows that PLNU's share of language degrees awarded out of all language degrees awarded in the region is 0.7% (less than the PLNU median).

The enrollment headcount for the **Romance Language Program** from Fall 2006 through Fall 2012 shows a decline from 8.0 to 4.0 students, a 50% decline. Due to the Prioritization guidelines, the University has chosen to discontinue this program.

Romance Language Program retention and graduation rates, as indicated in the First-Time Freshman Persistence data and demonstrated in rolling three-year cohorts, were consistently below the university retention and graduation rates.

Year	Unduplicated University Total	Rolling 3-Year Combined Cohorts: Romance Languages
2006-2008	84.7%	--
2007-2009	83.8%	50%
2008-2010	83.1%	80%
2009-2011	82.7%	71.4%

The enrollment headcount for the **Spanish Program** from Fall 2006 through Fall 2012 shows a decline of only one student, going from 15 to 14 majors, though we did have as many as 21 majors in Fall 2008. However, currently there are 22 Spanish majors (CARS database as of 11/04/14), a dramatic increase. Spanish is the second largest minor on campus (exceeded only by Pre-Therapeutic Psychology)— with 39 current minors (CARS database as of 11/04/14). The growing number of Minors provides a good source for recruitment into the Major. If these students are advised early on, they have the potential to Major. The **French Program** has 6 declared Majors and 13 Minors. (CARS database 11/04/14). The **Romance Languages Program** has 3 current majors. In total the Language program has 83 Majors and Minors combined

Spanish Program retention and graduation rates, as indicated in the First-Time Freshman Persistence data and demonstrated in rolling three-year cohorts, are consistently above the university retention and graduation rates. Students who major in Spanish, even if they are double majoring in Spanish and another major, remain very committed to their Spanish major.

Year	Unduplicated University Total	Rolling 3-Year Combined Cohorts: Romance Languages
2006-2008	84.7%	86.7%
2007-2009	83.8%	91.7%
2008-2010	83.1%	100%
2009-2011	82.7%	100%

We use the rolling three-year cohort data because it shows less volatility than does the single-year cohort data. We are reporting our rolling three-year cohort data as part of our Self-Study Report as suggested by the Office of Institutional Research.

2. Internal Demand for the Program(s)

Support of University Program(s)

The Language Programs account for 8 units of the university's general education requirements for all majors except those majoring in nursing. Therefore, the programs in modern languages generate a significant number of units of instruction for the university.

Share of Undergraduate Headcount: The Spanish program's share of the PLNU undergraduate headcount has remained fairly steady over the last eight years.

	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013

Total Students	15	15	21	19	18	14	14	18
Average Load	14.87	13.73	15.12	14.95	14.89	15.43	15.57	

Retention Rates and Migration: Counterbalancing the share-of-headcount data, our retention rates in the Spanish major show that more students migrate into our major than out of our program. The retention rate is especially impressive considering that a large number of these majors are double-majoring.

	00-02	01-03	02-04	03-05	04-06	05-07	06-08	07-09	08-10	09-11
Original Cohort Size	11	7	8	5	9	7	9	8	8	7
Year 1	12	10	10	7	11	12	15	12	9	8
Year 2	13	12	11	13	16	17	16	14	12	
Year 3	11	11	11	13	16	18	16	12		
Year 4	10	9	9	12	16	17	15			
Year 5	10	9	9	12	16	17				
Year 6	10	9	9	12	16					

3. Size, Scope, and Productivity of the Program(s)

Faculty Profile: As of the fall of 2014, the **Spanish program** has four full-time faculty (Bennett, Cronovich, Mitchell, and Yorba-Gray) and three permanent part-time faculty who typically teach 16-20 units annually and who have demonstrated a long-term commitment to the Spanish program and the university. The **French program** has one full-time faculty member (Lescart) and one adjunct faculty member. Of the five full-time faculty members in the two programs, two hold the rank of full professor and have earned tenure (Lescart and Yorba-Gray), two hold the rank of associate professor (Bennett and Mitchell), and one holds the rank of assistant professor (Cronovich). An additional tenured full professor (McKinney) teaches eight units of introductory German courses annually in addition to world literature courses. The German courses do not count toward a degree program. One faculty member (Mitchell) has four units of release time annually to act as the coordinator of the languages program, to approve study-abroad language courses, and to advise all of the Minors. No one among the full-time faculty has announced plans to retire.

Teaching Assignments: Because of the heavy commitment of the language faculty to the general education program, a typical annual teaching load for the full-time Spanish faculty consists of 16 units of general education units and 6-8 units of courses for the Spanish majors. The French professor typically teaches 8 units of general education language courses annually so he is able to cover all the upper-division French courses for the majors. The permanent part-time and adjunct faculty teach general education courses exclusively. The four full-time Spanish faculty members have different areas of expertise and can, therefore, handle the demands of teaching the upper-division course required for the major and minor programs.

Student Profile: The enrollment numbers of Spanish majors from Fall 2006 through Fall 2013 is indicated in the table of institutional data below. The enrollment numbers show consistent enrollments in the program.

Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
15	15	21	19	18	14	14	18

The enrollment status data for our Spanish majors from Fall 2006 through Fall 2012 is indicated in the table of institutional data below. Our enrollment status data shows a fairly consistent percent of continuing students. Very few students transfer into the program from outside the university.

		Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012
Continuing	Headcount	10	13	17	16	14	12	12
	Percent	66.7%	86.7%	81%	84.2%	77.8%	85.7%	85.7%
First-time Freshmen	Headcount	4	2	3	3	2	2	1
	Percent	26.7%	13.3%	14.3%	15.8%	11.1%	14.3%	7.1%
New Transfers	Headcount	1		1		2		1
	Percent	6.7%		4.8%		11.1%		7.1%
Average Load		14.87	13.73	15.12	14.95	14.89	15.43	15.57

The diversity profile of the Spanish majors from Fall 2006 through Fall 2012 is indicated in the table of institutional data below. While the non-white percentage increased in the fall of 2008 and remained above 20%, room for further growth in this area is certainly possible. Heritage speakers comprise a large part of the student enrollment in Language Programs, especially in

California. We have begun to more actively recruit and inform native speakers on campus about the benefits of language study. We have connected with the Latino student club, ALAS, and with Mexico Ministry on campus in order to gain better access to this population.

		Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012
Gender:								
Men	Headcount	1	4	5	7	7	4	3
	Percent	6.7%	26.7%	23.8%	36.8%	38.9%	28.6%	21.4%
Women	Headcount	14	11	16	12	11	10	11
	Percent	93.3%	73.3%	76.2%	63.2%	61.1%	71.4%	78.6%
Ethnic Origin:								
Non-White	Headcount	2	2	6	5	4	4	3
	Percent	13.3%	13.3%	28.6%	26.3%	22.2%	28.6%	21.4%
White/Unknown	Headcount	13	13	15	14	14	10	11
	Percent	86.7%	86.7%	71.4%	73.7%	77.8%	71.4%	78.6%

The student class level profile of our Spanish majors from Fall 2006 through Fall 2012 is indicated in the table of institutional data below. Our students tend to declare the Major after they have enrolled at PLNU and usually after having taken the GE Language requirement.

		Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012
Freshmen	Headcount	4	2	3	3	2	2	1
	Percent	26.7%	13.3%	14.3%	15.8%	11.1%	14.3%	7.1%
Sophomore	Headcount	2	4	8	4	2	3	4
	Percent	13.3%	26.7%	38.1%	21.1%	11.1%	21.4%	28.6%
Junior	Headcount	3	5	4	6	6	3	5
	Percent	20%	33.3%	19%	31.6%	33.3%	21.4%	35.7%
Seniors	Headcount	6	4	6	6	8	6	4
	Percent	40%	26.7%	28.6%	31.6%	44.4%	42.9%	28.6%

The GPA and SAT exam scores indicate that the incoming Spanish majors compare favorably to the undergraduate population; however, the data sample is much too small to provide reliable information.

Criteria Incoming Student Data (1st-Time Freshmen)	Indicators SAT		Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012
	Avg. SAT Reading	SPA	603	557	645	590	550
		PLNU*	565	561	573	572	583
	Avg. SAT Math	SPA	547	527	600	600	550
		PLNU*	575	564	574	578	585
	Avg High School GPA	SPA	4.13	3.69	4.23	3.67	3.96
		PLNU*	3.73	3.70	3.74	3.77	3.81

4. Revenue and Other Resources Generated by the Program

The Language Programs do not generate additional revenues for the university beyond the tuition dollars their students provide. The Spanish program has a long tradition of generating significant summer school tuition revenue both we classes offered on the Point Loma campus and through the study abroad program in Costa Rica. We are also currently participating in the Community Classroom off-campus program by offering one section of SPA101 and SPA 102 a year. The enrollment for the Spring 2015 has more than doubled that of Fall 2014. This program is bringing added revenue to the University.

5. Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program(s)

The Languages Program budget is included in the budget for the Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages department; thus, it does not have a stand alone budget.

LJML Department budget totals for the past three years are in the table below and include all costs for departmental needs for all LJML programs.

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Annual LJML Budget	\$60, 979	\$60.979	\$60,970

Closing LJML Balance	\$6,810.39	\$3,997.95	-\$3480.58
-----------------------------	------------	------------	------------

According to the Delaware Data, the cost of modern language instruction yields no discernible pattern. In the 2010-11 year, the cost per unit was \$175, well below the established benchmark. In the 2011-12 year, the cost rose to \$230 per unit, just above the established benchmark. For the 2012-13 year, cost rose to \$233 per unit, but this now fell just below the established benchmark. Much more data would be required to make sense of the data, but the cost per unit is certainly worthy of further study. One factor not reported in the Delaware Data is whether or not the participating schools offer majors or rely primarily on adjuncts and part-time faculty for general education instruction.

6. Quality of Program Inputs and Processes

- **Faculty**

The general education language courses are taught by a mix of full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty. The courses for majors are taught almost exclusively by the full-time faculty. Thus, the program is able to deliver general education courses with fairly low labor costs to the university while still providing a quality major program to those students choosing to major or minor in Spanish and French. Spanish general education courses are routinely taught in the summer both on campus and in Costa Rica as part of a popular study abroad program.

Please see section II.3 above for Faculty Profile information already discussed.

Please see faculty vita in Appendix B.

- **Adequacy and Availability**

The French professor (Lescart) is a native speaker who is able to cover the range of upper-division courses required for the major. He holds a PhD. in French Literature from the University of Connecticut. He specializes in 19th Century French Literature and has extensive publications in this field. He presents at and attends conferences regularly. The four Spanish professors have a range of expertise that allows them to cover the courses required for a rich Spanish major. Cronovich and Bennett both specialize in Contemporary Latin American Literature. Yorba-Gray specializes in Golden Age Literature while Mitchell specializes in Contemporary Peninsular and contemporary Latin American Literature. All faculty participate in conferences on a regular basis. For a list of publications, see the attached CV's. Both programs are supplemented by the study abroad courses students are required to complete as a part of the major. Great care is taken to insure that students who study abroad enroll in programs where they receive quality instruction. Prior to studying abroad, majors and minors are advised by the Languages coordinator.

- **Professional Development/ Travel Support**

The language faculty receive the same professional development and travel support enjoyed by faculty across campus. The fact that many modern languages conferences are offered in non-US locations, as well as the need for research and travel abroad does put an additional strain on the professional development funds available to language faculty. It is common practice to accumulate two years of Professional Development Funds in order to be able to attend one event abroad.

- **Technology**

Because language instruction requires the regular use of the language lab, technology is crucial for the success of the Spanish program. The current language lab technology is adequate for the needs of the program.

- **Information and technology resources**

- Library print and electronic holdings in the teaching and research areas of the program

The current holdings are not necessarily adequate for the programs in Spanish and French. However the University's access to Link plus, our proximity to the SDSU and UCSD libraries compensate for any shortages.

- Information literacy outcomes for graduates

Information literacy outcomes for our graduates are specified in our Program Learning Outcomes which may be viewed on the Assessment Wheel. These outcomes are measured in our Capstone course and assessed through a Key Assignment.

- Technology resources available to support the pedagogy and research in the program

The resources in technology are adequate in most classrooms. We also use language lab with Sony Lab Technology. This lab currently meets the needs of our programs.

- **Facilities and other**

Faculty repeatedly request larger chalkboards and whiteboards. When sections of SPA and FRE 101 and 102 are offered in the Bond Academic Center, the facilities are adequate; however, some other classroom space across campus such as the rooms in Cabrillo and Starkey, are less than adequate for quality language instruction. Movable tables and chairs are necessary for optimum pedagogical conditions. The quality of instruction is difficult to maintain in an overcrowded classroom and classrooms in which the furniture is fixed.

- **Staff**

The program shares one department assistant with the programs in literature, writing, and journalism. In addition, the department assistant serves as BAC building coordinator. With the increased assessment demands for reporting and tracking data on our majors and program, with the increased use of online platforms for virtually all daily university business, and with the increased growth of our annual Writer's Symposium by the Sea, the job description of our department assistant needs to be significantly amplified. It now needs to identify specific computing, clerical, and publicity/marketing

proficiencies and test for each of these competencies during the hiring process, and more importantly, a key points throughout the first three years of employment.

Specific to assessment demands, the job description needs to include knowledge of compliance matters (WASC, DOE, etc.) so that our department assistant can complete a significant portion of the clerical work required in all this reporting.

- **Student Profile**

White females comprise the majority of the student population in the Language Majors. The data on students in the major are reported in Section 3 above.

- **Course Profile:**

As reported in number 5 above, the cost per unit is at \$233 per unit which is right below the established Delaware benchmark. Our courses are cost effective. Our enrollment numbers in some of the Upper Division courses tend to be low. Growing numbers in the Major will address this issue. We are also reviewing the transfer credit process of study abroad in order to curtail low enrollment in our Literature classes in particular. Many of our students receive credit for these lower enrolled classes while studying abroad. We can ensure they take other courses and reserve the Upper Division Literature courses to take at PLNU. On the chart below, some courses with one or two students are independent study courses made necessary because students sometimes miss an alternate year course while studying abroad.

Course	F09 sec./ total	SP10 sec./ total	F10 sec./ total	SP11 sec./ total	F11 sec./ total	SP12 sec./ total	F12 sec./ total	SP13 sec./ total	F13 sec./ total	SP14 sec./ total
SPA 101/10 2	13/313	13/30 4	14/32 6	13/323	14/278	14/301	13/265	14/281	13/255	13/262
250	2/18		2/12		2/19		2/13		19	
251		2/19		2/9		2/21		2/13		12
302	22		13		8		17		12	
303		21		18		3		15		17
310	15				9		2		17	
315			18		2		10			
320		11		4		11			1	13
380		16				7			9	

390				21				10		
400			2	9	2			3		
402	10									
437		3				3				2
439			10				2		2	
485		5		6		4		4		3

- **Resource Profile:**

Resources for the program are generally adequate for students enrolled in the major program. However, greater university resources must be committed to the promotion of language study at PLNU in order to attract more language students to the university. Data indicates that the students who enroll are satisfied with the program, but in a region as multilingual as southern California, more students should be interested in majoring and minoring in Spanish and French.

Capacity and Resource for Academic Quality

Key Findings	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Our students tend to be predominantly white. While, generally, Language programs draw interest of Heritage Speakers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · We have established contact with groups directly associated with this population on campus, and are more actively recruiting. (ie. ALAS, the Association of Latino American Students)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Low enrollment in Upper Division Courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · We are reviewing the current process of accepting Study Abroad credit to ensure students take courses offered at PLNU
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The large numbers in the Minor provide an opportunity for recruitment into the Major. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Ensure Minors are advised early on of the benefits and possibility for the Major.

PART III – Educational Effectiveness: Analysis of Evidence about Academic

Program Quality and Viability

- **Lines of inquiry:**

1. *Is the program growing, shrinking, or maintaining its current size (enrollment trends over 5 years, retention over 5 years, degrees awarded over 5 years)?*

According to the data the program has decreased in enrollment over the past five years. The average enrollment over the past five years is at 17 and last year the enrollment was at 14. However, this year the enrollment is at 22 for the Major and 39 for the Minor, the strongest numbers ever according to this data. The Romance Language Major had grown over the last five years, but this Program will be discontinued as per recommendation of the Prioritization process of the University. The new French Major has 6 Majors and the French Minor has 13 students enrolled. We do not have data available for the Minors at this time. This data will be important in the future, since these programs are growing.

There have been 26 degrees awarded in Spanish and four in Romance Languages over the last five years. We currently have 83 Majors and Minors enrolled in the Language Programs.

2. *Are students able to move through the program in a timely manner (time-to-degree, courses with high failure rates, course rotation schedule)?*

The time-to-degree is between four to five years and the graduation and retention rates are a little higher than the university's averages. The Majority of our Majors are double Majors.

3. *Is the department diverse (student and faculty data disaggregated to ethnicity, gender, etc.)?*
The student population in Languages tends to be mostly female, with an average of nearly 70% over the past five years. Only about 25% represent an ethnic minority. The university average is 33%.

- **Quality of Program Outcomes**

Mission: Our Mission Statement was drafted and adopted in 2011-2012. No changes have been made since.

http://assessment.pointloma.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/LJML_Mission_2013-2014_Mission-Statement-LJML.pdf

Outcomes: Our Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) were drafted, implemented, assessed, reviewed and revised over the last five years. These outcomes were written to meet the ACTFL standards for Language proficiency as well as the WASC Core Competencies. All of our outcomes were written and revised using Bloom's Taxonomy. All of our Program Learning Outcomes and their alignment to the Institutional Learning Outcomes can be viewed in the documents on the Assessment Wheel.

Please see the 2013-14 Student Learning Outcomes under current documents:

- [05. LJML Outcomes 2013-14, 2014-15 PLOs LANG](#)
- [06. LJML Outcomes 2013-14, 2014-15 PLOs LANG Aligned](#)

Maps: Differentiated Curriculum Maps were drafted and adopted in 2011-12. Revisions were made over the last two years and the current Curriculum Maps for the Spanish and French Programs can be viewed on the Assessment Wheel.

- [LJML Map 2013-2014 Curriculum Map FRE](#)
- [LJML Map 2013-2014 Curriculum Map SPA](#)

Plan: Our Assessment Plan was written in 2012 and has been revised since. Originally it was to be completed in three year cycles, but it was decided that assessment at the mastery level would be more informative, and all assessment is conducted annually in the capstone course. Our Assessment Plan is available for viewing on the Assessment Wheel.

- [05. LJML Plan 2013-2014 Assessment Plan Languages](#)
- [06. LJML Plan 2013-2014 Assessment 3YR Cycle French](#)
- [08. LJML Plan 2013-2014 Assessment 3YR Cycle Spanish](#)

Evidence: For the past three academic years we have written an Annual Assessment Report for our Programs. Annual Reports include listings and results of all key assignments. The Language Faculty meet at the end of the semester, and use the ACTFL rubrics to assess all assignments. Our Criteria for Success was established using College Board Guidelines for the SATII Subject test in Languages and the ACTFL Proficiency Standards. Both of these are normative in the field. Rubrics, assignments and results are available for viewing on the Assessment Wheel. The results gathered demonstrate the Program is working effectively. All performance targets set were met or exceeded.

- [LJML Evidence 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report LANG](#)

Use of Evidence: The French Major was established in 2012. This was mostly in response to difficulty students were encountering with the Romance Language Major. The demands for mastering both languages in one program were too daunting and students tended to opt for only one of the languages. Since 2012 no formal APC proposals have been made for the Language Programs. We have, however, implemented many changes in our assessment work.

1. Revised Alumni Survey in order to embed PLOs and obtain information that is truly relevant to the program.
2. Revised the Portfolio Key Assignments in order to better address our PLOs and WASC Core Competencies.
3. Participated in the Lumina Foundation Pilot Program, DQP. We adapted all Key Assignments to meet these standards as well as those for WASC.
4. Created a new Key Assignment in order to address the Quantitative Reasoning/Literacy Competency.

5. Established a routine calibration and assessment meeting to assess all Senior Spanish Portfolios and Key assignments during finals week.
6. Assessed all Senior Spanish Portfolios.
7. Reviewed assessment results of Senior Portfolios following the completion of the assessment.
8. Embedded WASC Core Competencies into the language of our PLOs, and added competencies that were missing (Quantitative Reasoning/ Literacy).
9. Added to our Assessment Plan and indication of “formative” or “summative” for our Key Assignments.
10. Created Google Drive documents to facilitate and streamline annual revisions to our assessment practices.
11. Completed revisions to our web pages that feature employability and student testimonials for Language Majors.

We plan to take the following actions in 2014-15:

1. Determine curricular changes for Spanish and French Majors proposed in our Program Review Self Study Report.
2. Draft and submit APC Proposals for these curricular changes.
3. Begin to review data collected by the new Alumni Survey.

- **Credit Hour Policy and Monitoring**

The credit hours are in line with university standards which are based on the Carnegie unit. In 2012-13 our curriculum was reviewed and adjustments were made to ensure our courses met number of minutes required by the Carnegie unit standard. The credit hours are monitored by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

- **Recruitment, retention, and student services**

Our recruitment practices and admission criteria are standard to the University. We participate in Preview Days and provide information packets to visiting potential students. We include a document highlighting the kinds of careers our graduates have successfully entered. We have followed up via telephone on admitted students who have shown intention to Major. We have begun an information/recruitment day for the Minor. We invite all of the current 101-102 students for a meet and greet with the faculty and provide information on the requirements and advantages of the Minor. We regularly meet with and advise all Majors and Minors.

- **Disciplinary, Professional, and Community Interactions**

Community interactions are embedded into our curriculum. Students are required to participate and attend community events throughout the entire curriculum. Service Learning components have been incorporated into several courses. More specific examples of Community Service and Interaction is described in Part IV under Unique Features of this document. Furthermore,

students are encouraged to present at conferences and have worked along with Faculty on Research projects. Each Senior presents original research as a Final Senior presentation through the Capstone course. In addition, our students consistently conduct Honor’s Projects.

- **Post-Graduation Outcomes and Alumni Satisfaction**

- A. Graduate School Acceptance Rate— In 2013-14 we created a document in Google Drive to record actual quantitative (not anecdotal) data from all graduates of our LJML programs. The current document includes graduates from the past seven years most completely, but we are adding information from graduates further back as we receive it.
- B. Exit Surveys—We have revised these into a standard template to more directly align with our Program Learning Outcomes, Employability Goals, and Lifelong Learning Goals

Educational Effectiveness: Analysis of Evidence about Academic Program Quality and Viability

Key Findings	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Our PLOs are in line with the Institutional Learning Outcomes and with the WASC Core Competencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · No changes needed at this time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Our Criteria for Success are normative for our field. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · No changes required at this time.
<p>Our Assessment results and data demonstrate the Program is working effectively in meeting our Learning Outcomes. All of our performance targets were met or exceeded.</p>	<p>No changes required at this time.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · We do not have a quantitative record of our students’ placement rates in graduate schools and jobs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · We have created and are building a Google Drive spreadsheet where a systematic, quantitative, and ongoing record our students’ placement rates in graduate schools and careers will be kept.

PART IV – Comparative Position and National Standards

- **Comparison with comparable programs at comparator and aspirant programs at other universities**

Our Programs have been carefully designed and present a well balanced curriculum. The Programs are intended to broaden the student’s perspective and offer a basic foundation upon which to build. The curriculum has been judiciously planned in order to cover the most material with the fewest amount of courses. Twenty one other Colleges and Universities, considered peer schools, were researched for comparative purposes. We discovered that PLNU’s curricular offerings and requirements are well in line with these institutions. We also conducted a study of eleven aspirant schools, most of which have considerably larger programs than PLNU’s. In the tables we have listed all of the PLNU curriculum for the Spanish and French Programs and compared with the offerings at the peer schools. The tables also show where others have additional courses in areas we cover, but we do not list the entire curriculum of each outside program. A review of the tables provides a quick comparison of our courses with these other Colleges and Universities.

Curriculum Comparative Analysis Of Aspirant Schools for Spanish Major

PLNU	101-102	250-251	302	303	310	315	320	380	390	400	402	437	439	485
Calvin College			x	x	X	x			X (2 Courses)	X (one, rest abroad)				
Gonzaga University	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	X 12+ Genre or Period Course		x	x	x	x	x

								s						
Occidental College	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	X 12+ Genre or Period Courses	X (2 Courses)	x				x
Pepperdine University	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x
Santa Clara University	x	x	x	x	x		x	X 12 + Genre or Period Courses	x	x	x	x	x	
Seattle University	x	x	x	x	x	x		X 4 Genre or Period Courses		x	x	x	x	
Trinity University	x	x	x	x	x	x		X 12+ Genre or Period Courses		x	x	x	x	x
University of Portland	x	x	x	x	x	x		X 12+ Genre or Period Courses		x	x	x	x	
University of Redlands	x	x	x	x	x	x		X 8 Genre or Period Courses	x	x	x	x	x	

University of San Diego	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	6+ Genre or Period Courses	X 2 Courses	x	x	x	x	
Wheaton College	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x		x		x

Curriculum Comparative Analysis of Aspirant Schools for French Major

PLNU	101-102	250-251	303	315	320	420	495
Calvin College	x	x	x	x	X	x	x
Gonzaga University	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Occidental College	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Pepperdine University	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Santa Clara University	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Seattle University	x	x	x	x		x	
Trinity University	x	x	x	x		x	x
University of Portland	x	x	x	x		x	
University of Redlands	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
University of San Diego	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Wheaton College	x	x	x	x		x	x

Curriculum Comparative Analysis of Comparator Schools for Spanish Major

PLNU	101-102	250-251	302	303	310	315	320	380	390	400	402	437	439	485
Abilene Christian	x	x	x	x	x	x		x 3 courses		x		x		x
Anderson Univ.	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x
Asbury College	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
APU	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x 2 courses	x	x		x		
Bethel Univ.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x		x
Biola Univ.	x	x		x	x			x		x		x	x	x
Cal Luth Univ.	x	x		x	x	x		x 4 courses	x					x
Chapman Univ.	x	x	x	x combined with Lit	x combined with Lit	x	x	x 2 courses	x 2 courses	x	x	x	x	
George Fox Univ.	x	x	x	x	x	x				x		x		x
Gordon College	x	x	x	x	x	x		x 2 courses	x	x		x		
Messiah College	x	x	x	x	x	x		x 3 courses	x 3 courses	x	x	x		
North Park Univ.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x 2 courses	x	x	x	x	
NNU	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x 2 courses	x	x			x
ONU	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x		x		x
Palm Beach Atlantic Univ.	NA (no Major in													

	Spani sh)													
SPU	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	Ind,	x	Ind.	x
Taylor Univ.	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	
Trinity College	x	x	x		x 2 cours es	x 2 Cour ses	x	x 10+ cours es		x	x	x	x	
Union Univ.	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Westmont College	x	x	x		x	x		x 6 cours es		x	x	x	x	
Whitworth Univ.	x	x	x	x	x	x		x 3 cours es	x	x	x			x

Curriculum Comparative Analysis of Comparator Schools for French Major

PLNU	101- 102	250 - 251	303	315	320	420	495
Abilene Christian (Minor)	x	x	x	x		X 2 courses	
Anderson University	No Major						
Asbury College	x	x	x	x	x	X 3 courses	X in French
APU	No Major						
Bethel University	x	x	x	x	x	x	X in French
Biola University	No Major						
Cal Lutheran University	x	x	x	x		X 5 courses	
Chapman	x	x	x	x	x	X 8+	x

University						courses	
George Fox University (Minor)	x	x	Abroad				
Gordon College	x	x	x	x	x	X 3 courses	x
Messiah College	x	x	x	x	Abroad	Abroad	x
North Park University	x	x	x	x	x	X + 1 course	
NNU	No Major						
ONU	x	x	x	x		Ind.	
Palm Beach Atlantic University (Minor)	x	x	x			X 2 courses	
SPU	x	x	x	x	x	X 4 courses	x
Taylor University	x	x	x	x		X 4 courses	x
Trinity College CT	x	x	x			X 4 courses	x
Union University	x	x	x	x	x	X4 courses	
Westmont University	x	x	x			X 5 courses	x
Whitworth University	x	x	x	x	x	X 5 + courses	X Modern Language Capstone

Best Practices in the Field

In Spanish, best practices in the curriculum is to cover all periods of both Peninsular and Latin American Literatures. This is usually done through survey courses, as it is done at PLNU. Best Practices still indicate a need for Advanced skill courses and at least one Linguistics course, which is in line with the Point Loma Program offerings. Current best practices also include a capstone course and generally more of specific genre or period courses. Our Program falls short in the number of course offerings, specifically in regard to more specialized courses. Currently, Spanish requires a one unit capstone course. One unit does not adequately account for the amount of work needed in this course. The demands in assessment call for a full three unit course. Student feedback has consistently shown the load of this course exceeds its one unit credit. In addition, the great majority of our comparator schools require a Study Abroad component, which also aligns with Point Loma's requirement.

In French, best practices in the curriculum is to cover all periods of French Literature, as well as specific courses on particular authors. PLNU's program covers these in the survey course format without as many courses as other programs. Advance skill courses as well as some Linguistics courses are required. The French Program's size and scope is small and offers the bare minimum of courses to cover the field. Best practices shows the necessity of a Study Abroad component, and this is in line with PLNU's requirement. This program does not currently offer the capstone course needed for best practices in assessment.

Unique features

The interdisciplinary nature of our department allows a interaction between students of literature in both Spanish, French, and English. The Spanish Program requires LIT 250, The Introduction to Literary Studies. The French Program requires Lit 495, The Study of Literary Theory. These courses are foundational in the preparation for literary analysis through the use of literary theory, and allow students the opportunity to transfer knowledge from one language to the other.

The French Program offers a Francophone Literature course which recognizes the many French speaking populations outside of France. This type of course is common practice at larger universities, and is becoming more and more prominent in the study of French Literature.

Through the Capstone course, Spanish Majors prepare and present a senior research project to an audience of their peers, professionals, and family members. This offers students the experience of speaking publicly in a formal setting, thereby providing preparation for both post-graduate work and future employment training.

The Spanish Program offers SPA 320, the course in Mexican-American Literature. This type of course is generally offered in Chicano Studies Programs and/or English Departments. This course reflects the recognition of the large Hispanic population, its culture, and its presence particularly in the southwest area. No other Point Loma program offers this vital course given the growing Hispanic student present on campus.

Point Loma's proximity to the border and its San Diego location provide great cultural integration opportunities for students. All Spanish faculty require students to attend and participate in local cultural events including the annual San Diego Latino Film Festival, the San Diego Mission, Museum exhibits, Dia de los Muertos and Posada events in Old Town, the annual Chicano Park Day, Mass or Church service in Spanish, as well as many others. The majority of the students participate in Mexico ministry teams and events. One faculty member takes Elementary and Intermediate students to visit a Tijuana orphanage once per semester. Several faculty members have incorporated service learning components into courses. Senior Spanish students have served as interpreters at the Mid City Health Promotion center. Many of these activities are service oriented. A Civic Engagement/Service Learning course would officially recognize the work done by both the faculty and the students in this area and would give clear identifiable distinction to the program while supporting the Christian mission and vision of the University.

Comparative Position and National Standards

Key Findings	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · All of our comparator and aspirant schools have Spanish programs except for one. All aspirant schools have French programs. Of the 21 comparator schools 17 have French Programs. Fourteen of these schools offer a Major and three additional schools offer a Minor in French. 	<p>Retain the Language Programs. Not only are they completely standard for our comparator and aspirant schools, but are essential to a Liberal Arts education. Spanish has an added relevance given the Universities location, and both the Spanish and French Programs are growing.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Our curriculum is well in line with our comparator and aspirant schools in terms of covering the basics in the field. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Retain the current curriculum. It is already at a minimum in order to cover all areas of the field.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Our course offerings are minimal. Most programs offer a variety of specialized courses. (ie.in Spanish: Don Quijote, Women Writers, Latin American Short Story, Latin American/Spanish Film, Business Spanish, Translation, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · We have responded to this with the offering of SPA 380, which is a genre/period course that can change topics. Students also have the option of taking courses in these areas while studying abroad. Growing the number of Majors would allow us to offer one or

	more courses of this nature.
Capstone courses are standard three unit courses for the majority of programs.	Add a capstone course to the French Major Add 2 units to capstone course in Spanish. The current one unit is not sufficient to complete all of the necessary assessment.
Given the advantageous location of PLNU, we have great potential for creating distinction in our Spanish program through a Civic Engagement/Service Learning course.	Add a Civic Engagement/Service Learning course. This course would serve both Majors and Minors and would emphasize Christian distinction to the program.

PART V - Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats Analysis

- **Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiality of the Program(s)**

The Languages Programs fully support the mission and vision of the University. Languages are an integral part of a Liberal Arts Education. The programs fit naturally under the core value of Global Perspectives and Experience, where the goal is to equip students to become “world citizens.” Each Language Program is intentional about exposing students to learn about and to experience global perspectives while connecting and expanding their own Christian worldview. Furthermore, the learning and mastering of a foreign language is a skill that complements any career choice making students more marketable by allowing them to work with a wider range of populations and thereby setting them apart from the competition. Our Programs have shown to be efficient and effective. Our assessment data shows we are exceeding the benchmarks for proficiency and that our students are well prepared upon completion of their degree.

- **Opportunity Analysis of the Program(s)**

Our students consistently exceed the set proficiency benchmarks demonstrating the strength and quality of preparation they receive. Our alumni have become employed throughout the country and abroad in the areas of education, law, government, health care, business, NGOs, military service, etc. The Language Programs have great capacity for growth within the University. We are actively recruiting students with the possibility to Minor and informing Heritage speaking students about the benefits of language study. A course in Civic Engagement/Service Learning would enliven the Program by adding practicality into the Major and Minor and would be a draw for Point Loma students.

PART VI - Program Review Themes for Future Inquiry

THEMES FOR FUTURE INQUIRY: Based on the current program review and analysis, discuss any future lines of inquiry the Academic Unit wants to pursue for continuous improvement of the program? Such future lines of inquiry might include revision to mission, learning outcomes, goals, grant opportunities, revised assessment plan, specialized accreditation, etc.

- Alignment of CLOs to newly adopted GELOs
- Increase units from one to three for Spanish capstone course
- Add a capstone course to the French Major
- Add a Civic Engagement/Service Learning course to the Spanish Program
- Actively recruit from within the University potential Minors and Majors
- Maintain our annual assessment procedures and review as reported in our Assessment Wheel
- Review data collected by exit/alumni surveys
- Continue efforts in a Point Loma Study Abroad Program. Currently taking place in the summer in Costa Rica
- Consider the need for other language options within the GE program

Program Review Committee Feedback on Modern Languages Self-study (for complete PR committee report see the end of this document)

Language Feedback: The committee felt that the Languages section of the self-study was generally good but contained some gaps in the analysis, use of evidence and depth of reflection on the programs data. It was unclear whether or not the Languages program was tracking the success of their students post-graduation or not since this was not referenced or discussed in any significant way in the report. It was also unclear if the program is collecting and using information from current students as part of its assessment plan. If the program is not collecting and tracking these kinds of information, it is recommended that they put a plan in place to ensure that they do this moving forward as it is a significant part of the program review process. Like the Literature section, the curriculum analysis against comparator programs was missing key benchmark information regarding the enrollment/size of the comparator programs. It is recommended that this information be included in the final version of the self-study. Also, the committee was concerned that the report did not address the small enrollments within the language programs, especially since this was an issue and expectation raised in the department's prioritization memo as needing attention in program review. The committee wondered if the department learned anything from their curriculum analysis against comparators schools that might lead to useful strategies that could be employed to address this issue moving forward.



PLNU Program Review

External Reviewer Report

Rev 12-4-15

Department Level Analysis

O) Introduction

P) Alignment with Mission

Please review and evaluate the academic unit's response to the questions regarding mission alignment of their unit with the university mission from both an academic and Christian faith perspective. Are there any suggestions for how they might better articulate and demonstrate their alignment to the university mission and purpose?

The PLNU mission highlights minds, character, and service. The LJML Mission Statement aligns well with this statement, especially the first two aspects, mind and character, when it references "focusing on the power of language and story to shape us and our world." This emphasis is evocative and appealing as a framework for studying literature and language. The LJML statement is less explicit about service than the university mission statement. The Modern Languages perhaps seek to remedy this lack in their call for a Service Learning Course as a way to acknowledge and embrace the importance of service within the larger PLNU mission.

Q) Quality, Qualifications and Productivity of Department Faculty

Based on all the evidence and responses provided in the program review report, provide a summary analysis of the qualifications of faculty associated with the program. Identify the degree to which scholarly production aligns with the expectations of the degree level of the program offered (undergraduate, master's) at this type of institution. Are there any strengths or distinctives that should be noted? Are there any gaps or weaknesses that should be noted?

In general the LJML Languages program appears to have sufficient faculty for the number of courses they offer. Most have terminal degrees in their field.

In the Modern Languages department there is coverage of both Latin America and Spain, but there does not appear to be a faculty member with expertise in Linguistics, although Linguistics is required course for Spanish majors. The department is depending on generalists to cover this area. Because the French major is heavily literature-based, it appears that the current faculty are adequate for the program. However, it will be difficult to sustain a program with only one fulltime and one part time faculty member.

Review and comment on the scholarship of the faculty. Identify the degree to which scholarly production aligns with the expectations of the degree level of the program offered (undergraduate, master's) at this type of institution. Where appropriate, suggest improvements that may be necessary to increase the quality and/or quantity of scholarship produced by the faculty in this program.

Because I was unable to ascertain the university's expectation of faculty, it is somewhat difficult to evaluate the scholarly production of Modern Languages faculty. According to the CVs that were passed on to me, few faculty have published or been active in scholarly presentations or publications in the last five years. This may simply be a factor of a failure to update documents—perhaps more recent publications have not been recorded. In their report, Modern Language faculty express concern that their professional development funds are inadequate to their needs. Suggestions: Does the university have a scholarship statement outlining expectations for scholarship? Is there a department level document? What does PLNU and LJML consider scholarship? A number of faculty list travel abroad and leadership of study abroad programs on their CV. Others mention attendance at conferences and workshops. Does the university consider this activity as a way to fulfill, at least in part, the requirement for scholarship? Although, in general, smaller undergraduate liberal arts colleges are not “publish or perish” institutions, in most there is an expectation that faculty will demonstrate an active life of the mind. How does Point Loma envision this? What resources does the university have to facilitate research or to encourage faculty to participate in scholarly forums? Clear expectations and support for faculty so that they can meet university standards would most likely enhance scholarly output.

R) Progress on Recommendations from Previous Program Review

Review the narrative supplied for this section. Discuss whether it provided a good accounting and rationale for what changes have or have not been made based on the previous program review and/or any circumstances that have arisen since? Where appropriate, identify any insights or questions that you might have stemming from this narrative.

According to the Self Study provided, the previous Program Review “will not be referenced in any formal way in this Self-Study Report.”

S) General Education and Service Classes

Identify any program response to GE or service classes that may be associated with this program. Review and discuss the quality of the program's responses to the questions in this section of the self-study. Identify any insights or suggestions that program might consider based on your knowledge of courses like these at other institutions.

The report states that General Education constitutes a large percentage of the annual load for Modern Language faculty. There is no indication that this is seen as burdensome, or conversely, seen as essential to the functioning of the department.

It is surprising that the Foreign Language requirement is only through the elementary level. Especially in a state like California with its large bilingual and immigrant communities, strong language abilities would seem to be an important skill for graduates to demonstrate.

T) Program Level Analysis

1. Trend and Financial Analysis

Based on data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the effectiveness of the program's recruitment and matriculation efforts as it relates to enrollment. Are there any suggestions or insights that you might have that can help to increase the demand for the program and/or improve the enrollment yield?

Enrollment: The report indicates wide participation in events in the local Hispanic community and in nearby Tijuana. In addition to the current Study-Abroad options, these opportunities for language and cultural immersion in the local community should be highlighted in recruitment materials since they are generally attractive to incoming students. The department report states that "greater university resources must be committed to the promotion of language study at PLNU" thus indicating a departmental recognition of a need. However, the report does not state any specific measure to be taken. The department should list specific actions it would like to see taken by enrollment management, along with the cost of these initiatives. These actions might include more targeted communications with students in high schools with strong language programs, communications directed to bilingual communities, college fairs or departmental fairs in local or feeder schools, specific language days to which interested students could be invited, etc.

Based on data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the program's role in GE and Service functions and identify any opportunities or challenges from this that could have positive or negative impacts on the program itself.

Because some of the GE and service courses are taught by part-time and adjunct faculty they are cost effective to the university. However, care should be taken to avoid "ghettoization" of having these courses taught exclusively by non-full-time faculty. The current approach seems to be a sustainable mix.

Based on data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the efficiency of the program based on its overall and course enrollment trends along with the external benchmarking use of the cost per student credit hour data (Delaware). Are there any suggestions or insights that you might have that can help to increase the efficiency of the program without having a negative impact on quality?

No suggestions for increased efficiency.

2. Findings from Assessment

After reviewing the program's responses to their assessment findings, do you think the program is effectively using their assessment activities and data? Are there suggestions that you might make to improve their assessment plan or insights from their data that you might offer in addition to their analysis? Discuss the quality of their analysis and identify elements of their analysis that you think could be strengthened.

From the documents submitted it appears that all assessment activities are concentrated in the required one-credit capstone course. This has the advantage of capturing data on 100% of the program majors, but the disadvantage of turning this course into a strictly assessment-gathering tool rather than a true academic course.

The assessment activities employed by the department are problematic. PLO 5 (Knowledge of the nature and structure of language) is currently measured through an exit exam, listed as the SAT II Subject Test in Spanish. This test, while thorough, is intended to measure the language abilities of a strong high school student or a 4th semester university student. The SAT website states that "this test reflects what is commonly taught in high school." As such it would appear to be an inadequate measure of university-level learning.

The other PLOs are said to be measured using the ACTFL (American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages) rubrics for speaking and writing, however the department provides a "key" which translates percentage grades into ACTFL scores, thus rendering these ACTFL ratings meaningless or mere labels for internal scoring.

While it is certainly legitimate for the department to set up its own criteria for determining success and to measure student output against that criteria, it seems specious to say that the department is using ACTFL criteria, when in fact it is using its own benchmarks (percent grades on tests and assignments) to determine student achievement.

While a true ACTFL rating of Advanced High is most likely an indication that a student would be able to achieve a 90% or better on an exam or assignment, the converse is not necessarily true. That is, a student may be able to achieve 90% on an assignment, but still be unable to meet the very specific requirements of an Advanced High designation according to ACTFL.

Also problematic is the practice of having all students internally rated. ACTFL, through Language Test International, offers testing in all of the four skills. Although this testing is costly, it would be helpful to have at least a portion of the students tested externally to provide an external benchmark of quality.

My concerns are based on the extraordinarily high achievements of the PLNU students. At most universities few students, other than native speakers or heritage speakers, are able to reach the ACTFL Advanced High proficiency level by the time they graduate. Based on the information given in the diversity profile of Spanish students at PLNU, it appears that most Spanish majors do not fall into those categories, yet department data show that not one student falls below the Advanced level in any area of evaluation, with most achieving an Advanced Mid or an Advanced High.

According to Glissan et al. (2013) only a little more than half (54%) of teacher candidates are attaining at least an Advanced Low according to the ACTFL scale. However, according to the data in the Year-End report for Languages, 100% of PLNU students achieve the Advanced level on the internally administered and evaluated Oral Proficiency Interview, and the majority of those are at the Advanced Mid or Advanced High level. When compared to national averages, these statistics do not appear credible.

The unusually high scores in the oral proficiency levels of students cast doubt on the similarly high achievement levels in other categories.

Recommendations: If the department wishes to continue to use ACTFL guidelines and terminology in its program evaluation, faculty who administer and evaluate tests and assignments should be trained through an official OPI certification workshop and should periodically have the opportunity to attend refresher workshops to ensure that they are evaluating according to the most current norms in the field. ACTFL offers a number of workshops each year. However, these workshops are very expensive and require a great deal of additional time and effort for the faculty member who participates.

Alternately, some or all students could take an official test through a third-party organization, such as LTI. These externally administered tests will provide clear and unbiased data about the achievement levels of PLNU graduates.

Even if neither of these aforementioned recommendations are possible, percent grades should no longer be connected to ACTFL levels. The department could legitimately have a goal that stated that 70% of students would achieve a grade of at least 80% on a certain test or assignment. However this 80% should not be equated with an ACTFL level for the reasons mentioned earlier.

3. Curriculum Analysis

After reviewing the program's curricular analysis, student learning outcomes (SLOs), and curricular map, characterize the quality and appropriateness of the program's curriculum for meeting the learning outcomes expected of students within this discipline. Identify any possible changes to the curriculum or to the SLOs that would result in an improved program.

In general, the curriculum of the Modern Languages department is appropriate and adequate to meet the needs of its students. The capstone course requirement of a public presentation of a senior research project is an excellent way to showcase the breadth and depth of learning of student who is a language major. However, since students in this course are called to summarize and reflect on their entire university experience and are also asked to fulfill all the assessment tasks for the major, one credit hour is insufficient to fulfill these objectives effectively. The department desire for a full, three-hour capstone course is very reasonable and would bring it into alignment with world language departments in other institutions, while the addition of two credits to the program would not overly burden a student majoring in Spanish.

The department also mentions the possibility of a Civic Engagement/Service Learning course. Such a course could be an important component of the student experience. The department does not indicate whether this would be an additional requirement for the major, an elective credit within the major, or an interdisciplinary course offered as a cognate for the major. Does the university have a policy on the size of a major that would preclude adding this as a requirement? If so, what current course would be eliminated to make room for the Service Learning course? If the course is added into the rotation of upper level courses, how would that affect other course offerings? Are there faculty to teach this course? Are there sufficient high-quality, language-rich placements to justify this being a Spanish course? Would it be more feasible as an interdisciplinary cognate course? If this is a required course for the major or an elective, the department would have to decide whether courses taken during study abroad could fulfill the requirement (more and more off-campus programs include some opportunity for service learning or internships). This is an exciting and innovative possibility, but it needs additional research before moving forward.

After reviewing the program's curricular analysis through a guild or comparator lens, summarize and discuss the quality of their analysis and comparison and offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider regarding their curriculum content and structure.

The current scope and sequence of curriculum is quite standard and adequate to the needs of most students of Spanish. The requirement for Spanish majors to take LIT250 and French majors to take LIT495 is an excellent way to ensure that students have a strong, basic conceptual understanding of literature and literary criticism before embarking on their study of literature in the target language. The total of 28 credit hours beyond the intermediate level is somewhat light. Most programs require at least 30 credit hours above the 200 level.

After reviewing the program's curricular analysis through an employability lens, summarize and discuss the quality of their analysis and narrative and offer any suggestions or insights that

might be helpful for the program to consider regarding their curriculum content and structure as a preparation for future employment.

The current Spanish, French, and Romance Language majors are all very heavily literature based, comparable to many other university's World Language programs. However, with more and more of higher education being market driven, it may be wise to rethink traditional curricular offerings. Perhaps the addition of a "Special Topics" course which could encompass the desired Service Learning/Cultural Engagement as well as Spanish for Business/Medicine/Social Work/etc. would allow the flexibility to explore new course offerings and the nimbleness to adjust to differing needs of students and expertise of faculty.

Although the alumni survey seems to indicate that a number of graduates go on to positions in education, there do not appear to be any courses taught in the department that would focus specifically on their needs. The School of Education offers Education 346, but it is unclear who teaches this course and how the course is related to the Spanish Department. Since Spanish high school teachers can be potent influencers of the students in their classrooms, it behooves the Spanish Department to nurture the connection with their graduates who plan to go into education.

After reviewing the program's curricular analysis through a pedagogy lens, summarize and discuss the quality of their analysis and narrative and offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider regarding the delivery of their curriculum in ways to enhance the student learning experience.

Nothing in the materials provided addresses the type of pedagogy employed by the department.

4. Potential Impact of National Trends

After reviewing the program's discussion of possible impacts from national trends, discuss the quality of their response and identify if there are trends in the discipline that the self-study has missed or not adequately addressed based on your expertise and opinion.

National trends are contradictory. On the one hand, there has never been so much emphasis on global readiness and intercultural competence. On the other hand, xenophobia is rampant and more and more people are willing to trust technology like Google Translate to communicate for them. World Language programs in many institutions are likely to face continuing challenges from those who believe that the dominance of English worldwide obviates the need for second language learning. However, particularly in Christian colleges and universities, the mission of teaching languages and cultures is a clear response to God's call to love our neighbor as ourselves.

5. Quality Markers

After reviewing the program's discussion of its quality markers and the questions posed in this section of the self-study, discuss the quality of their response to these questions and identify

any particular strengths and/or weaknesses that you might see in this section of the self-study. Please offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider relating to these quality markers.

No information found.

6. Infrastructure and Staffing

After reviewing the program's discussion of its infrastructure and staffing, discuss the quality of their analysis and reflection in this important area and offer any suggestions or insights that you might suggest they consider.

The department indicates that resources are generally adequate, although they highlight the need for classroom with sufficient space and flexible seating. While these may seem like minor elements, they are important to enable faculty to employ effective pedagogical techniques. World language classrooms must be conducive to communication, with space for students to move around and interact, and furniture that can be moved to accommodate different types of communicative activities.

Due to increased assessment and reporting requirements throughout higher education, academic departments are generally in need of increased clerical assistance. This staff must be cognizant of the common evaluation tools in the field and be able to compile and organize data so that it can be easily accessed and understood.

7. Challenges and Opportunities

Do you feel the report adequately identified the challenges and opportunities that they face based on your understanding of the discipline? Why or why not. Are there other challenges or opportunities that you see based on your review of the self-study and your understanding of the discipline in today's higher education context?

The internal evaluation does not indicate any recognized weaknesses of the program, nor does it identify any specific threats.

Generally, World Languages departments in the United States face the threat that comes from English being the dominant world language. As David Smith has noted, "It has always been harder to persuade the powerful to learn the languages of the less powerful. If my culture is powerful, it's easier to sit back and rely on others' efforts to learn my way of speaking" (141). Because of this, World Language faculty must continue to assert the value of language learning as both a communicative and cultural tool in our increasingly global society.

The university already has an established program in Costa Rica during the summer for beginning language learners. This program could potentially serve Spanish majors and minors as well with the added benefit that PLNU would be able to control curricular content. The department could explore ways to further leverage this existing program.

The proximity of PLNU to Hispanic communities in San Diego and in Mexico has been mentioned in the documents as a benefit for students of Spanish. The department seeks to enhance their connection to these communities through a Civic Engagement/Service Learning course. Such a course could increase the cross-cultural engagement of the students and provide valuable space for additional language practice. Continued exploration of connections between PLNU and its Spanish-speaking neighbors should be encouraged.

Smith, D. I. (2012). Shouting at Your Neighbor: Why We Bother with Other Peoples' Languages. In G. Schmidt & M. Walhout (Eds.), *Practically Human: College Professors Speak from the Heart of Humanities Education* (pp. 133-145). Grand Rapids, MI: Calvin College Press.

8. Recommendations for Program Improvement

Do you feel the recommendations being made for this program are supported by the analysis and evidence provided in the self-study document and narrative? Discuss why or why not. Are there other recommendations or suggestions that you would make that the academic unit should consider? If so, please give a brief rationale for why?

The department has identified three recommendations under Capacity and Resource for Academic Quality:

- 1) Actively recruiting majors/minors from Hispanic populations on campus.

This has potential to increase enrollment. However, this group generally has unique linguistic needs. Does the department have the ability and capacity to offer these students more specialized courses such as Spanish for Heritage Speakers?

- 2) Review what Study Abroad courses are accepted.

The data mention that enrollment numbers in some of the Upper Division courses tend to be low and that part of the reason for that are the credits that students transfer in from their study abroad experience. This problem is not unique to PLNU. Indeed, most World Language programs are struggling with how to balance the desire for students to participate in an off-campus program with the need to maintain quality upper division courses for language majors on campus. A possible solution—if other university departments are willing—is for students to fulfill other general education requirements in the target language during their study abroad. Even this, though, can be a double-edged sword. If students are able to count these courses toward both general education requirements and major requirements, the ability to “double dip” makes the study abroad very attractive and makes it very easy for students to double major. However, when all of these courses are allowed to count toward a language major, the on-campus language program may lose enrollment in upper level courses. While limiting the number of courses that count toward a language major may help enrollment in upper level courses in the short run, it may also discourage students from double majoring. I have not heard of a university resolving this problem in a way that is satisfactory to all involved.

- 3) Ensure minors are encouraged to major

This is an excellent way to grow enrollment in the major.

The department has identified only one recommendation under Educational Effectiveness:

Spreadsheet to record placement rates: In many universities this information would be collected and kept by a Career Services office in conjunction with the academic departments.

In addition, I would recommend revising and improving the current assessment program as detailed in the comments in Section 2.

The department has identified five recommendations under Comparative Position and National Standards.

Since enrollment in both Spanish and French appear to be growing, it is clear that there is demand for these programs, and that they should be continued.

The current curriculum manages to cover the most essential areas covered by most universities, although, at 28 credits beyond the intermediate level, it is smaller than many programs. If possible, it would be good to increase the number of credit hours in the major by at least two (probably the additional two credit hours requested for the capstone). Although the small number of majors hinders the department from offering a many different upper level courses, a “Special Topics” course could encompass courses beyond literature and allow students to explore Spanish in the professions, Spanish in the Arts, or other specialized areas.

The French major is similarly challenged, with nearly all of the upper level courses being literature centered. It too would benefit from a strong capstone course and a special topics course.

The department’s recommendation for a Civic Engagement/Service Learning course is a creative approach to community engagement. While such a course would likely prove attractive to students, the concerns mentioned in section 3, Curriculum Analysis, should also be considered.

U) External Reviewer Feedback on PLNU Program Review Process:

We recognize that there are many ways to approach a program review. We would value your feedback on our process so that that we can continue to make it better and more helpful to the programs undergoing review. Are there areas that were confusing or sections that you felt were unhelpful? Are there areas that you were not asked about where you feel you could have provided useful information? Is there anything about the process that you would recommend we change or consider changing that could make it better?

Although receiving the documents for this review via email attachment was efficient for the university, it was cumbersome for me. It required me to hunt through the documentation for hotlinks and download and print information that I needed to consult as I prepared my remarks. I'm not sure that I always found the correct or most up-to-date information. Particularly challenging was the information found on the Assessment Wheel. While the wheel maybe an attractive and efficient way of displaying information electronically, it did not lend itself to the kind of extended study and evaluation required of a project of this nature.

I was also frustrated at times with the disconnect between the questions that the report template asked and the kind of information that the department documents provided. For example, the template regularly asked the evaluator to review "the department's discussion of..." certain elements and then to "discuss the quality of their response." However, often the department documents did not address the issues about which the report template inquired. I believe it would have been helpful for the department to have been able to use the report template to guide them as they prepared documents for the evaluators.

There was little opportunity to review and evaluate the department's co-curricular activities (i.e. student clubs, advising, student-faculty interactions, both organized and informal, outside of class). In many cases alumni report that these co-curricular activities strongly influence decisions about whether or not to major in a particular area. Thus, there should be some sort of accountability or recognition of these activities.

**Response to External Review
Modern Languages Program
April 2016**

Plan for Improvement: Recommendations from the Program Review:

List the recommendations that emerged from the program review that will be pursued to improve the programs housed in the academic unit.

The Program Review Committee made a number of recommendations to the Modern Languages Programs.

1. The committee urged the language programs to demonstrate that they were active in tracking the success of their graduates.
2. The committee urged the language programs to engage current students in future program review activities.
3. The committee urged the language programs to compare themselves to other comparator and aspirant programs regarding the size of the program.
4. The committee wanted the program faculty to discuss plans to address small class sizes because this was listed as a priority during the process of establishing priorities for the academic sector.
5. The committee asked the Foreign Languages Program to address the scope of curricular changes in greater depth. Through these curricular changes we are attempting to address the growth of the Program as well as meet the demands of the current trends, and highlighting our missional distinction.

Action Steps for Implementing Improvements:

Indicate the actions steps and timeline that will be followed to implement the recommendations being pursued. Note – not all recommendations listed need to be implemented.

1. Like all the programs in LJML, the Modern Languages programs are tracking alumni by entering data about alumni in a shared Google document. In addition, the Modern Language faculty are working with Marketing and Creative Services to redesign the program's website to include testimonials from alumni regarding their experience as students and the work they have done utilizing their degree as alumni.
2. As the Spanish program prepares to prepare an APC proposal for curricular changes, we will be sure to engage current students in the process.
3. The comparator work has not yet been done, but we will include comparator and aspirant program information in the rationale for the curricular changes to be developed in the fall.
4. Program faculty are discussing a number of initiatives to address small class sizes in the major programs in Spanish and French. The development of a certificate in French is underway. And the development of a certificate in Spanish is being discussed. In addition, the Modern Languages section has been given a substantial monetary gift, and the faculty are discussing how to use the funds to raise the profile of language study on the campus. Plans include a public lecture series to raise the visibility of the modern language programs on campus, working with the appropriate support staff personnel to identify incoming students who might be interested in further language study (those, for example, who have scored at least a 4 on the AP language exam and have thus waived the GE requirement), and continuing to work within the new

structures of the Office of Global Studies to allow Spanish majors to complete key aspects of the major during a semester or summer abroad.

5. The following suggestions consist of lower and upper division changes to move the program forward for a 2016 APC proposal as well as aspirational goals for the Spanish program:
 - a. Lower Division: GE and Intermediate-
 - i. Greater emphasis on communicative skills in the beginning language courses.
 - ii. Spanish 101 and 102 will be changing to a textbook that will allow the flexibility to modify the content to one that still meets our needs, and also frees up time for the emphasis in communication.
 - iii. Language Lab use will be restructured. We will be using the *Talkabroad* Language service, which allows students to set up conversations with native speakers from around the world. This will provide a communicative goal for students to work toward, connect internationally and offer relevancy. The Spanish faculty have incorporated a pilot conversation program that will be instituted in all elementary sections once a financing plan is completed.
 - iv. Change the name of the first course of Intermediate to Conversation in order to promote continuation of Language study. The focus of this course is oral production and if this is reflected in the name, it will encourage more students to continue.
 - b. Upper Division: Major and Minor-
 - i. Offer SPA 320 as a cross-listed course for Literature in English. SPA 320 is Mexican American Literature and Culture. The readings of this course are in English, and the course material necessitates the use of English already. If the course is open to all students as a possibility for meeting a Lit requirement, it would potentially draw heritage speakers and encourage them to take other SPA courses.
 - ii. Propose a Civic Engagement course that would be required for all Minors and Majors. This course would emphasize cultural interaction and promote the use of oral skills. It would allow our program to take advantage of our location, as well as highlight missional distinction through partnership with Christian organizations serving the community.
 - iii. Add 2 units to SPA 485, the capstone course. This would allow for all assessment work to be completed, and for the course to also serve its academic purpose. The current one unit credit is insufficient for the demands of the course.
 - c. Aspirational Goals—The following steps are designed to build a program with at least 20 majors by the fall of 2020. They are also designed to ensure that no more than one class per semester has fewer than 10 students enrolled.
 - i. Work with colleagues across campus in appropriate academic units (for example: Education, Social Work, International Studies, International Relations, International Business, Nursing, Christian Ministry) to explore how language study beyond the GE requirement might be incorporated into their respective programs of study. Report to the LJML chair and the Dean of Arts and Humanities by the end of the Spring 2017 semester. This may include but need not be limited to a certificate program.

- ii. Work with the Office of Global Studies to develop a Spanish language study trip led by PLNU faculty with the goal of submitting a proposal for such a trip no later than the 2017-2018 academic year.
 - iii. Work with the LJML chair to schedule one special topics course for the 2017-2018 academic year aimed at attracting heritage speakers who are not currently majoring or minoring in Spanish. Establish a goal of an enrollment of at least 15 students for that.
 - iv. Work with the LJML chair to schedule a second section of SPA250 for the fall of 2017 to boost enrollment in the course and to enhance pedagogy among those enrolled.
 - v. Develop a partnership with colleagues in the Office of Spiritual Development to provide mutual support for ministry programs or Love Works trips to Spanish speaking areas.
- d. MLA Consultation- Hire a consultant through the MLA for assistance and advice on how to invigorate the program. The exact semester of implantation will depend on the availability of the appropriate consultant. But the hope is that the consultation will be complete before January 2018.
- e. Promotion Events: We are committing gift funds to putting on events that will promote Language study on campus. The first step will be completed in the 2016-2017 academic year with a cooperative program with the Brewed Awakening series sponsored by the CJR. A larger promotional event will be planned before the end of the Spring 2017 semester.
6. **Assessment Measures:** What assessments will be done to determine if the recommendations are leading towards the desired improvements? How will we know if we have been successful?
- a. Success will be demonstrated when information from alumni is included in the next round of program review.
 - b. Success will be demonstrated when information from current students is included in the APC proposal in the fall of 2016.
 - c. Success will be demonstrated when information from comparator and aspirant programs is employed as informing the APC proposals in the fall of 2016.
 - d. Success will be demonstrated when enrollment in French and Spanish courses increase.
7. **Financial Implications of the Action Steps:** Are there any financial implications associated with the actions steps coming from the program review recommendations? If so, what is the timeline and estimated scope of each need listed?
- a. Because of the generous gift received by the Modern Language section, the action step of promoting language study should not require significant institutional funds. Rising enrollments will make the language faculty even more productive than they are now.
8. **Areas of Accountability:** Are there areas identified by the administration that need particular attention during the next review cycle period? If so, indicate what they are and how and when they will be addressed.
- a. The most obvious area of accountability is in the need for increasing enrollments in the intermediate and upper-division language classes and in the need to make sure the

curriculum offered to Spanish and French majors and minors compares favorably to the programs at comparator and aspirant programs.

9. Response to the External Reviewer's Comments:

- a. The review responded in mostly positive ways to the programs and their faculty. The reviewer's questions about faculty scholarship have been largely addressed in the process of developing rank and tenure policy. The reviewer expresses surprise that an intermediate GE language requirement was not in place. Obviously, the program faculty would fully support a required second year of language study.
- b. The reviewer expressed concerns in the "Findings from Assessment" section regarding the use of the ACTFL scores. The program faculty have cleared up a misunderstanding and have stated that we do use ACTFL Standard rubrics and designations. We gave them numbers for quantified data purposes, but we use their designations to do evaluations. In addition, two of the three continuing Spanish professors are OPI trained, and the French professor is also trained for OPI assessments. The reviewer questions the validity of some of the achievement levels of the Spanish majors. But the major continues to attract high achieving students, many of the double majors who have exhibited high grade point averages not only in their Spanish courses but in their other courses as well. The language faculty insist on the validity of the assessment data provided.
- c. The reviewer was generally supportive of the program faculty's desire to expand the capstone course and add a service learning/civic engagement component to the curriculum.

To: Karl Martin, Chair of the Department of Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages

From: Program Review Committee

Subject: Program Review Committee Feedback on Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages Self Study

The Department of Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages (LJML) submitted to the Program Review Committee in December 2014, their program review self-study of the faculty's assessing and analyzing the current state of the department's academic programs and the students' educational experience. The LJML faculty are to be commended for their commitment to work together to address their common concerns, and they are to be commended for the extensive work they have undertaken over the past several years in the areas of assessment and program review. The self-study is ready for external review and the following is the Program Review Committee's feedback based on its review and analysis of the department's self-study.

The Program Review Committee prepared for the review of the LJML self-study document according to the approved Program Review Guidelines protocol. The Committee has taken into consideration that while the department has been working on the program review, that the Program Review Guidelines have been continually updated. As much as possible the Program Review Committee has taken this into consideration and been guided in its assessment by the Guidelines under which the department began the program review process. The Program Review Committee provided the department a liaison, Dr. Maggie Bailey, to support the department's review work through the process. In addition, the college dean (Kathy McConnell) and the Director of Institutional Research also met with the department on an as-needed basis.

However, since the review of the self-study by the Program Review Committee in spring 2015, the process of Program Review has been simplified and a new template with guided questions has been adopted. Given there are significant changes in the new process and LJML completed their self-study under the old system, it seemed prudent to re-evaluate the committee's feedback to the department in light of the new expectations to ensure that the feedback does not emphasize areas that will not be a part of program reviews moving forward (while also not introducing new expectations). Previous feedback from the Program Review committee to other departments has been directly tied to the PR template for the self-study. Rather than provide the feedback in this manner for LJML, we will summarize the general areas that the committee had concerns that would still be relevant under the new and simplified system. The PR committee apologizes for the delays caused by this transition to a simplified system but believes the feedback will be more beneficial to the department as a result.

2. All programs did well introducing and describing their programs and the quality and scholarly productivity of their faculty. However, all programs tended to view productivity solely in terms of scholarship and therefore did not reflect on other areas of faculty productivity such as SCH generation, advising loads, % of FT faculty, and involvement in high impact practices, etc...
3. While it is strongly believed that the faculty implicitly support and live out the Christian mission of the university, the committee had difficulty finding explicit evidence of this in the written documents of the department that would distinguish them from any other university without a Christian mission. The Program Review committee recommends the department find ways to explicitly communicate what we know is implicitly occurring in this area.
4. On the whole, there seemed to be unevenness between programs in terms of the quality and thoroughness of their self-studies with Literature coming in highest and Writing, Languages and Journalism following in that order.
 - a. Literature Feedback: The committee felt that the Literature section of the self-study was very well researched and written and demonstrated significant reflection and analysis with good use of evidence. This may be tied to the fact that the assessment plan and infrastructure for literature was the most highly developed of the LJML programs. The one area of weakness in the Literature section was that the curriculum analysis against comparator programs was missing key benchmark information regarding the enrollment/size of the comparator programs. It is recommended that this information be included in the final version of the self-study.
 - b. Writing Feedback: The committee felt that the Writing section of the self-study was generally good but did contain a few gaps in the analysis and depth of reflection on the programs data. It was unclear whether or not the Writing program was tracking the success of their students post-graduation or not since this was not referenced or discussed in any significant way in the report. If the program is not collecting and tracking this kind of information, it is recommended that they put a plan in place to ensure that they do this moving forward as it is a significant part of the program review process and the program is in its 7th year. Like the Literature section, the curriculum analysis against comparator programs was missing key benchmark information regarding the enrollment/size of the comparator programs. It is recommended that this information be included in the final version of the self-study. Finally, there seemed to be a gap around the understanding of the connection between the increase in enrollment in the Writing program and the decrease in enrollment in the Journalism program. Given these programs recently separated, the committee expected the analyses of these programs to be done in this context. The Writing analysis emphasized the significant increase in enrollment without acknowledging it was primarily due to a decrease in Journalism and by not looking at the combined data between the two programs, failed to recognize the overall decreasing enrollment trend.

- c. **Language Feedback:** The committee felt that the Languages section of the self-study was generally good but contained some gaps in the analysis, use of evidence and depth of reflection on the programs data. It was unclear whether or not the Languages program was tracking the success of their students post-graduation or not since this was not referenced or discussed in any significant way in the report. It was also unclear if the program is collecting and using information from current students as part of its assessment plan. If the program is not collecting and tracking these kinds of information, it is recommended that they put a plan in place to ensure that they do this moving forward as it is a significant part of the program review process. Like the Literature section, the curriculum analysis against comparator programs was missing key benchmark information regarding the enrollment/size of the comparator programs. It is recommended that this information be included in the final version of the self-study. Also, the committee was concerned that the report did not address the small enrollments within the language programs, especially since this was an issue and expectation raised in the department's prioritization memo as needing attention in program review. The committee wondered if the department learned anything from their curriculum analysis against comparators schools that might lead to useful strategies that could be employed to address this issue moving forward.
- d. **Journalism Feedback:** The committee felt that the Journalism section of the self-study was had some good areas but contained several gaps in the analysis, use of evidence and depth of reflection on the programs data and curriculum analysis. It was unclear whether or not the Journalism program was tracking the success of their students post-graduation or not since this was not referenced or discussed in any significant way in the report. It was also unclear if the program is collecting and using information from current students as part of its assessment plan. If the program is not collecting and tracking these kinds of information, it is recommended that they put a plan in place to ensure that they do this moving forward as it is a significant part of the program review process. The committee felt that the main gap in the Journalism report was that the curriculum analysis was inadequate to warrant the "status quo" recommendations contained in the report. Even accounting for the decline in enrollment due to the formation of the Writing major, there is a significant drop off in Journalism majors which was not acknowledged or addressed. Additionally, there have been significant changes in the industry since the last program review and these were only addressed tangentially in the report and led to no significant recommendations. Finally, the comparison of the curricular model of Journalism at PLNU to two other programs from large universities gave a good philosophical argument for the model but lacked any detailed analysis of curriculum or use of data to demonstrate its adaptability to a school of our size and resources. It is recommended that the department work with the Dean and external reviewers to make sure that a more in depth analysis occurs to determine if the recommendations in the report are adequate for ensuring the success of the Journalism program moving forward.

Program Assessment & Review Committee
FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT
LJML Program Review (Self-Study & External Reviews)

DATE: December 12, 2016

TO: Dr. Karl Martin, Chair of the Department of Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages

FROM: Program Assessment & Review Committee (PARC)

SUBJECT: PARC Feedback on LJML Program Review

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages (LJML) submitted a rigorous, substantial, and comprehensive review of four programs. During academic year 2015-16, each of its four programs completed a self-study and received feedback from the former Program Review Committee (PRC), culminating in an LJML summation report before proceeding to the External Review stage, which in turn produced responses germane to the External Reviewer Reports (ERR). The Literature program, in particular, was praised for a well-articulated analysis and earned further recognition for a highly developed assessment infrastructure. The quartet of self-studies and external reviews led to constructive insights and recommendations for all four programs. Although the self-studies varied in the quality and/or quantity of data analysis and depth of narrative, the four LJML program reviews, taken as a whole, reflect an arduous journey in pursuit of evidence-informed, continuous improvement. To this end, LJML is ready to proceed with crafting a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

CONTEXT & PROCESS

The LJML Department conducted its program review during a transition to the current one. PARC has taken these changes into consideration, offering flexibility in its criteria to allow for differences between the former evaluative rubric and the new version. For example, challenges in linking the analysis of data templates to questions in the prior format are mitigated by the provision of data charts loaded directly into streamlined program review templates. Additionally, the prior self-study format required a SWOT analysis, which can be applied to the criteria for GF7, “Challenges and Opportunities” in the new one, but the criteria for “Quality Markers” did not align as seamlessly.

Due to the aforementioned transition in formats and criteria, new rubrics used for this final report on LJML program review will not be submitted in the form of a consensus rubric. Whereas the former Program Review Committee provided formative comments for each program’s self-study based on the old criteria, this final report aims to offer a final summation with an eye towards providing useful recommendations for submitting Academic Policy Committee (APC) proposals and crafting the MOU.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

LITERATURE/ENGLISH EDUCATION

As previously mentioned, Literature’s program review presented a highly developed assessment culture, providing a strong humanities exemplar for evidence-informed decision-making. Updates to the General Education literature curriculum, which included culturally diverse, global experiences, were also commendable.

In light of enrollment trends at the national and university levels, the Literature program could benefit from proactively strategizing to recruit majors externally (via admissions and marketing) and internally (within the university). In consultation with the School of Education, it should also closely

monitor the demand for single-subject teachers in English and/or Language Arts with regard to California's new 4-year track to a credential, with the potential of an English Single-Subject Matter Program (SSMP) under exploration.

WRITING

The Writing program enjoys stability in its enrollments. The external reviewer also encouraged continued efforts to improve the Writing program's internal (on campus) and external visibility. Persistence in outcomes-based assessment and analyzing longitudinal alumni data (esp. "employability lens") will continue to guide curricular adjustments and hiring needs.

Its faculty are encouraged to be mindful of equitable distribution with regard to faculty GE course loads, a good practice for all programs carrying heavy GE service. Forecasting program strengths, areas for growth, challenges, and opportunities will continue to benefit this program. Examples could be exploring the feasibility, sustainability, and viability of a low-residency MFA program and/or professional certificate program in publishing or editing to enhance the Writing program's visibility, growth, curriculum, and revenue.

JOURNALISM

The most anecdotal in style of the four program reviews, Journalism's self-study presented a dedicated faculty passionate about teaching in their discipline. Going forward, in future review cycles, the program should aim for improved evidence-based analysis in its reporting. For instance, clearer quantification and cause-effect analysis of the "major migration" between Journalism and Writing programs could help faculty ascertain how to strengthen (mutually enhance) each of their majors to sustain or grow enrollments. In this spirit, as the program explores combining Journalism and the Communication & Theatre Department's Broadcast Journalism into a joint major (possibly as Media Journalism), the program should continue to monitor enrollments, program assessment findings, alumni job placements, national industry trends, and skills demand.

Continued longitudinal alumni data collection and "closing the loop" on alumni tracking, especially with regard to job placement, will also be relevant as the Journalism and Broadcast Journalism program faculty discuss the future of their program identities and curriculum. Using data-informed evidence from annual outcomes assessment, alumni surveys, and industry reports will guide program-level adjustments and equip journalism majors with transferrable skills like digital storytelling and global media-based writing within the classic contexts of journalistic inquiry and faith-based professionalism.

MODERN LANGUAGES – Spanish and French

The Spanish program was commended for a strong assessment culture wherein curricular adjustments ensue from outcomes measured by standardized assessment instruments, and for overall sustaining useful practices to measure the attainment of learning outcomes at or near graduation, such as a required exit survey. Moreover, the Spanish program was praised for presenting a strong curricular analysis of comparator & aspirant campuses, and for its clear reflective analysis on language lab resources (deemed adequate at the writing of the self-study), classroom furniture issues, library resources (usefulness of library exchange program), and other facility areas and/or infrastructure.

Tracking the rising costs of language programs, enrollment numbers, and the evolving role of language programs (comparative literature) as purveyors of "translingual" and "transcultural competence" will continue to inform our programs in Spanish and French, especially in light of PLNU's vision as a transformational, globally engaged university. A resource to inform strategic planning for Spanish and French might be "Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed

World” (MLA Profession 2007), and more recent reports on the Modern Languages Association (MLA) Foreign Languages site: <https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Teaching-Enrollments-and-Programs/Foreign-Languages-and-Higher-Education-New-Structures-for-a-Changed-World>

Romance Languages, per longitudinal enrollment data (currently at 3 majors), is in the process of elimination due to prioritization. On a side note, the reflective analyses in the Spanish program review constituted the predominant voice in the Modern Language program review, whereas the quantitative and qualitative analyses for the French major were sparse by comparison. (From the data provided, it is unclear whether French is sustainable as a major. Further clarity and analysis would be useful for elucidating the major’s sustainability.) Data analyzed for the French major was remarkably less apparent, overshadowed by the abundance of information presented for the Spanish program within the report. Clarification on whether French and Spanish are assessed as a unit (as Modern Languages, for example), and the benefits of this approach, is recommended.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EACH PROGRAM

LITERATURE/ENGLISH EDUCATION

Evidence-Informed Culture of Decision-Making

1. Sustain exemplary assessment practices, fine-tuning processes and adjusting curriculum as necessary.
2. Continue to review and update CLOs for course redesign, per Literature’s program review findings and prioritization.
3. Continue to monitor Literature’s course enrollments with a goal of remaining at or below the Delaware benchmark (cost per unit).
4. Monitor the demand for English SSMP and related subject matter(s) (i.e. Language Arts) in light of new four-year track to a credential; interface with School of Education leadership for guidance.

Program-Level Curricular Development

1. See above.
2. Sustain the inclusion of global & underrepresented voices in course reading lists and topically focused courses, adjusting curriculum wherever necessary based on internal assessment evidence, comparator & aspirant campuses, and national trends in Anglophone literature and comparative literature programs.

Program-Level Co-Curricular Development

1. Launch a chapter of Sigma Tau Delta, the International English Honor Society (for English language and literature majors) to promote the quality and visibility of the Literature major; collaborate with Writing program to recruit members and sponsor events. Website: <http://www.english.org/sigmatd/>
2. Continue to develop a strong undergraduate research culture. Prepare students for undergraduate conference presentation opportunities.
3. Identify and pursue writing opportunities for Literature events in collaboration with Writing and Journalism.

Departmental-Level Culture & Strategy

1. Participate in holistic “shared mission & vision” strategic thinking, evidence-informed decision making, information-sharing, and other actions germane to promoting department-level educational effectiveness among the four LJML programs, including the recruitment and retention of all majors.

WRITING

Evidence-Informed Culture of Decision-Making

1. Sustain excellent assessment practices, fine-tuning processes and adjusting curriculum as necessary.
2. Continue to review and update CLOs for course redesign per Writing's program review findings.
3. Establish an alumni advisory group to advise the program faculty, as described in "Program Review Themes for Future Inquiry" for the Writing program.
4. Consider exploring a partnership with the Office of Institutional Research in creating a database that tracks job placement rates and career destinations, per External Reviewer's report.
5. Monitor faculty workload data to support equitable GE course-load assignments between faculty.

Program-Level Curricular Development

1. Explore program development opportunities based on current and projected trends and market niche(s) for writers, editors, and publishers in southern California.

Program-Level Co-Curricular Development

1. Identify and pursue feasible & relevant grant-writing opportunities for Writing in collaboration with Literature and Journalism.
2. Consider ways to increase the number of Writing majors serving at the Writers' Studio, per self-study recommendations.
3. Consider launching a chapter of Sigma Tau Delta, the International English Honor Society (for English language and literature majors) to promote quality and visibility for the Writing major; collaborate with Literature program to recruit members and sponsor events. Website: <http://www.english.org/sigmatd/>

Departmental-Level Culture & Strategy

1. Participate in holistic "shared mission & vision" strategic thinking, evidence-informed decision making, information-sharing, and other actions germane to promoting department-level educational effectiveness, especially between related majors such as Journalism.

JOURNALISM

Evidence-Informed Culture of Decision-Making

1. Continue to implement the multi-year assessment plan to sustain & strengthen Journalism's culture of evidence-based, outcomes-based analysis. Adjust the curriculum as appropriate.
2. Identify and pursue feasible & relevant grant-writing opportunities for events in collaboration with other LJML programs such as Writing and Literature, including the high-profile literary lecture series, Writer's Symposium by the Sea.
3. Closely monitor any declining major and course enrollments; strategize accordingly in dialogue with other programs, esp. Writing.
4. Any requests for FTE hires vs. adjunct coverage would benefit from stronger connections to curricular coverage needs and richer analysis of Delaware data.
5. Continue to monitor alumni and job placement information ("employability lens") to inform programmatic adjustments, as relevant.

Program-Level Curricular Development

1. Design a culminating experience ("capstone") that combines WRI 310 and WRI 350.
2. Explore courses shared with CMT, common goals, efficiencies, threats, and opportunities between Journalism and Broadcast Journalism. Interface with CMT chair and Broadcast Journalism faculty.
3. On a related note, further explore the pros and cons of designing a new media journalism program, possibly blending and/or replacing the two aforementioned programs (Journalism and Broadcast

Journalism), and how this might exist in relation to CMT's Media Communication.

4. Periodically revisit program learning outcomes to keep current with a fast-paced, media-saturated field with multiple facets (i.e. visual storytelling, photojournalism, media writing, broadcast journalism).
5. Design methods of regular environmental scanning to forecast industry trends, updating curriculum according to internal outcomes-based assessment and external skills-based demand.
6. In collaboration with the Chair and the Dean of Arts & Humanities, engage in further consideration and response to external review comments as the program crafts its action plan.

Program-Level Co-Curricular Development

1. Grant-writing opportunities, as mentioned in the program review, are worthwhile to the program's goals (preceded by clarification of vision and strategy as Journalism, Broadcast Journalism, or Media Journalism) and capacity-building.
2. Continue to develop internship opportunities for Journalism's majors in partnership with the Office of Strengths and Vocation.

Departmental-Level Culture & Strategy

1. Participate in holistic "shared mission & vision" strategic thinking, evidence-informed decision making, information-sharing, and other actions germane to promoting department-level educational effectiveness, especially with related majors such as Writing.
2. Design a strategy for the proactive recruitment and retention of the program's majors & minors in dialogue with the LJML chair and lead faculty in other LJML programs.
3. Journalism's program review frequently underscored a need for more diverse faculty. Consider what steps can be taken to remedy the underrepresentation in future hires, such as extending its current network of contacts among LJML colleagues and beyond PLNU.

MODERN LANGUAGES

Evidence-Informed Culture of Decision-Making

1. Sustain excellent assessment practices, fine-tuning processes and adjusting curriculum as necessary, such as adding a civic engagement, service-learning course to the Spanish program.
2. Develop a plan for what language offerings PLNU should make accessible to current and future students. For instance, create a shared rationale that the university and other departments & schools can support to empower Modern Languages in offering relevant GE language choices.
3. Implement adjustments to Spanish capstone, revising units from 1 to 3, per Spanish self-study recommendations.
4. Design a culminating experience ("capstone") for the French major.
5. Continue to monitor alumni and job placement information ("employability lens") via data collected by exit and alumni surveys.
6. Further reflection on potential factors contributing to the rising cost-per-unit trend (per Delaware), and what steps could minimize costs, would be useful.
7. Strengthening the data analysis for the French program would be useful for elucidating sustainability.

Program-Level Curricular Development

1. Identify and evaluate potentially useful models for language programs per Modern Languages Association (MLA) Profession reports, analysis of national trends, and comparator & aspirant institutions.
2. Ascertain which majors partner with Spanish with regard to double majors (Business, Education, health sciences) to strengthen visibility and accessibility. Proactively develop relationships with these

majors, i.e. plan schedules together, host informational sessions, and design cross-disciplinary marketing and academic advising.

3. In collaboration with the Chair and the Dean of Arts & Humanities, engage in further consideration and response to external review comments as the program crafts its action plan.

Program-Level Co-Curricular Development

1. Continue to offer study abroad in Costa Rica in partnership with the Office of Global Studies, refining curriculum and updating marketing as necessary.

Departmental-Level Culture & Strategy

1. Participate in holistic “shared mission & vision” strategic thinking, evidence-informed decision making, information-sharing, and other actions germane to promoting department-level educational effectiveness.

2. Program faculty and department chair should meet with the Arts & Humanities Dean to design a plan for Modern Languages in terms of review the structure of their programs according to current disciplinary standards (MLA Profession Report as a resource) and ascertain which languages PLNU needs to provide to its students.

3. Additionally, clarify whether the current status is a Modern Languages program or a separate Spanish program and French program. On a related note, clarify whether the language(s) programs will be assessed together as a unit.

4. Design a strategy for proactive recruitment and retention of language(s) majors & minors in dialogue with the LJML chair and lead faculty in other LJML programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT

DEPARTMENT OF LITERATURE, JOURNALISM, & MODERN LANGUAGES (LJML)

The LJML program review, in sum, provided rich insights into the details of a quality curriculum with heavy GE service as well as distinctives such as the Writer’s Symposium and study abroad opportunities. The narratives elucidated the genuine efforts of a dedicated, productive faculty passionate about teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service in each of their disciplines. The focus on program-level identity and ownership, at the same time, ran slightly contrary to reflecting on the program reviews in aggregate, probably due in part to the prior format of the self-study, which did not include a departmental-level synthesis. (The current self-study format requires a department-level synthesis.) The resulting effect was a compartmentalized or “siloe” presentation wherein autonomous programs took precedence over a collective, departmental identity, in turn obscuring any traces of a mutually responsive culture enhancing educational effectiveness. In the future, enhanced lateral communication, cohesiveness, and information-sharing among the programs could be useful in monitoring enrollments, cost per unit (Delaware), the effectiveness of shared curriculum, and the development of co-curricular programming such as Sigma Tau Delta and grant-writing activities.

Likewise, the Writing program’s response to its External Reviewer Report (dated December 4, 2105) encouraged the Program Review Committee to consider reviewing Literature, Journalism, and Writing programs “in aggregate” rather than separately, in other words, “treating them as an English Department with 112 majors. The Noel-Levitz data, for instance, grouped Journalism, Broadcast Journalism, and Writing into one aggregate. Looking at the FTE of the faculty of those three programs will yield more informative results than examining the programs individually” (102). In the future review

cycle, LJML should keep in mind the new program review template with regard to a required departmental-level synthesis for multiple-program departments.

Administratively, LJML might consider shifting the department chair's service from a rotational basis to a multi-year commitment after a trial period with the possibility of renewal. The benefits of administrative stability and continuity, especially in light of implementing multi-year strategic plans and building a cohesive department-level culture – especially under the guidance of an effective chair – might outweigh the benefits of rotating chair duties, the latter which presents its own set of challenges.

With regard to departmental-level strategic planning, PARC further suggests that LJML persists in reflecting on proactive strategies to market its unique distinctives, adjusting curriculum for growing their major enrollments in light of national trends. For instance, it might explore markets within creative industries (literary editing, magazine publishing, book design, media writing), transferrable skills and employability for relevant industries, professional certifications (book design, publishing, and/or editing), all constructed from existing courses in Writing, Journalism, Business / Marketing, and Art & Design, which could offer our LJML department a competitive edge in recruiting humanities majors early in the admissions stage.

Writing in various contexts, intercultural competencies, interpersonal “soft skills,” and critical thinking are only a few of the multitudinous “highly desired” skills & traits sought by today's employers. To this end, persisting in monitoring industry trends (MLA Profession, U.S. Dept. of Labor's O-Net, and Burning Glass), collecting meaningful quantitative and qualitative alumni data, and analyzing their job placements will strengthen LJML's ability to plan strategically and maximize their resources over the years; at the writing of their program review, LJML tracked alumni quantitatively back seven years, which is a commendable practice. “Closing the loop” on this data will continue to benefit the department.

Finally, with the state of California's new 4-year path to a teaching credential, the university might consider investing time and resources in supporting potential single-subject matter (SSMP) preparation programs like LJML to equip prospective teachers of literature, writing, language arts, and/or foreign languages like Spanish and French, plus English Language Development (ELD) or ESL (English as a Second Language) certifications and/or preparation.

CONCLUSION

With a full set of recommendations in hand, LJML is positioned to gather insights from its program faculty, department chair, and dean in response to this report prior to PARC's finalization of “Findings & Recommendations.” The programs, in collaboration with the Dean of Arts & Humanities, are specially encouraged to engage in further consideration and response to external review comments as the programs craft their action plans.

After the report is finalized and the department is provided with an opportunity to share feedback, LJML may submit proposals for curricular adjustments and craft an MOU in conferral with its faculty, chairs, dean, and provost. As aforementioned, suggestions to improve the program review process for multiple-program departments are welcome.