

**Board of Regents Program Review  
Department of English  
Weber State University**

Scott M. Sprenger  
Lindquist College of Arts and Humanities

V@Áí ||| , ā \* ĩ Á@ÁÖ^æ q ÁÛ^• ] [ ] • ^ Áí ÁGEÍ -16 Board of Regents Program Review of the English Department at Weber State University. I have reviewed all of the available materials, including the English Department Self-Study, the Evaluation Team Report and the Department Response. I want to thank Hal Crimmel and his colleagues for their thorough Self-Study as well as the Evaluation Team for their valuable report. In my response, I concur with most of points made in the Department Response to the Evaluation Team Report, but I also raise a few new questions and areas of concern.

**Standard A Mission Statement**

Áæ ] ! ^ & ãe Á @ Áí } & ã ā } Áæ ā Áæ ã Á Á @ Áí ^ æ d ^ } q Á ã • ā } Áæe { ^ } d Á • ] ^ & ãe Á as it is embodied later in two, extremely succinct learning outcomes.

**Standard B: Curriculum**

I agree with the faculty comments that there should be some (but not too much) flexibility in the writing course curriculum, especially at the 2010 level. There are many ways to build that in. One could imagine, for example, developing 3 or 4 different course models, inflected by a writing-in-the-disciplines approach and which would accomplish two things: it would better serve students across campus who need and want to learn to write in their chosen fields and it would provide potential variety for faculty members. The concern for unity and common standards across sections could be achieved via common learning outcomes and rigorous assessment of learning. The work done over the last few years, led by former WSU Composition Director Dr. Scott Rogers, to develop the TICE 2010 curriculum in collaboration with other state-supported schools,

courses? 2) Are there other curricular issues that might be discouraging students to complete a major?

**Standard C: Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment**

The phrase: "Evidence exists that the faculty are somewhat surprising. Does this mean that faculty are not required to use learning outcomes in the syllabus and/or the assessment of writing?"

As I mentioned above: the departmental outcomes are clear and elegant. I think, however,

contiguity, am I to conclude that the reviewers and/or department members feel that pre-requisites are driving students away from the English major? I am happy to see that Chair Crimmel has put an inquiry into retention issues on the agenda for the coming year.

**General recommendations:**

If you are not an English major, you should not take this course. If you are an English major, you should take this course as a pre-requisite for ENGL 101. If you are a non-English major, you should not take this course. If you are an English major, you should take this course as a pre-requisite for ENGL 101. If you are a non-English major, you should not take this course. If you are an English major, you should take this course as a pre-requisite for ENGL 101.