Program Outcomes Assessment

MA in English

Created on: 11/09/2010 02:18:00 PM CST
Last Modified: 05/18/2015 03:18:58 PM CST

Table of Contents

General Information (Program Outcomes Assessment)

Standing Requirements

◈ Mission Statement

The goal of the graduate program in English is to prepare students to pursue terminal degrees, to teach in community colleges and high schools, or to work in technical writing, editing, and publishing. Courses in the Department provide opportunities for students to acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to succeed in their academic and professional lives.

To achieve this multifaceted goal, students in the graduate program in English study literature, language, and criticism; write in a variety of contexts for a variety of purposes; and complete a culminating project (master's paper, thesis, or creative project).

Through a multifaceted program of study, practice, and application, graduate students in English are prepared to continue their graduate studies or to begin their professional careers.

◈ Outcomes Library

MA in English

1. Professional Communication

Outcome	Mapping
1.1 Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.	No Mapping

2. Diverse and Complex Communities

Outcome	Mapping
2.1 Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.	No Mapping

3. Ethics

Outcome	Mapping
3.1 Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.	No Mapping

4. Mastery of Knowledge

Outcome	Mapping

4.1 Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.   No Mapping

5. Mastery of Skills

Outcome	Mapping
5.1 Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.	No Mapping

Old - MA in English

MA in English Learning Outcomes

Outcome	Mapping
1.a. Conduct research Conduct research which shows originality and the mastery of research tools and materials.	No Mapping
1.b. Theoretical approaches Skillfully employ a variety of critical and theoretical approaches.	No Mapping
1.c. Literary works in English Demonstrate a broad, sophisticated understanding of literary works in English—and their literary, cultural, and historical contexts.	No Mapping
1.d. Written work Produce substantive written work that demonstrates creativity and superior command of rhetorical strategies and style.	No Mapping
1.e. Specialized knowledge Demonstrate specialized knowledge of an area of literature, writing, or pedagogy.	No Mapping

◈ Curriculum Map

Active Curriculum Maps ⊚

MA in English (See appendix)
Alignment Set: Old - MA in English
Created: 04/26/2012 2:46:37 pm CST
Last Modified: 04/27/2012 10:38:20 am CST

◈ Communication of Outcomes

The Department of English makes its programmatic outcomes clear to students and other interested people in a variety of ways. The outcomes are

- posted on the Department website,

- posted on the advisement website of the Director of Graduate Studies,
- clarified in Department brochures,
- reiterated in the course materials of English 600 (Bibliography and Research Methods in English), and
- reiterated in the course materials of English 635 (Literary Theory and Criticism).

Archive (This area is to be used for archiving pre-TaskStream assessment data and for current documents.)

◈ Archive

File Attachments:

1. **English_ISU External Review 2009.pdf** (See appendix)
....
2. **English_Self-Study Report. Fall 2009.pdf** (See appendix)
....
3. **Grad. Studies--communication of outcomes** (See appendix)
   the ways and places where we convey our program's progress
....
4. **Graduate Program Review 2013-2014.pdf** (See appendix)
....
5. **Graduate Studies in English--mission statement** (See appendix)
....

2009-2010 Assessment Cycle

◈ **Assessment Plan**

Outcomes and Measures

Old - MA in English

MA in English Learning Outcomes

1.a. Conduct research
Conduct research which shows originality and the mastery of research tools and materials.

▼ **Measure:** Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): three year cycle (2008, 2009, 2010)

Responsible Individual(s): Director of Graduate Studies

1.b. Theoretical approaches
Skillfully employ a variety of critical and theoretical approaches.

▼ **Measure:** Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective.

Target: MA Graduate Students

Implementation Plan (timeline): three year cycle (2008, 2009, 2010)

Responsible Individual(s): Director of Graduate Studies

1.c. Literary works in English
Demonstrate a broad, sophisticated understanding of literary works in English—and their literary, cultural, and historical contexts.

▼ **Measure:** Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): three year cycle (2008, 2009, 2010)

Responsible Individual(s): Director of Graduate Studies

1.d. Written work
Produce substantive written work that demonstrates creativity and superior command of rhetorical strategies and style.

▼ **Measure:** Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): three year cycle (2008, 2009, 2010)

Responsible Individual(s): Director of Graduate Studies

1.e. Specialized knowledge	▼ **Measure:** Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment Direct - Student Artifact
Demonstrate specialized knowledge of an area of literature, writing, or pedagogy.	**Details/Description:** graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective. **Target:** **Implementation Plan (timeline):** three year cycle (2008, 2009, 2010) **Responsible Individual(s):** Director of Graduate Studies

◈ Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

Old - MA in English

MA in English Learning Outcomes

1.a. Conduct research	▼ **Measure:** Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment Direct - Student Artifact
Conduct research which shows originality and the mastery of research tools and materials.	**Details/Description:** graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective. **Target:** **Implementation Plan (timeline):** three year cycle (2008, 2009, 2010) **Responsible Individual(s):** Director of Graduate Studies

Findings for Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment

Summary of Findings: Entry Level - 31
Middle Level - 50
Advanced Level - 55
Not Applicable - 3

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations :

Reflections/Notes :

1.b. Theoretical approaches	▼ **Measure:** Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment Direct - Student Artifact
Skillfully employ a variety of critical and theoretical approaches.	**Details/Description:** graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective. **Target:** MA Graduate Students

Implementation Plan (timeline): three year cycle (2008, 2009, 2010)

Responsible Individual(s): Director of Graduate Studies

Findings for Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment

Summary of Findings: Entry Level - 39
Middle Level - 55
Advanced Level - 54
Not Applicable - 3

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations :

Reflections/Notes :

1.c. Literary works in English

Demonstrate a broad, sophisticated understanding of literary works in English—and their literary, cultural, and historical contexts.

Measure: Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): three year cycle (2008, 2009, 2010)

Responsible Individual(s): Director of Graduate Studies

Findings for Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment

Summary of Findings: Entry Level - 22
Middle Level - 55
Advanced Level - 53
Not Applicable - 2

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations :

Reflections/Notes :

1.d. Written work

Produce substantive written work that demonstrates creativity and superior command of rhetorical strategies and style.

Measure: Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): three year cycle (2008, 2009, 2010)

Responsible Individual(s): Director of Graduate Studies

Findings for Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment

Summary of Findings: Entry Level - 28
Middle Level - 47
Advanced Level - 76

Not Applicable - 0

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations :

Reflections/Notes :

1.e. Specialized knowledge

Demonstrate specialized knowledge of an area of literature, writing, or pedagogy.

▼ **Measure:** Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): three year cycle (2008, 2009, 2010)

Responsible Individual(s): Director of Graduate Studies

Findings for Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment

Summary of Findings: Demonstrated - 124
Not Demonstrated - 22
Not Applicable - 1

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations :

Reflections/Notes :

Overall Recommendations

No text specified

Overall Reflection

No text specified

◈ **Action Plan**

◈ **Status Report**

2010-2011 Assessment Cycle

◈ **Assessment Plan**

Outcomes and Measures

MA in English Outcome Set

Outcome

conduct research
conduct literary research which shows originality and the mastery of research tools and materials

▼ **Measure:** Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): three year cycle (2008, 2009, 2010)

Responsible Individual(s): Director of Graduate Studies, currently Dr. Matthew Brennan, collects and compiles the data from the surveys. He reports the results to the Department of English.

employ literary theory
skillfully employ a variety of critical and theoretical approaches

▼ **Measure:** Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

understand literature
demonstrate a broad, sophisticated understanding of literary works in English--and their literary, cultural, and historical contexts

▼ **Measure:** Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

write well
produce substantive written work that demonstrates creativity and superior command of rhetorical strategies and style

▼ **Measure:** Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

demonstrate specialized knowledge	▼ **Measure:** Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment Direct - Student Artifact
demonstrate specialized knowledge of an area of literature, writing, or pedagogy	**Details/Description:** graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a two level scale: number of students in this course that Demonstrated/ Did Not Demonstrate this criterion. **Target:** **Implementation Plan (timeline):** **Responsible Individual(s):**

Culminating Experience	▼ **Measure:** grade distribution Direct - Student Artifact
-develop a proposal for a Masters Paper, Creative Project, or Masters Thesis -complete the project under the supervision of a Committee from the Graduate Faculty -defend the project to the Committee and (in the case of Creative projects) to read their work in a public, departmental forum	**Details/Description:** grades awarded by the graduate student's committee, after the project has been defended and a final copy deposited **Target:** **Implementation Plan (timeline):** **Responsible Individual(s):**

◈ Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

MA in English Outcome Set

Outcome

conduct research	▼ **Measure:** Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment Direct - Student Artifact
conduct literary research which shows originality and the mastery of research tools and materials	**Details/Description:** graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective. **Target:** **Implementation Plan (timeline):** three year cycle (2008, 2009, 2010) **Responsible Individual(s):** Director of Graduate Studies, currently Dr. Matthew Brennan, collects and compiles the data from the surveys. He reports the results to the Department of English. **Findings** for Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment **Summary of Findings:** Entry level: 31 students Middle level: 50 students Advanced level: 55 students Not applicable: 3 students **Recommendations :**

> **Reflections/Notes :** These numbers represent all graduate students over three years in all required courses (Eng. 600: Bibliography and Research Methods), Eng. 635: Literary Theory and Criticism, 600-level American Literature Courses, 600-level Pre-1800 British Literature, 600-level Post-1800 British Literature, Directed Electives

employ literary theory
skillfully employ a variety of critical and theoretical approaches

Measure: Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment

Summary of Findings: Entry Level: 22 students
Middle Level: 55 students
Advanced Level: 54 students
Not Applicable: 2 students

Recommendations :

Reflections/Notes :

understand literature
demonstrate a broad, sophisticated understanding of literary works in English--and their literary, cultural, and historical contexts

Measure: Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment

No Findings Added

write well
produce substantive written work that demonstrates creativity and superior command of rhetorical strategies and style

Measure: Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a three level scale: number of students in this course that finished with 1. an Entry level of proficiency 2. a Middle Level 3. an Advanced Level of this objective.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment

Summary of Findings: Entry Level: 28 students
Middle Level: 47 students
Advanced Level: 76 students

Recommendations :

Reflections/Notes :

---

demonstrate specialized knowledge

demonstrate specialized knowledge of an area of literature, writing, or pedagogy

▼ **Measure:** Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on a two level scale: number of students in this course that Demonstrated/ Did Not Demonstrate this criterion.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment

Summary of Findings: 124 students Demonstrated
22 students Did Not Demonstrate

Recommendations :

Reflections/Notes :

Culminating Experience

-develop a proposal for a Masters Paper, Creative Project, or Masters Thesis
-complete the project under the supervision of a Committee from the Graduate Faculty
-defend the project to the Committee and (in the case of Creative projects) to read their work in a public, departmental forum

▼ **Measure:** grade distribution
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: grades awarded by the graduate student's committee, after the project has been defended and a final copy deposited

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for grade distribution

Summary of Findings: Between Fall 2007 and Spring 2010, thirty-three graduate students completed their degrees in English. Of those, thirteen complete Eng. 692 (the Masters Paper), fourteen completed English 698 (the Creative Project), and six completed English 699 (the Masters Thesis).

grades:
A+ 1 student
A 20 students
A- 1 student
B+ 6 students
B 6 students

Recommendations :

Reflections/Notes :

Overall Recommendations

No text specified

Overall Reflection

No text specified

◈ Action Plan

◈ Status Report

2011-2012 Assessment Cycle

◈ Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

MA in English Outcome Set

Outcome

no assessment data collected in 2011-12

We had a challenging time with graduate studies during the last several years.
The previous Director of Graduate Studies was on a sabbatical during Fall 2011 and then chose to resign the position and return to full-time teaching; the acting director did a fine job with advisement but did not address other matters related to the position.

The current Director has made efforts to bring us "up to speed" and has managed to move us forward with our programmatic efforts. However, she and I have not yet been able to reconstruct the assessment data from the "missing year."

We will continue these efforts, however.

No measures specified

◈ Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

MA in English Outcome Set

Outcome

no assessment data collected in 2011-12

We had a challenging time with graduate studies during the last several years.
The previous Director of Graduate Studies was on a sabbatical during Fall 2011 and then chose to resign the position and return to

No measures specified

full-time teaching; the
acting director did a fine
job with advisement but did
not address other matters
related to the position.

The current Director has
made efforts to bring us
"up to speed" and has
managed to move us
forward with our
programmatic efforts.
However, she and I have
not yet been able to
reconstruct the assessment
data from the "missing
year."

We will continue these
efforts, however.

Overall Recommendations

No text specified

Overall Reflection

No text specified

◈ Action Plan

Actions

2011-12 Action Plan

Outcome

2011-12 Action Plan	▼ **Action:** reassesses efficicacy of general issues
	This Action is associated with the following Findings No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action. **Action Details:** Action Plan (2011-2012): Because we have been in transition, with three different Directors in the past academic year, we are at the point of reassessing the efficacy of general issues. Some of these issues will be addressed in the upcoming year, and others will take more time in order to collect data to pinpoint what changes may need to be made. For any issue we need to address that requires program modifications, our process starts in the Graduate Committee. Once the Committee has developed the change or goal, we take it to the Department for further development and consultation, and then, after refinement, proceed with implementation. We then review the changes periodically to verify that they have, in fact, produced the results that were intended. The three areas that we will be addressing this year are: (1) changing the deadline for Fall admissions from June 1 to March/early April in order to be consistent with application deadlines for Teaching Assistantships (currently March 1) and to be more competitive with likeinstitutions; (2) removing the foreign language requirement because it does not seem to function in the ways that we had originally intended, it cannot be completed (as coursework) within the time frame of the allotted financial support (assistantships), and it isn't being incorporated into the learning experience; and (3) reducing the graduate teaching assistantship teaching and/or coursework load to reduce stress on our students and to allign with every other graduate program in the university. **Implementation Plan (timeline):** These will be undertaken in 2012-13

Key/Responsible Personnel: Department Chair

Measures: Policies recommended and adopted

Resource Allocations: none

Priority: High

◈ Status Report

Action Statuses

2011-12 Action Plan

Outcome

2011-12 Action Plan	

▼ **Action:** reassesses efficicacy of general issues

Action Details: Action Plan (2011-2012):

Because we have been in transition, with three different Directors in the past academic year, we are at the point of reassessing the efficacy of general issues. Some of these issues will be addressed in the upcoming year, and others will take more time in order to collect data to pinpoint what changes may need to be made.
For any issue we need to address that requires program modifications, our process starts in the Graduate Committee. Once the Committee has developed the change or goal, we take it to the Department for further development and consultation, and then, after refinement, proceed with implementation. We then review the changes periodically to verify that they have, in fact, produced the results that were intended.
The three areas that we will be addressing this year are: (1) changing the deadline for Fall admissions from June 1 to March/early April in order to be consistent with application deadlines for Teaching Assistantships (currently March 1) and to be more competitive with likeinstitutions; (2) removing the foreign language requirement because it does not seem to function in the ways that we had originally intended, it cannot be completed (as coursework) within the time frame of the allotted financial support (assistantships), and it isn't being incorporated into the learning experience; and (3) reducing the graduate teaching assistantship teaching and/or coursework load to reduce stress on our students and to allign with every other graduate program in the university.

Implementation Plan (timeline): These will be undertaken in 2012-13

Key/Responsible Personnel: Department Chair

Measures: Policies recommended and adopted

Resource Allocations: none

Priority: High

Status for reassesses efficicacy of general issues

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status:

Next Steps/Additional Information: Because we have been in transition, with three different Directors in the past academic year, we had little to reference from the previous year. Consequently, we began with three points to examine, all of which were addressed in the previous year and all of which went through the process from Graduate committee to Department faculty review to policy.

The three areas that we addressed this year were:
1. Changing the deadline for Fall admissions from June 1 to March/early April in order to be consistent with application deadlines for Teaching Assistantships (currently March 1) and to be more competitive with like-institutions.
• We changed it to April 10.

2. Removing the foreign language requirement because it does not seem to function in the ways that we had originally intended, it cannot be completed (as coursework) within the time frame of the allotted financial support (assistantships), and it isn't being incorporated into the learning experience.
• We removed the foreign language requirement.

3. Reducing the graduate teaching assistantship teaching and/or coursework load to reduce stress on your students and to fall in line with every other graduate program in the university.
• The Department requested a teaching-load reduction for our Assistantship students to one course while taking three during their first year of graduate student. The Chairperson requested the course reduction for all semesters of graduate study; the Dean supported this change, as is it consistent with all other graduate programs University-wide. After negotiation, the Provost approved a reduced teaching load during the first year of study. Beginning in Fall 2013, TAs will teach one course each semester and tutor five hours a week in the Writing Center during their first year; during the second year, TAs will teach two classes each semester.

Substantiating Evidence:

2013. April 1. Unapproved Minutes.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

2013. March 4. Minutes.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

Status Summary

No text specified

Summary of Next Steps

No text specified

2012-2013 Assessment Cycle

◈ Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

MA in English Outcome Set

Outcome

Culminating Experience

-develop a proposal for a Masters Paper, Creative Project, or Masters Thesis
-complete the project under the supervision of a Committee from the Graduate Faculty
-defend the project to the Committee and (in the case of Creative projects) to read their work in a public, departmental forum

▼ **Measure:** Final Project Rubric
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Graduate students complete a final project: creative project, thesis, or paper. Graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on seven traits:
rhetorical stance
writing ability
organization
disciplinary understanding
originality
documentation
technical skills

Each trait is evaluated on a three level scale:
exceeds expectations
meets expectations
does not meet expectations

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): annually

Responsible Individual(s): Director of Graduate Studies collects and compiles the data and reports the results to the Department of English.

◈ Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

MA in English Outcome Set

Outcome

Culminating Experience

-develop a proposal for a Masters Paper, Creative Project, or Masters Thesis
-complete the project under the supervision of a Committee from the Graduate Faculty
-defend the project to the Committee and (in the case of Creative projects) to read their work in a public, departmental forum

▼ **Measure:** Final Project Rubric
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Graduate students complete a final project: creative project, thesis, or paper. Graduate faculty evaluate students' level of achievement on seven traits:
rhetorical stance
writing ability
organization
disciplinary understanding
originality
documentation
technical skills

Each trait is evaluated on a three level scale:
exceeds expectations
meets expectations
does not meet expectations

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): annually

Responsible Individual(s): Director of Graduate Studies collects and compiles the data and reports the results to the Department of English.

Findings for Final Project Rubric

Summary of Findings: Seven students completed final projects in 2012-13 which were evaluated against the final project rubric (attached).

Except for one student whose work did not meet expectations for technical skills, all students either met or exceeded expectations for the seven traits represented in the rubric.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : We are pleased with the performance of our graduate students and will continue to assess the final projects annually.

Reflections/Notes :

Substantiating Evidence:

EnglishAssessmentsGraduate20122013.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Continue to monitor
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Evaluate assessment plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Overall Recommendations

No text specified

Overall Reflection

No text specified

◈ Action Plan

Actions

MA in English Outcome Set

Outcome

Culminating Experience	▼ **Action:** Continue to monitor
-develop a proposal for a Masters Paper, Creative Project, or Masters Thesis -complete the project under the supervision of a Committee from the Graduate Faculty	**This Action is associated with the following Findings** **Findings for Final Project Rubric** (Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle) **Summary of Findings:** Seven students completed final projects in 2012-13 which were evaluated against the final project rubric (attached).

-defend the project to the Committee and (in the case of Creative projects) to read their work in a public, departmental forum

Except for one student whose work did not meet expectations for technical skills, all students either met or exceeded expectations for the seven traits represented in the rubric.

Action Details: We are generally pleased with the assessment results for 2012-13 and will continue to monitor student achievement.

Implementation Plan (timeline): annually

Key/Responsible Personnel: Director of the Graduate Program

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority: High

▼ **Action:** Evaluate assessment plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Final Project Rubric
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)
Summary of Findings: Seven students completed final projects in 2012-13 which were evaluated against the final project rubric (attached).

Except for one student whose work did not meet expectations for technical skills, all students either met or exceeded expectations for the seven traits represented in the rubric.

Action Details: We will review the assessment plan and, if indicated, modify to improve efficacy of assessment processes and value of data yielded.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-14

Key/Responsible Personnel: Director of the Graduate Program

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority: High

Other actions

▼ **Action:** Modify assistantship requirements

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Our teaching assistantships in English have for years been uncompetitive. We required the most teaching (two composition classes a term—as the instructor of record, with the full responsibilities that that requires) and the lowest stipend in the state (and even eastern Illinois). This clearly created problems when we tried to recruit graduate students.

Last spring, with the Provost's approval, we began a new pattern:
Year 1: Teach one class; tutor in the Math and Writing Center (each semester)
Year 2: Teach two classes (each semester)

We were not able to increase the stipend. However, this improved assistantship, we hope, will make our program more attractive to prospective students—and thereby increase both the number of and the caliber of our applicants.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority:

Supporting Attachments:
   Proposal to modify assitantship requirements (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

▼ **Action:** Reconsider language requirement

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: For decades, we have required two years of college foreign language or a "pass" score on a foreign language competency test to complete our program—though we have never required a foreign language for admission to the program.

ISU used to offer graduate-level courses for non-language majors that allowed our students to meet these requirements without having to mix Language 101 courses into their graduate studies; however, those graduate courses were eliminated years ago.

Last year, the Graduate Committee completed a comparative review of peer institutions, focusing particularly on their language requirements. They discovered that over half of our peer schools had no language requirement at all, while others provided other competencies (American Sign Language, linguistics, and so on).

After much deliberation and debate, the Department voted to eliminate the foreign language requirement.

As we compete with our peer institutions for prospective students, we hope that change in policy will, once again, make ISU more competitive.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority:

Supporting Attachments:
   Arguments for and against Dropping the Foreign Language Requirement (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)
   Foreign Language Requirements for Peer Institutions (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

◈ **Status Report**

Action Statuses

MA in English Outcome Set

Outcome

Culminating Experience

-develop a proposal for a Masters Paper, Creative Project, or Masters Thesis
-complete the project under the supervision of a Committee from the Graduate Faculty
-defend the project to the Committee and (in the case of Creative projects) to read their work in a public, departmental forum

▼ **Action:** Continue to monitor

Action Details: We are generally pleased with the assessment results for 2012-13 and will continue to monitor student achievement.

Implementation Plan (timeline): annually

Key/Responsible Personnel: Director of the Graduate Program

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority: High

Status for Continue to monitor

No Status Added

▼ **Action:** Evaluate assessment plan

Action Details: We will review the assessment plan and, if indicated, modify to improve efficacy of assessment processes and value of data yielded.

Implementation Plan (timeline): 2013-14

Key/Responsible Personnel: Director of the Graduate Program

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority: High

Status for Evaluate assessment plan

No Status Added

Other actions

▼ **Action:** Modify assistantship requirements

Action Details: Our teaching assistantships in English have for years been uncompetitive. We required the most teaching (two composition classes a term—as the instructor of record, with the full responsibilities that that requires) and the lowest stipend in the state (and even eastern Illinois). This clearly created problems when we tried to recruit graduate students.

Last spring, with the Provost's approval, we began a new pattern:
Year 1: Teach one class; tutor in the Math and Writing Center (each semester)
Year 2: Teach two classes (each semester)

We were not able to increase the stipend. However, this improved assistantship, we hope, will make our program more attractive to prospective students—and thereby increase both the number of and the caliber of our applicants.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority:

Supporting Attachments:
Proposal to modify assitantship requirements (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

Status for Modify assistantship requirements

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status:

Next Steps/Additional Information: Robert Perrin, with the support of the Graduate Committee, initiated
a change in the teaching load for TAs in English. Ultimately, both the
Dean and the Provost supported this plan—in modified form. During
the first year, TAs in English teach one class each semester and tutor
10 hours a week in the Writing Center; during the second year, they
teach two classes each term. This new pattern began in Fall 2014.

Action: Reconsider language requirement

Action Details: For decades, we have required two years of college foreign language or a "pass"
score on a foreign language competency test to complete our program—though we have never
required a foreign language for admission to the program.

ISU used to offer graduate-level courses for non-language majors that allowed our students to
meet these requirements without having to mix Language 101 courses into their graduate studies;
however, those graduate courses were eliminated years ago.

Last year, the Graduate Committee completed a comparative review of peer institutions, focusing
particularly on their language requirements. They discovered that over half of our peer schools had
no language requirement at all, while others provided other competencies (American Sign
Language, linguistics, and so on).

After much deliberation and debate, the Department voted to eliminate the foreign language
requirement.

As we compete with our peer institutions for prospective students, we hope that change in policy
will, once again, make ISU more competitive.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority:

Supporting Attachments:
Arguments for and against Dropping the Foreign Language Requirement (Adobe Acrobat
Document) (See appendix)
Foreign Language Requirements for Peer Institutions (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See
appendix)

Status for Reconsider language requirement

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status:

Next Steps/Additional Information: The Graduate Committee, after reviewing the requirements at
comparable institutions, proposed this change. Expecting this to be a
volatile discussion, Kit Kincade, Director of Graduate Studies, and
Robert Perrin, Chair, prepared a comprehensive table.
The Department met on three separate occasions to discuss this
matter, and finally approved the change on May 2, 2013. (See
Department meeting minutes from March 4, April 1, and May 2,
2013.)

Substantiating Evidence:

Department Meeting Minutes - April 1, 2013 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)
Department Meeting Minutes - March 4, 2013 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)
Department Meeting Minutes - May 2, 2013 (Adobe Acrobat Document) (See appendix)

Status Summary

No text specified

Summary of Next Steps

No text specified

2013-2014 Assessment Cycle

◈ **Assessment Plan**

◈ **Assessment Findings**

◈ **Action Plan**

◈ **Status Report**

2014-2015 Assessment Cycle

◈ **Assessment Plan**

◈ **Assessment Findings**

◈ **Action Plan**

Actions

Action Plan

Outcome

Action Plan 2014-15	▼ **Action:** A Department-level guide to graduate studies
	This Action is associated with the following Findings No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action. **Action Details:** In the Department, we have several primary documents: Policies and Procedures (which includes the Bylaws), Writing at ISU, Undergraduate Studies in English at ISU, and Creative Writing at ISU. We have begun work on a parallel document—Graduate Studies in English at ISU—and hope that it will provide the kind of clear guidance that the other documents have provided. **Implementation Plan (timeline):** **Key/Responsible Personnel:** **Measures:** **Resource Allocations:** **Priority:** Medium
	▼ **Action:** Change in admission for international students
	This Action is associated with the following Findings No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action. **Action Details:** We have had some international students thrive in our program and some struggle. We have begun a process by which we will examine our admission patterns (use of test scores, grades, years of English as a second language, undergraduate majors, and other factors) to discover patterns that have led to student success and patterns that have not. Based on what we find, we will propose changes. **Implementation Plan (timeline):** **Key/Responsible Personnel:** **Measures:**

Resource Allocations:

Priority: Medium

▼ **Action:** Change in admission for native students who do not have undergraduate majors in English

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Over the years, we have admitted students who did not have undergraduate majors in English; they typically had minors in English or Creative Writing, but not always. Because some of these students have struggled, we want to explore all cases to see whether we can find patterns of success (informal support groups, SAT verbal scores, numbers of undergraduate English classes, and so on). It's not that we want to exclude these students—because we don't. But we want to develop patterns that will help promise success.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority: Medium

▼ **Action:** Change in creative thesis/paper

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: Students who choose the Writing concentration typically complete a creative project. As our Graduate Handbook now stands, they may choose either a thesis option or a paper option; however, the descriptions are neither clear nor complete. We must clarify the descriptions of these projects so that students can make the best choices (six-hour thesis option or three-hour paper option), depending on their future plans.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority: Medium

◈ **Status Report**

Action Statuses

Action Plan

Outcome

Action Plan 2014-15

▼ **Action:** A Department-level guide to graduate studies

Action Details: In the Department, we have several primary documents: Policies and Procedures (which includes the Bylaws), Writing at ISU, Undergraduate Studies in English at ISU, and Creative Writing at ISU. We have begun work on a parallel document—Graduate Studies in English at ISU— and hope that it will provide the kind of clear guidance that the other documents have provided.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority: Medium

Status for A Department-level guide to graduate studies

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status:

Next Steps/Additional Information: This semester, we completed extended work to develop a substantial
document: Graduate Studies in English as Indiana State University.
GSEISU includes descriptions of the program and policies for its
operation, as well as descriptions of and objectives for every graduate
course offering.

▼ **Action:** Change in admission for international students

Action Details: We have had some international students thrive in our program and some struggle. We have begun a process by which we will examine our admission patterns (use of test scores, grades, years of English as a second language, undergraduate majors, and other factors) to discover patterns that have led to student success and patterns that have not. Based on what we find, we will
propose changes.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority: Medium

Status for Change in admission for international students

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status:

Next Steps/Additional Information: Kit Kincade, the Graduate Director, and I reviewed the language
requirements (TOEFL scores, GRE scores, and so on) related to
admission for international graduate students. We discovered that the

percentages currently required for admission varied from 60% to 85%, which we found unacceptable. We took some recommendations to the Graduate Committee, which they approved, and then took the recommendations to the Department. The faculty approved the new, more uniform standards.

Action: Change in admission for native students who do not have undergraduate majors in English

Action Details: Over the years, we have admitted students who did not have undergraduate majors in English; they typically had minors in English or Creative Writing, but not always. Because some of these students have struggled, we want to explore all cases to see whether we can find patterns of success (informal support groups, SAT verbal scores, numbers of undergraduate English classes, and so on). It's not that we want to exclude these students—because we don't. But we want to develop patterns that will help promise success.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority: Medium

Status for Change in admission for native students who do not have undergraduate majors in English

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status:

Next Steps/Additional Information: Because the School of Graduate Studies has eliminated "conditional
admission," we needed to consider how to approach the admission of
students from non-English majors. Based on Department-level
discussions, we will now ask students to begin the program by taking
500-level courses to gauge their likely success.

Action: Change in creative thesis/paper

Action Details: Students who choose the Writing concentration typically complete a creative project. As our Graduate Handbook now stands, they may choose either a thesis option or a paper option; however, the descriptions are neither clear nor complete. We must clarify the descriptions of these projects so that students can make the best choices (six-hour thesis option or three-hour paper option), depending on their future plans.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority: Medium

Status for Change in creative thesis/paper

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status:

Next Steps/Additional Information: To ensure that English 692 (Master's Paper) and English 698 (Creative
Project) earn parallel credit for parallel work, the Creative Writing
Committee and the Graduate Committee recommended that both
courses be 3-hour offerings (in the past, English 698 had a 3–6-hour
option). The proposal was approved by the Department.
(Importantly, graduate students in both concentrations continue to
have a 3–6-hour thesis option.)

Status Summary

No text specified

Summary of Next Steps

No text specified

2015-2016 Assessment Cycle

◈ **Assessment Plan**

Outcomes and Measures

MA in English

1. Professional Communication

1.1 Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.

▼ **Measure:** Presentations and papers
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students give presentations and prepare papers in all of our graduate seminars.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

2. Diverse and Complex Communities

2.1 Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.

▼ **Measure:** Landini Speaker Series presentations
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Professional Conferences: Our graduate students are encouraged, and many do, attend, and participate in, professional conferences in a variety of different fields, depending on their areas of interest or specialization.

When students present papers at conferences, they almost always give the same presentation in the Department as part of the Landini Speaker Series.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Schick Lecture Series

Details/Description: Schick Lecture Series: Our lecture series provides our graduate students with the unique opportunity to meet with respected members of the profession in small groups for both conversation and discussions about the lecturer's area and, often, for small special sessions or class meetings.

What graduate student learn when they interact with internationally known scholars is hard to gauge, but we welcome this opportunity for our students.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** TA observations
Direct - Other

Details/Description: The Director of Writing Programs (Dr. Susan Latta) observes each teaching assistant multiple times during each semester, as well as reviews multiple sets of graded papers.

Teaching: Our graduate students teach their composition courses with a mixed student audience, sometimes those who are directly out of high school, sometimes those returning to their studies after a brief intermission, and sometimes those who have had families and careers and are returning after many years. All of these groups also come with varied skill-levels.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

3. Ethics

3.1 Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.

▼ **Measure:** TA assessments
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Teaching: The Teaching Assistants are the instructor of record for their sections, being responsible for grading and evaluating their students and learning to help their students understand the student "Code of Conduct."

Serving as instructor of record for the courses they teach provides our teaching assistants with a broad experiences; their assessments from Dr. Latta are developmental and extremely helpful.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Tutoring in the Writing Center assessments
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Tutoring in the Writing Center: Our tutors get one-on-one experience with students, experience with online instruction, working with other graduate students, tackling the special needs of International students, and engagement with writing assignments in all types of areas, fields, and specialties.

Nicole Bailey, Director of the Math and Writing Center, provides on-going assessments.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

4. Mastery of Knowledge

4.1 Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.

▼ **Measure:** GPA
Direct - Other

Details/Description: The GPAs of our students indicate that they have achieved a mastery of the course material in the program. If students' grades are not satisfactory, then we encourage them to retake courses.

We check students' GPAs on a semester-by-semester basis.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Measure: Projects, thesis, or papers
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The assessment of a student's project, thesis, or paper occurs in stages and includes both the written work and the defense. Creative projects also require a public reading.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

5. Mastery of Skills

5.1 Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.

Measure: GPA
Direct - Other

Details/Description: The GPAs of our students indicate that they have achieved a mastery of the course material in the program. If students' grades are not satisfactory, then we encourage them to retake courses.

We check students' GPAs on a semester-by-semester basis.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Measure: Projects, thesis, or papers
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The assessment of a student's project, thesis, or paper occurs in stages and includes both the written work and the defense. Creative projects also require a public reading.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

◈ Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

MA in English

1. Professional Communication

1.1 Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.

Measure: Presentations and papers
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Students give presentations and prepare papers in all of our graduate seminars.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Presentations and papers

No Findings Added

2. Diverse and Complex Communities

2.1 Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.

▼ **Measure:** Landini Speaker Series presentations
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Professional Conferences: Our graduate students are encouraged, and many do, attend, and participate in, professional conferences in a variety of different fields, depending on their areas of interest or specialization.

When students present papers at conferences, they almost always give the same presentation in the Department as part of the Landini Speaker Series.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Landini Speaker Series presentations

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Schick Lecture Series

Details/Description: Schick Lecture Series: Our lecture series provides our graduate students with the unique opportunity to meet with respected members of the profession in small groups for both conversation and discussions about the lecturer's area and, often, for small special sessions or class meetings.

What graduate student learn when they interact with internationally known scholars is hard to gauge, but we welcome this opportunity for our students.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Schick Lecture Series

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** TA observations
Direct - Other

Details/Description: The Director of Writing Programs (Dr. Susan Latta) observes each teaching assistant multiple times during each semester, as well as reviews multiple sets of graded papers.

Teaching: Our graduate students teach their composition courses with a mixed student audience, sometimes those who are directly out of high school, sometimes those returning to their studies after a brief intermission, and sometimes those who have had families and careers and are returning after many years. All of these groups also come with varied skill-levels.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for TA observations

No Findings Added

3. Ethics

3.1 Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.

▼ **Measure:** TA assessments
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Teaching: The Teaching Assistants are the instructor of record for their sections, being responsible for grading and evaluating their students and learning to help their students understand the student "Code of Conduct."

Serving as instructor of record for the courses they teach provides our teaching assistants with a broad experiences; their assessments from Dr. Latta are developmental and extremely helpful.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for TA assessments

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Tutoring in the Writing Center assessments
Direct - Other

Details/Description: Tutoring in the Writing Center: Our tutors get one-on-one experience with students, experience with online instruction, working with other graduate students, tackling the special needs of International students, and engagement with writing assignments in all types of areas, fields, and specialties.

Nicole Bailey, Director of the Math and Writing Center, provides on-going assessments.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Tutoring in the Writing Center assessments

No Findings Added

4. Mastery of Knowledge

4.1 Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.

▼ **Measure:** GPA
Direct - Other

Details/Description: The GPAs of our students indicate that they have achieved a mastery of the course material in the program. If students' grades are not satisfactory, then we encourage them to retake courses.

We check students' GPAs on a semester-by-semester basis.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for GPA

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Projects, thesis, or papers
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The assessment of a student's project, thesis, or paper occurs in stages and includes both the written work and the defense. Creative projects also require a public reading.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Projects, thesis, or papers

No Findings Added

5. Mastery of Skills

5.1 Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.

▼ **Measure:** GPA
Direct - Other

Details/Description: The GPAs of our students indicate that they have achieved a mastery of the course material in the program. If students' grades are not satisfactory, then we encourage them to retake courses.

We check students' GPAs on a semester-by-semester basis.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for GPA

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Projects, thesis, or papers
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The assessment of a student's project, thesis, or paper occurs in stages and includes both the written work and the defense. Creative projects also require a public reading.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Projects, thesis, or papers

No Findings Added

Overall Recommendations

No text specified

Overall Reflection

No text specified

◈ Action Plan

◈ Status Report

2016-2017 Assessment Cycle

◈ **Assessment Plan**

◈ **Assessment Findings**

◈ **Action Plan**

◈ **Status Report**

2017-2018 Assessment Cycle

◈ **Assessment Plan**

◈ **Assessment Findings**

◈ **Action Plan**

◈ **Status Report**

2018-2019 Assessment Cycle

◆ **Assessment Plan**

◆ **Assessment Findings**

◆ **Action Plan**

◆ **Status Report**

2019-2020 Assessment Cycle

◈ **Assessment Plan**

◈ **Assessment Findings**

◈ **Action Plan**

◈ **Status Report**

Appendix

A. **MA in English** (Curriculum Map)
B. **English_ISU External Review 2009.pdf** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
C. **English_Self-Study Report. Fall 2009.pdf** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
D. **Graduate Program Review 2013-2014.pdf** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
E. **Graduate Studies in English--mission statement** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
F. **Grad. Studies--communication of outcomes** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
G. **2013. April 1. Unapproved Minutes.pdf** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
H. **2013. March 4. Minutes.pdf** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
I. **EnglishAssessmentsGraduate20122013.pdf** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
J. **Arguments for and against Dropping the Foreign Language Requirement** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
K. **Foreign Language Requirements for Peer Institutions** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
L. **Proposal to modify assitantship requirements** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
M. **Department Meeting Minutes - April 1, 2013** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
N. **Department Meeting Minutes - March 4, 2013** (Adobe Acrobat Document)
O. **Department Meeting Minutes - May 2, 2013** (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Mission Statement: Graduate Studies in English

The goal of the graduate program in English is to prepare students to pursue terminal degrees, to teach in community colleges and high schools, or to work in technical writing, editing, and publishing. Courses in the Department provide opportunities for students to acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to succeed in their academic and professional lives.

To achieve this multifaceted goal, students in the graduate program in English study literature, language, and criticism; write in a variety of contexts for a variety of purposes; and complete a culminating project (master's paper, thesis, or creative project).

Through a multifaceted program of study, practice, and application, graduate students in English are prepared to continue their graduate studies or to begin their professional careers.

I.   Connection with mission of department, college, and university

The evidence of reputation, as well as the proof of meeting the requirements of the missions at various levels, can be seen in the fairly constant and highly consistent level of our graduate students. Because ISU has always been associated with education (both K-12 and higher education), our reputation rests on our ability to train teachers. Our graduate students fall into primarily (though not exclusively) two categories: high school teachers who return for further certification and training and individuals who work for Indiana's community college and university systems.

A.   High school teachers need the MA to be qualified to teach in the College Challenge program (these dual-credit courses are now mandated by the state).

B.   High school teachers often need the MA to teach gifted and talented students.

C.   High school teachers must update certification in their subject areas, post-baccalaureate, and our courses provide a way to do that.

D.   An MA is preferred when teaching for Indiana regional campuses and community colleges for higher learning.

E.   An MA is required for teaching as a Lecturer or Instructor at all Indiana, as well regional, colleges and universities.

F.   An MA helps those students pursuing the PhD in English to progress more rapidly and self-assuredly through their graduate programs.

With budget cuts throughout the state and nation in higher education, more institutions are looking toward candidates with MAs in many fields to help teach their incoming classes. Not only is this labor force needed to sustain the already high numbers of students, but we need to increase our numbers of Masters students to help meet the demands of increasing undergraduate enrollment at ISU.

II. Connection to Assurance of Student Learning

A.   Professional communication proficiencies

1.   Taking and passing our core-curriculum proves this outcome: our curriculum builds into the requisites of all different types of course work the abilities to communicate professionally in both writing and speaking.

B.   Contribute to diverse and complex communities and environments: Our students are exposed to this in three primary areas:

1.   Teaching: Our graduate students teach their composition courses with a mixed

student audience, sometimes those who are directly out of high school, sometimes those returning to their studies after a brief intermission, and sometimes those who have had families and careers and are returning after many years. All of these groups also come with varied skill-levels.

2. Professional Conferences: Our graduate students are encouraged, and many do, attend, and participate in, professional conferences in a variety of different fields, depending on their areas of interest or specialization.

3. Schick Lecture Series: Our lecture series provides our graduate students with the unique opportunity to meet with respected members of the profession in small groups for both conversation and discussions about the lecturer's area and, often, for small special sessions or class meetings.

C. Professional and ethical challenges

1. Teaching: The Teaching Assistants are the instructor of record for their sections, being responsible for grading and evaluating their students and learning to help their students understand the student "Code of Conduct."

2. Tutoring in the Writing Center: Our tutors get one-on-one experience with students, experience with online instruction, working with other graduate students, tackling the special needs of International students, and engagement with writing assignments in all types of areas, fields, and specialities.

D. Mastery of Knowledge in their Field

1. Passing their classes (GPAs range from 3.24 to 4.00, with an average of 3.7595.)

2. Passing their Project/Thesis/Paper: Over the past three semesters, most students have earned an *A* or *A-* on the Culminating Experience (thirteen students); no one has earned a grade below a *B*.

E. Mastery of Skills

(See D1 & D2 above.)

III. Connection with other Programs

A. Writing Center (see above)

IV. Connection with student outcomes

A. Graduation numbers (see dashboard)

B. Enrollment numbers (see dashboard)

C. Remediation: We do not provide remediation in the traditional sense. However, if

students apply to our program without an undergraduate major in English Liberal Arts or English Teaching, they may be admitted conditionally. Our conditional admits not only meet the 3.0 GPA requirement for admission to the graduate college, but we require them take two upper-level undergraduate courses in English to establish a background in English studies. If they successfully complete these courses, their status is changed to a regular admission.

V. Connection with Grants/Contracts

Not applicable

VI. Connection of faculty with program

A. Teaching–modeling as well as education, this can been seen especially in our split classes (the 400/500 level courses that have both undergraduate and graduates)

B. The MA is our terminal degree, so the faculty provide a great deal of attention to our students.

C. Schick Lecture Series: The lecture series provides graduate student with the opportunity to talk to the faculty about non-classroom-related material and subjects in a more casual setting, thus opening up the possibility for many broad-ranging discussions that may occur over specific material from a particular class.

VII. Area of Concern

A. Enrollment: Our program has had small but steady enrollments. However, we have continued to consider ways to improve them. Last year, we reconsidered our earlier language requirement (since other, similar programs had less demanding expectations). Last year, we also have modified our assistantship requirements so that they are more in line with other institutions (see "Supplemental Information"). We hope that these adjustments will help to boost our enrollments.

Communication of Outcomes: Graduate Studies in English

The Department of English makes its programmatic outcomes clear to students and other interested people in a variety of ways. The outcomes are

- posted on the Department website,
- posted on the advisement website of the Director of Graduate Studies,
- clarified in Department brochures,
- reiterated in the course materials of English 600 (Bibliography and Research Methods in English), and
- reiterated in the course materials of English 635 (Literary Theory and Criticism).

SELF-STUDY REPORT

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FALL 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

V. RESOURCES

VI. OTHER

I. Department Governance and Leadership

A. Overview

Since the early 1970s, the Department has operated using a set of governing documents referred to as *Policies and Procedures*. This collection of documents contains the departmental Bylaws, as well as documents related to pre-tenure review, promotion and tenure, graduate standing, performance assessment, travel, summer school, and so on.

During the early part of the self-study period, Ronald Baker served as Chairperson; during the remaining part of the period, Robert Perrin served as Acting Chair (Fall 2004), Interim Chair (Spring 2006–Fall 2007), and Chairperson (Spring 2007–present).

The Personnel Committee initiated early work on the Department's governing documents; the current Chairperson initiated later work. The faculty discussed all revisions at departmental meetings, recommended modifications, and voted to approve the changes, as specified in the Bylaws.

B. Governing Documents

Spring 2003. The Personnel Committee proposed these revisions to *Policies and Procedures*: clarification of eligibility requirements for the Personnel Committee, discussions of faculty mentors, requirements for describing work in progress, guidelines for using self-made evaluation forms, requirements for announcing meetings, requirements for the publication of committee minutes in *Department of English Notes*, requirements for reappointment and nonreappointment, and deletions relating to an Associate Chairperson and first-time use of the Bylaws. After discussion and the incorporation of recommended modifications, the faculty approved these changes at the March meeting.

Fall 2004. The Policy Committee, in conjunction with the Acting Chairperson, revised the membership guidelines for the Department's standing committees. Even though the numbers of faculty had decreased over the years, the numbers of members on committees remained at levels when the Department had forty faculty. Consequently, the Policy Committee recommended reducing the membership of all committees and developing a Policy Committee that was composed of the members of the Personnel Committee, plus two members elected at large (who could be nontenured faculty). After discussion and the incorporation of recommended modifications, the faculty approved these changes at the October meeting.

Spring 2007. At the Chairperson's request, the Policy Committee drafted a policy governing outside use of English classes for research studies, questionnaires, promotions, special projects, and so on. After discussion and the incorporation of recommended modifications, faculty approved the classroom-use policy at the March 2007 meeting.

August 2008. The Chairperson proposed these changes in the Bylaws: delete consecutive term limits for members of the Personnel Committee, change the procedure for electing the Committee chair, update the description of the Policy Committee, clarify the duties of the Policy Committee (including new duties with grade appeals and reviews of part-time faculty), and clarify the role and operation of two of the three curricular committees (Undergraduate Curriculum and Graduate Committees). After discussion and the incorporation of recommended modifications, the faculty approved these changes.

October 2008. Based on recommendations from the August meeting, the Chairperson proposed a further revision of the Bylaws: adding a section on the role and operation of the Composition Committee, the third of three curricular committees. The Chairperson also proposed revisions to two additional sections of *Policies and Procedures*: "Procedures for Evaluation, Reappointment, and Tenure" and "Procedures, Criteria, and Requirements for Faculty Promotion." The revisions were both stylistic (an attempt to make the documents readable and clear) and procedural (i.e., eliminating elements that are no longer possible—such as having assistant professors without terminal degrees). After discussion and the incorporation of recommended modifications, the faculty approved these changes.

November 2008. On the recommendation of the Policy Committee, the Chairperson proposed revisions to two additional sections of *Policies and Procedures*: "Travel Policy" and "Graduate Faculty Membership." The revisions of the travel policy were the result of lengthy discussions by the Policy Committee—and its request that the Chairperson describe the processes for distributing travel funds. The section titled "Graduate Faculty Membership" was replaced by documents generated by the College of Graduate and Professional Studies. After discussion and the incorporation of recommended modifications, the faculty approved these changes.

March 2009. The Chairperson proposed revisions in the remaining section of *Policies and Procedures*: "Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines for Determining Salary Recommendations." After discussion and the incorporation of recommended modification, the faculty approved these changes.

C. Leadership Reviews

The Personnel Committee conducted Baker's final review as Chairperson in Fall 2001 and submitted a report to the Dean; the Dean shared his response to the report in Spring 2002.

In Spring 2009, the Personnel Committee conducted the third-year review of Jake Jakaitis, Director of Undergraduate Studies. The Personnel Committee has yet to conduct three-year reviews of the current Chairperson (Perrin) and two Directors (Matthew Brennan, Director of Graduate Studies, and Peter Carino, Director of Writing Programs) because three years has not passed. Having assumed permanent duties as Chairperson in Spring 2007, Perrin's review will occur in Spring 2010; Carino's review will occur in Fall 2010; Brennan's review will occur in Fall 2011.

D. Conclusion

For decades, the Department had one or two scheduled meetings a semester, although additional meetings were sometimes held to address specific matters. The new Chairperson has instituted regular meetings (the first Monday of each month); these meetings have provided opportunities for faculty to consider, on a regular basis, matters of importance to the Department—including governance-related issues. In the last several years, the Department has taken dramatic steps to improve its governing documents—essentially bringing them up to date and making them clear, accurate, and complete. Quite obviously, reviews of the Chairperson and the remaining program directors are needed to assess whether their leadership is, in fact, enhancing the work of the Department.

E. Supporting Documents

Minutes from Department Meetings
Policies and Procedures

II. PROGRAM ARRAY AND CURRICULUM

A. Overview

Undergraduate Degree Programs. The Department offers majors in English (Liberal Arts) and English Teaching, as well as minors in English (Liberal Arts) and Creative Writing. Students in either major take a core curriculum: six shared courses in literature and language.

The Department is committed to strengthening the undergraduate core curriculum and has, in the last several years, been very active in redesigning the program.

Graduate Degree Programs. The Department offers an MA with specializations in literature and writing. Students in either specialization take a core curriculum: five shared courses in research methodology, literary theory, American literature, and British literature.

The Department is committed to strengthening the graduate core curriculum and will, in the next few years, reevaluate the program.

Department Documents. For at least three decades, the Department has had a document to describe the writing program: *Writing at ISU (WISU)*. *WISU* incorporates a conceptual introduction, descriptions of all writing courses (including catalog descriptions, course overviews, course goals, and general requirements). In the last two years, the Department has developed corresponding documents to describe the other facets of our undergraduate program: *Literature and Language at ISU* and *Creative Writing at ISU*. In the next several years, we will develop an additional document: *Graduate Study in English at ISU* and update *WISU*.

B. Programs

English (Liberal Arts) – 39 hours. Eighty-five students (fifty-seven percent of our majors in Spring 2009) are in traditional English studies. They complete a core curriculum (nine classes), two General Education writing courses for majors, and then choose from an array of electives in the major. They are encouraged to pursue a second major or a minor.

English Teaching – 39 hours. Sixty-three students (forty-three percent of our majors in Spring 2009) are in English Teaching. They also complete the core curriculum (nine classes), two General Education writing courses for majors, but have fewer electives because they must take designated courses to fulfill state certification requirements (four classes). In addition, they complete thirty-two hours in Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology, the equivalent of a second major.

The Core Curriculum—Majors		
Course Number and Title	English Teaching	English Liberal Arts
108 Writing about Literature and Culture	Required (Gen Ed)	Required (Gen Ed)
230 Literary Analysis	Required	Required
236 World Literature and Culture I	Required	Required

7

The Core Curriculum—Majors		
Course Number and Title	English Teaching	English Liberal Arts
237: World Literature and Culture II	Required	Required
240: American Literature Survey	Required	Required
250: British Literature Survey	Required	Required
307: Writing for Teachers of English	Required (Gen Ed)	—
308: Practical Literary Criticism	—	Required (Gen Ed)
310: Grammar for Teachers and Writers	Required	Elective
336: Popular Literature in Mass Media	Required	Elective
340: Multicultural American Literature	Required	Elective
410: History of the English Language	Required	Elective
460: Shakespeare	Required	Required
486: Teaching English	Required (Edu)	
Advanced Electives		
Elective: American Literature	Required	Required
Elective: British Literature before 1800	Required	Required
Elective: British Literature after 1800	Required	Required

English (Liberal Arts) Minor – 24 hours. Fourteen students (Spring 2009) are pursuing the minor in English (Liberal Arts). They complete two General Education writing courses, five required literature courses, and nine hours of 300-level or 400-level electives.

The Core Curriculum—English Minors	
Course Number and Title	English Liberal Arts
108: Writing about Literature and Culture	Required (Gen Ed)
230: Literary Analysis	Required
236: World Literature and Culture I	Required
237: World Literature and Culture II	Required
240: American Literature Survey	Required
250: British Literature Survey	Required
308: Practical Literary Criticism	Required (Gen Ed)
Advanced Electives	
Elective: Advanced American Literature	Required
Elective: British Literature before 1800	Required
Elective: British Literature after 1800	Required

Creative Writing Minor – 18 hours. Fifty students (Spring 2009) are currently pursuing the minor in Creative Writing. They complete one required course, a course in literature; they then choose among writing courses in three genres: poetry, fiction, and creative nonfiction.

The Core Curriculum—Creative Writing Minors	
Course Number and Title	Creative Writing
219: Introduction to Creative Writing	Recommended
329: Contemporary Literature for Writers	Required

The Core Curriculum—Creative Writing Minors	
Course Number and Title	Creative Writing
Electives: 220/324/424 : Writing Fiction 221/325/424 : Writing Poetry 227/327/424 : Writing Creative Nonfiction	15 hours

Graduate Studies in English—32 hours. Twenty-three students (Fall 2008) are pursuing the MA program in English (seventeen in Literature and six in Writing). They complete five core courses, eleven hours of electives, and a culminating experience.

The Core Curriculum—Graduate Studies Literature or Writing	
Course Number and Title	Graduate
600: Bibliography and Research Methods	Required
635: Literary Theory and Criticism	Required
Elective: 600-level American Literature	Required
Elective: 600-level British Literature before 1800	Required
Elective: 600-level British Literature after 1800	Required
Open Electives	11 hours
Culminating Experiences: 699 (Thesis), 692 (Master's Paper), or 698 (Creative Project)	Required

Prioritization of Programs and Allocation of Resources. The Department neither encourages nor promotes one undergraduate major over the other. Rather, we see them as coequal. Because the two majors share a core curriculum, the allocation of resources has not been a problem. We also view the two MA program specializations as coequal.

C. Enrollment Patterns

Undergraduate Majors: Our enrollments in both undergraduate majors have declined—as have overall University enrollments. Our recent survey of students (see Section IV: Students) indicates that students are satisfied with the program, giving an overall rating of 3.92 (of 5.00) to eleven questions related to program satisfaction.

Undergraduate Minors: Enrollments in both undergraduate minors have remained fairly steady, with a moderate increase in enrollments in the Creative Writing minor.

Graduate Majors: Our enrollments in the graduate program have shown a moderate increase. Two years ago, we were allotted additional teaching assistantships—bringing our number to ten—and that has contributed to the modest increase in enrollments.

General Education: While our number of General Education courses has declined slightly, the number of sections is still very high. Each year, for example, we offer approximately 170 sections of writing courses that fulfill the writing requirements of the General Education program.

General Education Writing Courses Enrollment Limits of 25 Students per Section			
	Fall 2008 Sections	Spring 2009 Sections	2008–2009 Sections
101: Freshman Writing I	43	5	48
105: Freshman Writing II	9	36	45
107: Rhetoric and Writing	16	3	19
108: Writing about Literature and Culture	5	1	6
305: Advanced Expository Writing	13	17	30
305T: Technical Writing	12	10	22
307: Writing for Teachers of English	1	0	1
308: Practical Literary Criticism	0	1	1
TOTAL SECTIONS	99	73	172

Each year, we offer approximately sixty sections of literature and language courses that fulfill the requirements of the General Education program (in Literary, Artistic, and Philosophical Studies—Literature and Life; Multicultural Studies—International Cultures; Multicultural Studies—US Diversity; and Social and Behavioral Studies).

General Education Literature and Language Courses Enrollment Limits of 45 Students per Section			
	Fall 2008 Sections	Spring 2009 Sections	2008–2009 Sections
219: Introduction to Creative Writing	3	3	6
231: Introduction to Fiction	2	2	4
239: Literature and Life	10	11	21
243: Introduction to Black American Writers	1	0	1
310: Grammar for Teachers and Writers	1	1	2
335: Science Fiction as Social Criticism	1	2	3
336: Popular Literature in Mass Media	2	1	3
338: Literature and Public Life	5	1	6
340: Multicultural American Literature	4	3	7
346: Modern Black American Literature	0	1	1
349: Women Writers of the United States	1	0	1
359: Women Writers of Great Britain	0	0	0
370: Survey of Folklore	2	2	4
373: American Folklore	3	1	4
TOTAL SECTIONS	35	28	63

D. Program Revisions

In the last several years, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee has instituted a number of changes in the program—some large, some small, but all important. As the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee completed its work, members reviewed the programs at seventeen schools (including same-sized schools, other in-state schools, and schools where our students have pursued graduate studies). After discussion and deliberation, these changes have been approved by the Committee and the Department. These changes must now proceed through the University approval process.

- *Redesigned Courses.* Two literature courses in the core curriculum were redesigned: English 240 (Major American Authors) and English 250 (Major English Authors). These courses, which often concentrated on only a few important writers, did not provide the foundational coverage that we felt was important, with multiple periods, multiple genres, and representative authors. The revised courses—American Literature Survey and British Literature Survey—address these concerns.
- *Redesignation of Courses in British Literature.* Acknowledging that many of the writers included in English 250 and upper-division courses weren't only English, we chose to retitle these courses using the word *British*, the more inclusive term. When the word *English* accurately represents the course content, it has been retained (for example, Early English Drama and the English Novel).
- *Redefined Advanced Electives.* We eliminated 300-level courses from the list of advanced electives. Now, only 400-level courses can be used to fulfill that requirement. (See "Major Courses with General Education Credit" below.)
- *Prerequisites for 400-Level Courses.* Once English 240 and English 250 were redesigned as foundational courses, we made them prerequisites for 400-level courses in literature and language.
- *Elimination of Repetition in Course Offerings.* A decade ago, in an effort to build the foundation for an MA and PhD in cultural studies, the Department created a strand of 400-level courses (for example, Literature and Culture of the Nineteenth Century). The graduate program never materialized, but the course offerings remained. Deciding that all literature courses now incorporate aspects of cultural studies, we eliminated the five "Literature and Culture" courses; we retained the Seminar in Literature and Culture because it would, potentially, provide the opportunity for specialized study.
- *Expanding British and American Survey Coverage.* To enhance our students' shared experience in studying literature, we divided the American and British surveys into two semesters each. This plan was approved at the Department meeting in April 2009; it must now move through the University approval process.
- *Rethinking our World Literature Requirements.* We currently require a two-semester world literature sequence. We are considering whether to reduce that requirement to one semester. These discussions will continue in the coming year.
- *Creating Coherence among Elective Offerings.* At present, we have too many elective offerings, including those that overlap in terms of content and period. The Committee (and subsequently the Department) will address this issue in the coming year.
- *Major Courses with General Education Credit.* At present, we have a large number of major courses that can also be used to fulfill General Education requirements. With

11

the mixed student audience, faculty have difficulty targeting instruction. Should they direct the work to majors and overwhelm the nonmajors? Or should they direct the work to nonmajors and shortchange the majors? The Committee (and subsequently the Department) will address this issue in the coming year.

E. Experiential Learning and Community Engagement

We have always maintained that the study of literature and language is, by its nature, experiential. Yet we are also aware that our administration and review groups have something else in mind—a more "hands on," activity-oriented definition of *experience*. We have not, as some departments have, imposed experiential learning and community engagement requirements on students; rather, we have continued to emphasize traditional study. However, departmental opportunities exist for experiential learning and community engagement:

Internships. English 492 (Internship in English) provides opportunities for students, particularly those interested in editorial work. Working with the editors of journals published in the Department, students have worked on *Indiana English*, *Folklore Historian*, and *Grasslands Review*. Other students have completed internships in ISU's Folklore Archives, also housed in the Department. Still other students have completed internships with external agencies, including the Arts Illiana Foundation.

Early-Field Experiences and Student Teaching. Every English Teaching major completes numerous hours of experience-based work in the area schools, working with middle school and high school students. Because so many hours are required for these CIMT experiences, we do not add to this work but concentrate on content.

Creative Writing Readings. Students are encouraged to participate in a variety of creative writing readings that are held throughout the year. Further, they are encouraged to attend faculty readings and the readings of visiting creative writers.

Special Projects. Projects in some courses require students to engage with selected portions of the community. For example, in English 307 (Writing for Teachers), students create a "School Profile," based in large part on field research that includes school visits and interviews with administrators, teachers, students, and community members.

The Big Read. For the last three years, the Department has involved students in Terre Haute's Big Read activities. A panel of three faculty members and two students presented papers on *The Great Gatsby*; a panel of four graduate students presented papers on *The Call of the Wild*. This year, another panel of students will present papers on *My Ántonia*. These panels are held at the Clabber Girl building (off campus) and are attended by people from throughout the community.

F. Course Schedule and Class Enrollments

The scheduling and delivery of courses in English is a complicated process because so much of our schedule involves instruction in General Education. The sheer number of courses makes creating the schedule a challenge.

At the close of traditional registration periods (the end of the preceding semester), the Chairperson begins to monitor enrollments. Several weeks before the semester begins, the Chairperson combines under-enrolled courses when possible (for example, multiple sections of a Freshman Writing I); when combining is not possible, low-enrollment courses are cancelled.

When a course is cancelled, the Chairperson's administrative assistant calls all students in the section and, if possible, moves them to other open sections (using the interdepartmental transfer process). Faculty members are reassigned, generally to General Education writing classes.

G. General Education

Our contribution to General Education is substantial. In fact, each semester we deliver three times as many General Education courses as we do undergraduate major and graduate courses. This is also complicated—or perhaps simply made more confusing—by the fact that some undergraduate major courses can be used to fulfill General Education requirements.

Historically, we have been strong proponents of General Education and value the role that the Department plays in the educational experiences of *all* ISU students. By offering 100-level and 300-level writing courses and 200-level and 300-level "Literature and Life" courses, we engage with every ISU student at multiple times throughout his or her University experience.

Course Offerings—Fall 2008		
Kinds of Courses		
Courses	Number of Sections	Total
General Education		
Composition	99	119
Literature	20	
Major/Minor Courses*		
Undergraduate: Literature and Language	26	30
Graduate: Literature and Composition	4	
Elementary Education		
Literature	4	4
Prison Courses		
General Education	5	5
TOTAL		158
* Forty-six percent of these courses for undergraduate majors can also be used for General Education credit.		

Course Offerings—Spring 2009		
Kinds of Courses		
Courses	Number of Sections	Total
General Education		
Composition	73	90
Literature	17	
Major/Minor Courses*		
Undergraduate: Literature and Language	24	27
Graduate: Literature and Composition	3	
Elementary Education		
Literature	4	4
Prison Courses		
General Education	3	3
TOTAL		124
* Fifty percent of these courses for undergraduate majors can also be used for General Education credit.		

NOTE: As the number of Department faculty has decreased in the last several decades, fewer and fewer General Education writing courses are taught by faculty. Rather, these classes are most frequently assigned to adjunct faculty and to teaching assistants.

H. Distance Education

The Department offers three types of distance classes for General Education credit.

Writing. Multiple sections of English 305 (Advanced Expository Writing) and English 305T (Technical Writing) are offered every semester.

Literature and Life. While additional Literature and Life courses are in development, we presently offer multiple sections of three different courses each year.

A Capstone Course. At present, we offer one capstone course through distance education.

Instructors have commented that online courses take more time than on-campus classes, in part because students assume that online equates with "always available," and consequently they remain in constant e-mail contact. Instructors also feel that they must give extra comments and feedback because of the lack of face-to-face interaction. However, student evaluations indicate that both the amount of feedback and the flexibility of scheduling are important to them, and as long as they can manage the openness of that flexible schedule, most students are successful.

I. Conclusion

We have some challenges to face; some will be easier to address than others.

- *Curricular Revision.* One of our goals in the last few years has been to bring coherence and clarity to the undergraduate majors. We have made progress, but we have considerable work yet to do. We also need to review the graduate program.
- *Enrollment.* While we have always done some recruiting and have regularly worked with prospective students, we must do more than we have in the past to attract students in the future.
- *Meeting the Needs of General Education (Soon to Be Foundational Studies).* During the development of the Foundational Studies program, the Department spoke strongly in favor of retaining the level of instruction in writing and literature. Now we must plan for curricular revision and participate in review processes to ensure that the courses we offer meet the guidelines of the new program.

In the last few years, the Department has demonstrated a willingness to revisit ideas, plans, programs, and expectations. The faculty's willingness to reconsider curricular matters is one of our strengths.

J. Supporting Documents

Minutes of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Meetings
Minutes from Department Meetings
Writing at ISU
Literature and Language at ISU
Creative Writing at ISU
Student Survey
Fall 2008 Schedule
Spring 2009 Schedule

III. FACULTY

A. Overview

The Department has twenty-five faculty members. It's challenging to characterize the faculty as a group, but selected data provide a snapshot of the members of the group.

- *Rank:* 9 Professors, 11 Associate Professors, 5 Assistant Professors
- *Hiring Date:* 1966 (1), 1967 (1), 1979 (1), 1981 (2), 1983 (1), 1985 (2), 1986 (1), 1987 (1), 1988 (1), 1990 (2), 1991 (1), 1996 (1), 1998 (1), 2001 (1), 2002 (2), 2003 (1), 2004 (2), 2005 (3)
- *Degrees:* 21 PhDs, 2 MFAs, 2 MAs
- *Areas of Specialization:* 9 British Literature, 6 American Literature, 5 Writing, 2 Creative Writing, 2 Children's Literature, 1 Folklore
- *Gender:* 8 females, 17 males
- *Administrative Positions:* 6 faculty serve in administrative positions (Dean of the College, Associate Dean of the College, Chairperson, Director of Graduate Studies, Director of Undergraduate Studies, and Director of Writing Programs).

B. Workload

Teaching. Nineteen faculty teach three classes each semester; six faculty receive course reductions because of administrative duties.

Administrator	Course(s) taught each semester
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences	1
Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences	1
Chairperson	1
Director of Graduate Studies	2
Director of Undergraduate Studies	2
Director of Writing Programs	2

One faculty member teaches all folklore classes; one faculty member teaches all technical writing courses; the Dean and Associate Dean teach only literature courses; the Chairperson teaches only courses for English Teaching majors. Otherwise, faculty teach a combination of writing courses and literature courses—both major courses and General Education literature courses.

Writing classes have maximum enrollments of twenty-five students; literature courses have maximum enrollments of forty-five students. Faculty in the Department who do not have administrative assignments teach, on average, ninety-two students each semester, with an average class size of thirty one. (See "Faculty and Numbers of Enrolled Students: Spring 2009.")

Scholarship. All faculty are expected to pursue a scholarly agenda, including publications and presentations at conferences. Most do; a few don't. Those who are professionally active contribute in a wide variety of ways (see questionnaire results below).

Service. All faculty are expected to provide service to the Department through committee work and other contributions. We also encourage service to the College, University, profession, and community. In the last few years, the work in the Department has been demanding, as we have developed *Language and Literature at ISU* and *Creative Writing at ISU*. Almost all faculty provide active service at multiple levels (see questionnaire results below).

C. SIR Data

Each semester, the Department receives composite SIRs scores that include responses to the teaching of faculty, adjuncts, and teaching assistants. Our composite scores are on par with or slightly higher than those of the College, which are, in turn, on par with or slightly higher than the University average.

When we review SIRs as part of promotion and tenure review, we typically look at four questions: 4 (use of class time), 19 (comments on work), 36 (challenge of the course), and 40 (instructional quality). The tables below show the results of the composite reports for the University, College, and Department for two questions; full summaries (including all questions) are available in the supporting documents.

Question 19: Comments on Papers and Assignments			
Semester	University Mean	College Mean	Department Mean
Spring 2004	4.16	4.17	4.27
Fall 2004	4.10	4.14	4.25
Spring 2005	4.16	4.18	4.16
Fall 2005	4.10	4.11	4.25
Spring 2006	4.16	4.21	4.32
Fall 2006	4.16	4.21	4.32
Spring 2007	4.18	4.23	4.40
Fall 2007	4.14	4.17	4.39
Spring 2008	4.19	4.19	4.37
Fall 2008	4.12	4.14	4.34

Question 40: Quality of Instruction			
Semester	University Mean	College Mean	Department Mean
Spring 2004	3.99	3.98	4.05
Fall 2004	3.93	3.97	4.01
Spring 2005	3.97	4.00	4.06
Fall 2005	3.92	3.93	4.00

Question 40: Quality of Instruction			
Semester	University Mean	College Mean	Department Mean
Spring 2006	3.98	4.01	4.07
Fall 2006	3.96	3.98	4.01
Spring 2007	3.98	4.00	3.98
Fall 2007	3.94	3.96	4.10
Spring 2008	3.97	3.97	4.08
Fall 2008	3.92	3.94	4.05

Because faculty felt that the SIR was an inexact gauge of teaching in English studies, we explored the possibility of using an alternative instrument. A work group developed an alternative questionnaire, faculty volunteers had students complete both SIRs and our form, and we compared the results. Ultimately, we decided that the SIR worked almost as well as our alternative but had the benefit of being comparable across units (which was important for promotion and tenure reviews). This process took a great deal of time, but we learned something useful and can now see the SIR for what it is: a moderately helpful gauge of faculty teaching.

D. Advising

Undergraduate. Jake Jakaitis, Director of Undergraduate Studies, advises beginning students (either freshmen or transfer students) during their first two semesters at ISU. Thereafter, students are assigned to one of sixteen faculty who serve as advisors. Advisors work with students in their advisement "specialties": English (Liberal Arts), English Teaching, or Creative Writing.

In the past, we surveyed students regarding their advisement. Because fewer students than we would have liked responded to the surveys, the results were either inconclusive or not very helpful. We need to address this issue again—developing a new procedure and a new survey.

Graduate. Matt Brennan, Director of Graduate Studies, responds to inquiries about the program, meets with prospective students, and makes recommendations to the College of Graduate and Professional Studies regarding applications for admission. Once students are admitted, Brennan advises all graduate students throughout their program. He coordinates their semester-by-semester class registration; handles paperwork for arranged courses; coordinates the formation of students' committees for their theses, MA papers, or creative projects; and reviews the documentation for graduation.

E. Research and Creative Activities

Since Digital Measures (the University system for reporting yearly activity) provided incomplete information, we constructed a questionnaire for the faculty to complete, asking questions that were of interest to us.

The questionnaire (which requested data from 2004 to spring 2009) yielded these results:

- *Course Preparations:* On average, each faculty member taught eight different courses.
- *New Preparation:* On average, each faculty member developed 5.38 new courses (either new assignments, new courses, or major revisions of existing courses).
- *Online Courses:* Five different courses are delivered online by two faculty. (Two adjuncts also teach classes online.)
- *Numbers of Advisees:* The sixteen faculty who served as advisors each worked with, on average, 14.375 students.
- *MA Committees:* The twenty faculty who served on MA committees worked with, on average, 7.3 master's students; one faculty member served on nine PhD committees outside the Department.
- *MA Committees Chaired:* Thirteen faculty chaired, on average, 3.538 committees.
- *Single-Authored Books:* Nine faculty published a total of fifteen books. Two faculty published three; two faculty published two.
- *Co-Authored Books:* Two faculty published co-authored books.
- *Editorship of a Collection:* Two faculty edited a total of four collections; one published three, and one published one.
- *Chapters, Essays, Articles, Selections, or Entries in Edited Collections:* Thirteen faculty published thirty-seven contributions to collections.
- *Articles:* Thirteen faculty published a total of thirty-six articles in journals.
- *Poems:* One faculty member published thirty-two poems; one faculty member published three poems.
- *Short Stories:* One faculty member published five short stories; one faculty member published four short stories.
- *Nonfiction Essays:* One faculty member published one nonfiction essay.
- *Reviews:* Twelve faculty published a total of fifty-three reviews in journals. One faculty member published twelve reviews; two faculty published eight; one published five.
- *Editorships:* Nine faculty served in editorial positions.
- *Editorial Boards:* Nine faculty served on editorial review boards. One faculty member served on five.
- *International Conference Presentations:* Five faculty made twenty-two presentations at international conferences. One faculty member made nine; another faculty member made seven.
- *National Conference Presentations:* Fifteen faculty made forty-three presentations at national conferences. One faculty member made twelve; two made four; three made three.
- *Regional Conference Presentations.* Ten faculty made twenty-one regional conference presentations. One faculty member made five; one faculty member made four; two faculty made three.
- *State Conference Presentations:* Two faculty made four state conference presentations.
- *Featured Readings:* Six faculty gave thirty-one featured readings of their creative writing.
- *Open Readings:* Two faculty gave six open readings of their creative writing.

- *National-Level Committees:* Seven faculty served on fourteen national committees. One faculty member served on seven.
- *Regional Committees:* Four faculty served on four regional committees.
- *State Committees:* Five faculty served on six state committees.
- *University Committees:* Nineteen faculty served on fifty-seven University committees. One faculty member served on nine; two served on eight.
- *College Committees:* Sixteen faculty served on thirty-two College committees.
- *Department Committees:* All faculty served on Department committees. On average, faculty served on 5.125 departmental committees.
- *Elected Committees:* Twenty faculty were elected to thirty-six committees (at all levels of committee work).
- *Leadership Roles on Committees:* Nineteen faculty served in leadership roles on forty-one committees. On average, faculty served in 2.157 leadership roles.
- *Teaching Awards:* Six faculty received teaching awards.
- *Scholarly Awards:* Six faculty received eight scholarly awards.
- *Service Awards:* One faculty member received a service award.
- *Grants:* Four faculty received ten grants.

We encourage these activities and celebrate these accomplishments in the Department in several ways: the Chairperson makes announcements at Department meetings, we share information in the *Department of English News* (*DEN*, the weekly newsletter), we post information on the website, and distribute information to local media. Further, books by faculty are prominently displayed in the main office, and photographs of University award winners are displayed in the workroom/mailroom.

F. Hiring, Retention, and Tenure/Promotion

Hiring: The Department follows hiring procedures and policies that are outlined in the *University Handbook* and by the Office of Affirmative Action. The Department Chairperson appoints a search committee, usually composed of three faculty members, including a committee chair, who attends the Office of Affirmative Action's meeting on conducting searches. The search committee identifies the best three candidates, a list of whom is provided to the Department Chair, who then makes a recommendation to the Dean.

When examining the pool, search committees are unaware of the race or ethnicity of the candidates. Committee members can generally deduce the gender of applicants because of their names.

Five tenure-track faculty have been hired since 2004.

- *Gender:* 2 females, 3 males
- *Race/Ethnicity:* 1 Hispanic, 1 Asian, 3 Caucasian
- *Specializations:* 1 British, 2 American, 2 Creative Writing

Since 2004, we have lost five positions (two folklore, one 17th–18th-Century British, one writing, and one Creative Writing). One search was authorized in fall 2008: Creative Writing

(Poetry). After the search committee and Chairperson reviewed the files of 156 applicants and developed a "short list," the search was cancelled due to budget constraints.

Retention: We take retention very seriously because we have found over the years that when a faculty member leaves—either through retirement, resignation, or dismissal—we do not retain the line.

We have tried to assign mentors to new faculty, with limited success. These mandated relationships do not always create the experiences that we want for new faculty. As a result, the Chairperson now meets regularly with pre-tenure faculty to discuss teaching, scholarship, and service; the chairperson also observes the classes of pre-tenure faculty.

As required by the *University Handbook* and College of Arts and Sciences Bylaws, candidates undergo annual reviews. The Department takes these reviews very seriously, as the level of detail in our Bylaws makes clear. In addition, the Chairperson provides advice for preparing a portfolio that illustrates the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service.

The seven-member Personnel Committee reviews each portfolio and sends a written synopsis of the candidate's performance to the Chairperson, who then prepares a more detailed statement. The Chairperson then meets with the pre-tenure faculty member to discuss the departmental reviews, after which the review materials are forwarded to the Promotion and Tenure Committee in the College of Arts and Sciences.

When the process is completed in the College, the Chairperson meets again with the candidate to discuss the results and the candidate's plans to address any concerns.

Tenure and Promotion. Since 2004, the Department has had twelve faculty members in the tenure track, including those hired before 2004. Of these,
- four have earned tenure;
- five are making progress toward tenure;
- one was dismissed for refusing treatment for a substance problem;
- one did not complete the requisite publication for tenure; and
- one took employment at another university near her husband's place of employment.

The four candidates who have earned tenure have also been promoted to Associate Professor because tenure and promotion are linked at ISU. Since 2004, one faculty member has been promoted from Associate Professor to full Professor. In all cases, the Department follows promotion guidelines defined in the *University Handbook*, the College Bylaws, and the more specific guidelines of the Department's Bylaws.

G. Adjuncts

In a regular year, the Department employs approximately twenty adjunct faculty to teach, primarily, General Education Writing classes. With each adjunct assigned from one to four classes, adjuncts teach a sizeable proportion of our classes.

To indicate the important role that they play in the Department, adjuncts are listed on the directory at the main entrance to the Department, in ISU's telephone directory, and on the Department website. They have individual offices within the Department, have separate telephone lines, and are provided with computers. Adjuncts are encouraged to attend all Department meetings; although the Bylaws stipulate that they cannot vote on actionable items, they are welcome to participate in discussions. They are also invited to all Department functions.

Distribution of Teaching: Numbers of Sections					
	Faculty	Adjuncts	Teaching Assistants	Total	Percentage taught by Adjuncts
Fall 2008	67	66	20	153	43%
Spring 2009	61	45	17	123	37%
TOTAL	128	111	37	276	40%

Adjuncts must have a master's degree in English or a related field; many received their training as teachers while pursuing graduate degrees at ISU.

Adjuncts are reviewed every year by the Policy Committee.

Discussion of the budgetary issues of employing so many adjuncts appears in Section V: "Resources."

H. Conclusion

Faculty members are the Department's greatest resource. We are, as a group, effective teachers who develop opportunities for our students to learn. Even without merit pay (or some other sort of performance-based compensation), the majority of faculty are active scholars. And especially in the last few years, faculty have provided an increasing level of service. However, challenges still exist:
- The continued loss of faculty lines remains troublesome, but that problem is one that we cannot control.
- Our dependence on adjunct faculty to deliver General Education courses—and the reliance on "soft money" for their pay—remains troublesome as well; it is also beyond our control.
- Creating balance in departmental responsibilities is an ongoing challenge. The small number of faculty who have "opted out" of service or scholarship need to be drawn into the process again.
- Encouraging faculty to be involved in Department activities and to support special projects requires continued efforts.

I. Supporting Documents

Policies and Procedures
SIR Summaries (2004–2009)
Faculty Questionnaire
Faculty and Numbers of Enrolled Students: Spring 2009
Committee Assignments
Work Group Assignments

IV. STUDENTS

A. Overview

It has always been difficult for us to characterize the students in our program. Some are exceedingly pragmatic and purposeful; others are exceedingly cerebral and unfocused. Then again, some are pragmatic and unfocused, while others are cerebral and purposeful. That's the pleasure of teaching in a program that treats literature, language, and writing. We certainly work with a variety of students.

This section, however, attempts to provide a snapshot of our students, in an effort to understand who they are and how we can better serve their needs.

B. Student Profile[1]

According to Argos data, the number of students in our majors and minors breaks down this way:

Majors and Minors—Listed by Category and Semester*					
Semester	English Liberal Arts	English Teaching	English Minor	Creative Writing Minor	Graduate
Spring 2005	117	78	9	49	24
Fall 2005	107	85	2	49	28
Spring 2006	116	81	6	51	28
Fall 2006	111	70	6	49	30
Spring 2007	112	60	5	47	30
Fall 2007	90	64	7	44	25
Spring 2008	88	57	7	39	25
Fall 2008	76	71	10	44	23
Spring 2009	85	63	8	50	23
AVERAGE	100	70	7	47	26
* These numbers come from Argos.					

Enrollments in the English Liberal Arts major have dropped below the average in the last four semesters; enrollments in the English Teaching major have dropped below the average in four of the last five semesters; enrollments in the English minor, while small, have remained steady; enrollments in the Creative Writing minor have dropped below the average in three of the last four semesters; enrollments in the graduate program have dropped below the average in the last four semesters.

---

[1] The data in this section comes from spreadsheets provided by the College of Arts and Sciences, unless otherwise noted. In some instances, information comes from Argos, an alternative database; the use of this database is always provided in a table note. NOTE: There *are* discrepancies in the numbers.

Identifying the numbers of students in each program—and the rise or fall that comes naturally—can provide one kind of measure of the Department. But other data prove helpful, too.

Gender Balance among Majors and Minors			
Program	Male	Female	Total
English Liberal Arts	166	319	485
English Teaching	116	256	372
English Minor	3	33	36
Creative Writing Minor	89	113	202
Graduate	38	90	128
TOTAL	412	811	1,223
PERCENT	34%	66%	100%

Ethnic Balance among Majors and Minors*						
Program	African American	Asian American	Hispanic	White	Foreign	Multi-racial
English LA	18	10	11	408	25	7
English Teaching	18	0	6	330	3	6
English Minor	4	0	3	27	0	0
Creative Writing	12	4	5	178	0	2
Graduate	6	2	0	113	2	2
TOTAL	58	16	25	1,056	30	17
PERCENT	4.8%	1.3%	2.1%	87.8%	2.5%	1.4%
* The table does not include "American Indian" or "Unknown" categories; the numbers were too small.						

Age Range of Majors and Minors*				
Program	18–22	23–29	30–49	50+
English LA	319	111	39	16
English Teaching	261	76	31	1
English Minor	27	3	6	0
Creative Writing	143	41	13	5
Graduate	10	66	49	3
TOTAL	760	297	138	25
PERCENT	62.2%	24.3%	11.3%	2.0%
* The table does not include "Less than 18."				

Enrollment Status of Majors and Minors			
Program	Full Time	Part Time	Total
English LA	397	88	485
English Teaching	342	30	372
English Minor	32	4	36

Enrollment Status of Majors and Minors			
Creative Writing	179	23	202
Graduate	49	79	128
TOTAL	999	224	1,223
PERCENT	81.7%	18.3%	100%

While these figures provide a useful overview of our majors and minors, we thought it would be helpful to expand our understanding of our students by using a questionnaire. We prepared a document; the Chairperson sent it as an attachment to an e-mail and asked that students complete the form. Thirty-two students returned the completed form to the Chairperson's secretary. She printed copies, and the "Student" work group tabulated the results. Although the sampling is small, it is balanced, and the results are interesting.

Number of Years in the English Major/Minor Program						
	1 year	2 years	3 years	4 years	5 years	6 years
Number of Students	6	9	3	7	3	4

Statements that Apply to Our Majors	Number of Students
I am the first person in my immediate family to attend college.	11
Others in my family have graduated from college.	23
I am a transfer student.	7
I intend to transfer out of ISU.	0
I am a full-time student at ISU.	28
I am a part-time student at ISU.	5
I am pursuing more than one major at ISU.	3
I am pursuing more than one minor at ISU.	4
I am pursuing more than one degree at ISU.	1
My family is helping to fund my college tuition.	8
I am paying my own full tuition at ISU.	10
I am a scholarship recipient.	17
I am a federal grant recipient.	14
I work at a full-time job.	7
I work at a part-time job.	15
I am married.	7
I have one or more children.	6
I am a military veteran.	0
I am currently in the military.	0
I live on campus.	9
I live off campus in Terre Haute.	11
I commute to campus from outside Terre Haute.	12
I am involved in ISU extracurricular activities/organizations.	15

Statements that Apply to Our Majors	Number of Students
Upon graduation, I intend to attend graduate/professional school.	14
Upon graduation, I intend to enter the work force.	16
Upon graduation, I intend to join a non-profit/volunteer organization.	1

Several important details emerged with this limited though helpful questionnaire/survey:

- A smaller portion than we expected (34%) were the first person in their families to go to college; this counters our perception of our students as "first generation."
- A higher percentage than we expected (72%) had family members who are college graduates, which will make us rethink whether "first generation" is limited to only immediate family.
- A small portion of our students (25%) receive family assistance with tuition; that may establish the necessity for the students to apply for scholarships and grants.
- A small number of our students (22%) work full time; a sizeable number (47%) work part time; this could contribute to the lack of time for or interest in extracurricular activities in the Department.
- The post-graduation goals of our students divide rather evenly, with about half (44%) planning to go to graduate school and the other half (50%) intending to enter the workforce.

We know that this questionnaire needs to be reproduced with a larger sample. But the results of even this small sampling have challenged some of our preconceptions and may alter the ways in which we plan activities, coordinate new student orientation, think about recruitment, and consider retention.

C. Persistence and Success

Our students move through their programs effectively and graduate at rates that are typical of the University as a whole.

Graduates by Program and Semester*				
Semester	English	English Teaching	Graduate	Total
Spring 2005	12	6	7	25
Summer 2005	7	2	3	12
Fall 2005	6	3	1	10
Spring 2006	10	5	3	18
Summer 2006	5	2	1	8
Fall 2006	8	8	3	19
Spring 2007	20	7	8	35
Summer 2007	4	2	1	7
Fall 2007	12	2	5	19
Spring 2008	13	6	6	25
Summer 2008	3	1	6	10

Graduates by Program and Semester*				
Fall 2008	3	2	1	6
TOTAL	103	46	45	194
* These numbers come from Argos; they do not include second majors.				

D. Activities and Organizations

We have a few student organizations, none very active.

Student Advisory Committee. Our Bylaws stipulate that the Student Advisory Committee (SAC) be formed by the Directors of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies. The SAC's role is to draw attention to students' needs and to participate on student-related committees (for example, Recruitment and Retention). SAC can also sponsor student activities. We have found that the SAC is only as active as the members want it to be. When the students are interested and have a dynamic student leader, they are very active—hosting bake sales, having movie nights, presenting the Renaissance Faire, having Department tee-shirts made, and assisting with new-student orientation. When the group doesn't have a strong leader, all activities cease.

Sigma Tau Delta. The English honor society follows the same pattern as SAC. With the correct combination of students, the organization has proven to be very active. Without student leadership, the single faculty-sponsored activity is the induction ceremony.

Arion Creative Writing Club. Arion has, to some degree, been more active than other student organizations in the Department. It offers sponsored readings, which allows writers to share their work in an informal setting; the group has, at times, hosted bake sales to help fund its student publication: *Tonic.* However, *Tonic* has not been published in the last two years,.

Graduate Student Organization. Two pre-tenured faculty offered to serve as sponsors for a graduate student organization, but so far the group has not been active.

Two principles seem to be at work here. First, faculty are willing to assist in many ways, but they do not feel obligated to create extracurricular opportunities for students. Second, a high percentage of our students work and have other obligations. Perhaps extracurricular activities in the Department suffer because of students' other obligations.

The lowest rating on the student survey related to extracurricular activities (2.96 of 5.00); however, the rating is still "neutral."

E. Conclusion

Our students come to the study of English from different perspectives and exhibit strengths in different elements of study—some in literature, some in language, some in writing, and some in creative writing. One of our greatest challenges is to help our students see that all areas of English studies enrich the others. Our other more practical challenges are meeting

students' needs in terms of course offerings so that they can complete the program in a timely fashion and providing them with opportunities to learn.

F. Supporting Documents

Argos Spreadsheets
E-mail to Students (Re: Survey)
Student Survey
Student Survey Data

V. RESOURCES

A. Overview

The Department has been a good steward of resources, with the greatest expenses directly related to instruction and instructional support. This is to be expected, since we deliver a greater number of General Education classes than any other department at ISU.

B. Responses to Budget Changes

Even though we have no control over the allocations in our budget, we do control how we spend the amounts that we receive. The table below provides some context for the discussion that follows.

Budget Summary by Categories and Years						
Budget Category	2003–04	2004–05	2005–06	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09
Personnel Service (Student Wages)	$7,426	$7,426	$6,312	$6,312	$6,501	$6,729
Supplies and Expense	$39, 802	$39,802	$38,210	$38,210	$38,210	$38,210
Repairs and Maintenance	$2,719	$2,719	$2,719	$2,719	$2,719	$2,719
Capital Equipment *	$52,186	$14,241	$4,909	$13,211	$2,467	$10,000
* These allocations are based on yearly requests.						

Personnel Service (Student Wages). The Chairperson reserves an amount from Student Wages to pay for one student worker; the remaining amount goes into the separate Writing Center account to pay for tutors. So far, the amount we have received has been sufficient.

Supplies and Expense. This sub-budget is by far the most complicated to maintain—and the one that requires the best management.
- *Photocopying Expenses.* Charges for per-page photocopying are included in this budget; in 2008–2009, those costs were $2,406. (Toner is included in supplies). This cost, while not exorbitant, must be controlled. Currently, faculty are allotted three-hundred personal copies per month (set with access codes), while adjuncts and TAs are allotted two-hundred copies. These amounts may have to be adjusted.
- *Departmental Publications.* The publication costs for *Indiana English* (two issues), *Midwestern Folklore* (two issues), and *The Folklore Historian* (one issue) come from this budget; in 2008–2009, printing costs for these journals totaled $6,520. The American Folklore Society contributes $1,000 toward the publication of *The Folklore Historian*, and the College of Arts and Sciences also contributes $1,000. However, the remaining $4,520 of publications costs for all three journals (12 percent of the overall supply budget) is absorbed by the Department. If our yearly balance is "swept," we

will not have "carry forward" monies from other accounts to support these publishing endeavors.

- *Postage*. The Department's postage costs for 2008–2009 were $2,249. That is well within the budgeted amount.
- *Telephones*. Maintaining private lines for each person working in the Department (faculty, support staff, adjuncts, TAs) is our largest expense. At present, telephone service costs about $19,000 a year (50 percent of our Supply and Expense budget). In an effort to cut costs, the Chairperson disconnects telephones during the semester that an adjunct faculty member is not teaching; although a reconnect fee of about $70 must be paid the next semester, that cost is made up in three months, after which the Department saves the cost of a line during an adjunct's "off" semester.
- *Office Supplies*. The Department uses a great deal of paper, toner for the photocopier, printer cartridges, file folders, note cards, transparencies, pens, and so on. At present, we have been able to control this part of the budget by supplementing it with "carry forward" money. The Chairperson has encouraged faculty to use Web-based means (for example, Blackboard or individual websites) to post single-use materials. Many faculty have adopted this strategy, and some now post all class materials online. For those who remain print-bound, the Chairperson encourages the use of Profpaks that students buy at local copy shops.
- *Materials for Prison Courses*. Four on-campus faculty also teach courses in the Correctional Education Program (CEP). While their salaries for prison courses and their textbooks are paid for through the CEP budget, the Department is expected to provide their course materials. As the number of CEP students has increased, so have the demands for course materials—especially sets of research materials that are necessary because of understocked libraries and no Internet access. Each semester, on-campus CEP instructors generate between five-thousand and eight-thousand copies for their prison students—even though we receive no additional funding for supplies.

As the budgeted amount for Supplies and Expense shrinks (the supply and equipment budget was cut ten percent this year) and when "carry forward" dollars are depleted, we will face some serious challenges. We have made some progress in controlling these costs—but what we've done may not be enough.

Repairs and Maintenance. We've been lucky. We haven't needed any major repairs, so we've been saving our allotments for the last several years in order to make some substantial improvements in the Department. The hallways have not been painted since the building opened in 1988, so it's clearly time for that improvement. In addition, allergy-irritating, fabric-covered walls in some key areas have worn badly and need to be stripped (and the walls skimmed with plaster and primed for painting). This will be a necessary expense. As long as our strategically accumulated balance is not "swept," we should be able to proceed without depleting the account.

Capital Equipment. This budget is based on year-by-year requests for major purchases (a photocopier, computers for adjuncts, computers for TAs, and so on). As long as our requests are realistic, we will try to remain optimistic about securing funds. However, we are aware that this Arts and Sciences budget will become increasingly smaller over the next several years—which means that our chances for receiving funds will lessen each year as well.

C. External Resources

Federal or foundation grants in English studies (as opposed to the sciences, for example) are difficult to secure and tend to be project or faculty oriented. As a result, the potential impact of grant funding on the Department is limited.

Of special note, the Joseph S. Schick Memorial Fund, a major bequest made through the ISU Foundation, allows us to sponsor a speaker series. The Schick Fund is one of the Department's major resources, providing the Department with approximately $100,000 a year for Schick events. (Full descriptions of Schick-related activities appear in Section VI: "Other.")

In addition, thanks to donors, the Department has a number of scholarships available through the ISU Foundation. Some are large, some small, but all are used to recognize and support our students.

Foundation Scholarships		
Fund Name	Number Awarded	Award Amount
Mary Reid McBeth Memorial Scholarship	6	$25
Henry G. Reifsnyder Memorial Scholarship	1	$140
Terre Haute Literary Club Award	1	$160
George E. Smock Award	1	$500
English Alumni Scholarship	1	$500
Dr. Ray A. Miller Scholarship	1	$260
Dr. Ronald L. Baker Endowment Scholarship	1	$440
Ben F. Small Memorial Scholarship	1	$790
Richard Landini Scholarship	1	$800
Mark E. Stoffel Memorial Scholarship	1	$400
James and Virginia Bash Memorial Scholarship	2	$500
Leroy and Mary Morris Scholarship	1	$2,350
Emily Salter Brett Memorial Scholarship	1	$2,700
Hazel Tesh Pfennig Scholarship	12	$2,000
Dr. Theodore Bakerman Memorial Scholarship	1	$250
TOTAL	32	$33,940

In addition, we have two other Foundation accounts: the Department of English account and the Creative Writing account. These accounts are used at the discretion of the Chairperson and the Creative Writing Committee, respectively.

During the last three years, the Chairperson has established contacts with several of the primary donors (or their family members), has joined a Development Officer in meetings with potential donors, and has solicited donations to accounts. One donor contributed an additional $20,000; others have made small but steady contributions.

D. The "Soft" Budget for Adjuncts

What goes unstated in the resources allocations is that we depend on yearly allocations to hire adjunct faculty. This is one of our greatest worries.

As the Chairperson plans every semester's schedule, he must worry about whether he can employ sufficient adjunct faculty to deliver the courses that are needed. So far, we have been able to do so; however, the outcome is never certain.

Adjunct Salaries: 2008–2009		
Semester	Number of Adjuncts	Cost
Fall 2008	19	$172,176
Spring 2009	17	$110,943
TOTAL		$283,119

With adjuncts providing, on average, forty percent of the Department's classroom instruction (see table in Section VI: "Other"), we must have these resources to continue to offer the General Education courses that ISU students need.

E. Conclusion

In the past, we have been able to maintain our budget balances across all categories by using "carry forward" funds. When those funds are depleted—as they surely will be—we will face very serious challenges. Because most of our budgeted expenses directly support classroom instruction, further reductions will have a direct impact on the quality of instruction we are able to provide for our majors, our minors, our graduate students, and the students in General Education classes.

The concern about the adjunct budget is a long-standing one. As the size of the regular faculty has diminished, we have depended more and more on adjuncts to deliver instruction. Without fiscal resources, we will not be able to hire these "educational resources."

E. Supporting Documents

Budget Forms
Foundation Accounts

VI. OTHER

A. Overview

The life of the Department is not fully represented by the categories "Governance and Leadership," "Program Array and Curriculum," "Faculty," "Students," and "Resources." Consequently, we are pleased that a category such as "Other" gives us the opportunity to describe additional resources that enhance the Department and enrich the experiences of students, faculty, the College, the University, and the Community.

B. Support Staff

The work of the Department is supported by three talented support staff members who provide a broad range of technical and professional assistance:

Mary Ann Duncan. Mary Ann is the office manager for the Department. She (1) coordinates the preparation of class materials and supervises our student worker, (2) prepares all paperwork related to faculty travel, (3) prepares flyers and programs for Schick Lectures, (4) provides editorial assistance for the *Folklore Historian* and *Midwestern Folklore*, (5) proofreads documents, (6) keeps records of absences, and (7) prepares major Department documents.

Kathy Edwards. Kathy is the administrative assistant to the Chairperson. She (1) prepares the published copy of the course schedule, (2) prepares contracts for adjunct faculty and teaching assistants, (3) coordinates book orders, (4) assists with enrollment management, (4) prepares paperwork and contracts related to the Schick Lecture Series, (5) maintains Departmental budgets, (6) maintains personnel files, and (7) serves as receptionist for the Chairperson.

Lynda Cox. Lynda is the Writing Center Secretary. She (1) establishes and manages the schedule of the Writing Center in Root Hall, (2) coordinates operations with the Writing Center in Cunningham Memorial Library, (3) presents tutor-training sessions, (4) provides research assistance to the Chairperson, (5) assists faculty with research projects, (6) assists with the Department's website, and (7) provides instructional assistance when needed.

C. The Joseph S. Schick Lecture Series

Thanks to a generous bequest from Joseph S. Schick, Professor Emeritus of English at Indiana State University, the Department is able to host the Joseph S. Schick Lectures in Language, Literature, and Lexicography.

According to the conditions of Professor Schick's will, "Eminent scholars . . . will be invited to present lectures on the literature, language and lexicography of the United States . . . and Great Britain. The topics of the lectures will be limited to the period before 1900."

Beginning in 1988, the Department has hosted from four to eight Schick Lecturers a year. As part of their visits, these scholars have also presented informal talks on contemporary topics, read from their works, and visited literature classes and writers' workshops.

The benefits to the Department are many. The Schick Lecture Series

- brings internationally known scholars to deliver formal lectures related to literature, language, and lexicography before 1900.
- provides both faculty and students personal access to exceptional scholarship.
- allows both faculty and students to interact with renowned scholars and creative writers at receptions, luncheons, dinners, and classroom visits.
- provides the Department with a superb book collection of hundreds of volumes authored or edited by Lecturers, a valuable resource for both faculty and students.
- provides the Department with a video collection of the lectures for future study.
- facilitates interdisciplinary programs with other departments—including (so far) Music and Theater.
- facilitates conferences in conjunction with scholarly organizations—including the Hoosier Folklore Society, the Midwest Society for 18th-Century Studies, and the Medieval Association of the Midwest.
- facilitates programs with community groups—the "Big Read" Project and the Terre Haute Historical Society, for example.
- makes possible "fests" that bring together multiple scholars to lecture on and discuss special topics, such as past ones on Austen, Blake, Franklin, Melville, and Shakespeare, as well as fairy tales, Irish literature, and Scottish ballads.
- serves as a form of community outreach because people in the community attend lectures, luncheons, and dinners.
- affords the Department excellent facilities, including a well-appointed lecture room with adjoining kitchen area, an office for Lecturers and future Schick Fellows, and a soon-to-be-completed reception room.
- provides a Schick Fellowship for a graduate student, who helps plan events, coordinates the Lecturers' travel, and helps maintain the Schick Library.
- offers opportunities for travel that supports scholarly activity, such as conference presentations, on pre-1900 topics. This furthers scholarship consistent with the aims of the endowment—and enhances the work of the Department.

The Schick bequest provides the Department with opportunities that we would not otherwise have available. During the last few years, several initiatives have enhanced—or will further enhance—the program:

- *Records of Schick Lecturers' Visits:* Files for Schick Lectures now include full correspondence between the Chairperson and Lecturers, as well as copies of all promotional materials, news articles, programs, and Lecturer's handouts and PowerPoint slides.
- *Information on Schick Lecturers' Visits:* Notebooks contain information on each Lecturer's visit: name, title, affiliation, date of visit, title of the lecture, title of the informal presentation, and a listing of all books purchased for the Schick Library.

- *Cataloging of the Schick Library:* Notebooks contain full citation information on all books purchased for the Schick Library.
- *Video Collection:* Notebooks contain records of all Schick Lectures available on videotape. The collection will soon be converted to DVD format.
- *A Reception Room:* Work has begun on a reception room that will provide suitable space for informal gatherings after the Lectures.

D. Scholarly Publications in the Department

The Department houses a variety of scholarly publications that are edited by faculty members (current and emeritus). The journals not only enrich their areas of research or creativity, but they also provide opportunities for student internships and help the Department to establish its place in the academic community.

The Folklore Historian. Edited by Nan McEntire, *The Folklore Historian* is the official publication of the History and Folklore Section of the American Folklore Society. It is published once a year and has approximately 350 subscribers.

Grasslands Review. Edited by Brendan Corcoran (Managing Editor), Mark Lewandowski (Nonfiction Editor), Aaron Morales (Fiction Editor), and Matt Brennan (Poetry Editor), *Grasslands Review* is an annual literary journal affiliated with the Department's Creative Writing Program.

Indiana English. Edited by Laura Bates, *Indiana English* is the official publication of the Indiana Council of Teachers of English. It is published twice a year and has approximately 350 subscribers.

Midwestern Folklore. Edited by Catherine Baker, *Midwestern Folklore* is the journal of the Hoosier Folklore Society. It is published twice a year and has approximately 350 subscribers.

The Snowy Egret. Edited by Karl Barneby, *The Snowy Egret* is published by The Fair Press. It is the oldest independent journal of nature writing in the United States.

E. The Writing Center

The Writing Center provides assistance to students at all levels—from freshmen working on papers for composition classes to doctoral students working on dissertations. With facilities in Root Hall and Cunningham Memorial Library, the Center offers scheduled forty-minute tutorial sessions. Both facilities are open from 9:00 to 3:30 during the week, with weekend hours at the Library facility.

Most Center consultants are undergraduate English majors and graduate students. In addition, some specially trained consultants provide online assistance for students taking distance education courses.

During the 2008–2009 school year, the Writing Center provided 2,873 tutorials.

F. The ISU Folklore Archives

The ISU Folklore Archives, directed by Nancy McEntire, is the largest accessible folklore archives in the Midwest, with approximately 30,000 accessioned examples of folklore, dating from the 1960s to the present day.

Students in folklore classes have access to the Archives for research, and many contribute to the archives after they have completed their own fieldwork. A number of students have also completed internships in the Archives.

G. Department Website

The current version of the Department website has been in place for more than four years. While the author-based images appealed to those of us in the Department, the promotional quality of the site was limited and in-site navigation was sometimes difficult.

In spring 2009, Casey Burk, a student on a Community Engagement internship (supervised by Aaron Morales, a faculty member), designed five alternative homepages. The Chairperson displayed the pages in the workroom and asked Department members (faculty, staff, adjuncts, teaching assistants) to indicate their preferences and make comments. Once the results were tabulated and the design was selected, Casey prepared coordinating subpages and then began preparing the site.

By the end of the spring 2009 semester, Casey had a demonstration site online. The faculty supervisor and the Chairperson have suggested minor changes. By mid-summer, the new Department of English website should be "live."

H. Conclusion

The Department would not be able to function without the support staff who ably assist us in our efforts. The academic life of the Department would be weakened without the Schick Lecture Series, the journals, and the Folklore Archive that we support. We wouldn't be able to support students' efforts to improve their writing without the Writing Center. And we wouldn't be able to share information about the Department without an accessible and comprehensive website. In short, without these "Others," the Department would be diminished.

I. Supporting Documents

Schick Speakers
Books in the Schick Library

External Program Review of the Department of English, Fall 2009

Indiana State University

Linda K. Hanson (Ball State University)

Dana J. Ringuette (Eastern Illinois University)

30 December 2009

Introduction

On October 1 & 2, 2009, we conducted an on-campus external review of the Department of English, Indiana State University. The review team was composed of Dr. Linda Hanson, Professor of English and Site Director of the Indiana Writing Project, Ball State University, and Dr. Dana Ringuette, Professor and Chair of English, Eastern Illinois University. The on-campus review was preceded by a study of written materials, sent to us by the department chairperson, that included a Fall 2009 "Self-Study Report" encompassing department governance and leadership, program array and curriculum, faculty, students, resources, and other materials pertinent to the self-study. We also received and reviewed separate overviews and descriptions of the Literature and Language Program (undergraduate); Composition, Expository, and Technical Writing Program (undergraduate); the Creative Writing Program (undergraduate); and Policies and Procedures of the department. During our on-campus visit, we met and spoke with Dean Thomas Sauer and Associate Dean Harriet Hudson of the College of Arts and Sciences, English Chairperson Robert Perrin, and with faculty members and chairs of the major department committees—Graduate, Recruitment and Retention, Creative Writing, Composition, Undergraduate, Schick, and Personnel and Policy. We also met with pre-tenure faculty members, undergraduate and graduate students, support staff, and adjunct faculty members.

From our review of the written materials—the heart of which is the Self-Study Report, Fall 2009—and our interviews, we believe that the self-study is an accurate representation and assessment of the department. On the whole, we are impressed by the high-levels of professionalism, dedication and loyalty to the department among all faculty members we interviewed, the thoughtfulness about the department and about ISU students prevalent among faculty members with whom we spoke, and the evident intellectual energy in the department. The changes in department policies and procedures that have taken place and the ongoing review process initiated over the past two years strike us as having helped to reinvigorate the department. We also believe that the department is under capable, adept, and imaginative leadership by the chairperson and the program directors as the department anticipates revision of its undergraduate and graduate curricula to meet the challenges of improving and maintaining the quality of its programs in literature, writing, English Education, and general education (soon to become Foundational Studies).

We organize our report in three sections:

    I.   Curriculum:
          a. Undergraduate Programs
          b. Graduate Studies in English
    II.   Faculty: Staffing and Resources
    III.   Recommendations for Strategic Planning: a coherent vision for the department
          a. Anticipating and meeting needs
          b. The Scholar-Mentor Model

I. Curriculum

Undergraduate Programs

The Undergraduate Degree Programs consist of majors in English (Liberal Arts) and English Teaching and Certification. It also offers minor programs in English and Creative Writing. We will not rehearse the description of the undergraduate programs in English. These are well detailed in the Self-Study Report, Creative Writing at Indiana State University, Literature and Language at Indiana State University, Writing at Indiana State University, and the English Department's Policies and Procedures. However, we make special note of the revisions of the major the department has undertaken over the past years after extensive comparisons with and studies of programs at peer institutions. We applaud these efforts to create better coherence and clarity in the programs. And because the revisions affect equally both Liberal Arts and English Teaching degrees, we will hereafter simply refer to both in the singular, as major and/or program.

The revision of 200-level courses in American and English major authors to survey courses in American and British Literature, both courses offered two semesters each, will bring breadth of study to the major and provide the "foundational coverage" that the department finds important. It is especially key, we think, that these courses not become part of the General Education curriculum so as to avoid the mixed student audience of majors and non-majors this designation would create and the difficulty encountered when determining just who is the audience and what level of instruction should ensue. (This difficulty, of course, is already being encountered in a number of lower- and upper-division courses in literature and writing—an issue we address below.) This revision will also allow upper-division courses to focus with a greater sense of purpose on depth of learning and instruction in ways that they could not in the old major.

The question of the efficacy of survey courses is one that departments and programs across the country have debated for years, but in the case of ISU's English Department, we feel this revision will be a benefit because (1) they are pre-requisites to upper-division courses, and (2) teachers of 400-level courses will have a better sense of what their students should know and have studied, and they can plan their classes accordingly. Focus and coherence of the program are gained by this stepped program of, first, historical, periodic, and representative coverage and breadth, followed second by more intensity and depth of study in literature and writing.

The elimination of the five "Literature and Culture" courses streamlines the curriculum by removing repetition of course offerings, and unless there is demand for them, we would also recommend that the Seminar in British Literature and Culture Before 1800, the Seminar in British Literature and Culture After 1800, and the Seminar in American Literature and Culture be eliminated, or perhaps, that the three be consolidated into one course offering, Seminar in Literature and Culture, at the 400-level that would alternate

between British and American subjects. This latter alternative would still provide the opportunity for specialized study.

The Self-Study reports—and we learned in our meeting with the Undergraduate Studies Committee—that there is, however, still too much overlap in terms of content and period in elective offerings. We concur with this appraisal and encourage the department in its plan to address these issues in the coming year. It is evident that amalgamation of content in fewer but still focused offerings is possible.

Concerning overlap, it is also clear that the department has concerns about the large number of courses that can also be used to fulfill General Education requirements. And we note that this concern will no doubt continue to be the case as the university revises its general education curriculum and institutes the Foundational Studies program that will replace it. The Self-Study Report states that the department "spoke strongly in favor of retaining the level of instruction in writing and literature" for Foundational Studies. However, as we look at the steps already taken to revise the focus, clarity, and coherence of the English major and minor programs, we encourage the department to reconsider this decision.

Let us say first that this is not to understate or minimize the enormous contribution that the department and its faculty make to general education at ISU, for which the university must be grateful. Rather, the major problem is the evident success of the English contributions to the general education curriculum. The demand and need for the many sections of freshman writing will continue, and the responsibility for teaching these courses so well is in itself a huge contribution. However, a continuing demand for multiple sections in more advanced Foundational Studies in literature, composition, creative writing, and technical writing promises a strain upon the English major and minor programs, especially as revised. This demand then influences the number of courses that can be offered for English majors and minors under the new revisions. At present, the department, with limited resources, appears to be doing a good job of balancing these two demands. But in future discussion, the department will have to re-evaluate the allocation of faculty in Foundational Studies courses relative to major and minor offerings in the department. Another important reason for this recommendation to reconsider has been noted in the Self-Study Report (and mentioned above concerning revision of the undergraduate programs): major courses that also can be used to fulfill general education requirements have a way of making study and learning difficult for both majors and non-majors and of making preparation and instruction problematic for teachers. Finally, the efforts to revise the undergraduate programs to provide focus, clarity, and coherence go hand-in-hand with the goals of helping majors and minors understand the integration of literature and language, reading and writing, and of meeting students' needs in terms of suitable course offerings—and all this, in turn, is a key contributing factor to retention of majors and minors.

In regard to recruitment and retention of undergraduate majors and minors, we applaud the latest efforts of the Recruitment and Retention Committee and their targeted letter to prospective freshman English majors that yielded a 28% success rate (34 of 120 students

contacted). Thirty-four freshman English majors constitute a sizeable 23% of the majors in the program. We agree with the committee's assessment that the "best recruitment tool is our teaching staff," and we suspect that the many sections and variations of "Literature and Life" contribute to that success. This may be a course offering that the department wishes to remain a part of Foundational Studies. Because recruitment and retention is likely to remain an ongoing issue for English Departments in general and for ISU specifically, we encourage the department to explore new and inventive methods that involve both students and faculty. In our discussion with undergraduate (and graduate) students, we found that student interest in student organizations and involvement outside the classroom was very low, even though they were happy with the "scholarly, academic community" created in the English Department. If their primary sense of community is gained from being together in the classroom, then having majors and minors take more of their classes with more majors and minors could well be a crucial strategy in retention, a point which refers back to the problematic issue of the number of English electives designated as Foundational Studies.

Graduate Studies in English

The overall structure of the two-year graduate program leading to the Master of Arts in English is solid, as the Self-Study Report states and our interviews with the Graduate Studies Committee affirm. Choosing a "specialization" either in writing or literature, MA candidates take a five-course "core curriculum" in research methodology, literary theory, American literature, and British literature; eleven semester hours of "open electives"; and a "culminating experience" of a thesis, or a Master's paper, or a creative project.

Traditionally, a Master of Arts degree in English is not ordinarily a specialized research degree. In this conventional sense, for many students, it can be a capstone experience to—or simply the wish to extend—the study of literature, language, and writing they began as undergraduates. For others, it serves as a springboard to doctoral study, and for still others, a way to increase their expertise in secondary school teaching. These somewhat different purposes have perhaps always been best served by a curriculum that allows and expects students to acquire a broad base of literary study. ISU's Graduate Program in English, at present, allows for this broad-based background in both areas.

However, what distinguishes the program, or what constitutes its vision, is not a question we could answer in our review of the written materials or in our discussions with faculty and students. For this reason, we concur with the Self-Study Report and members of the Graduate Committee that a reevaluation of the program is past due. This is a good program that can and should be made stronger, more cohesive, and more attuned to the professional and career goals of students enrolled or interested in the program.

As we learned from our review and interviews, it is, as one faculty member put it, "difficult to construct a distinctive identity for the graduate program." And this for us is not only an admirably sincere, direct, and candid observation, but also a spot-on assessment. We note too that the ISU English Department is not alone in this difficulty.

English Departments across the nation that offer the MA as their highest graduate degree are reassessing the identity and purpose of their programs. There is a growing trend by students to regard the MA as a terminal degree. These students want to work in professional writing, in corporations and NGOs, in editing and marketing, in public relations, and other non-academic careers. But many students also want to teach at the community or junior college level for which an MA is the necessary degree. High school teachers enroll in order to maintain their teaching certification and to gain experience that lead to promotions and higher salaries. In addition to these students, there are still those who will use the experience of the MA as the first step toward doctoral study or some professional school.

However, in the specific case of this program, such speculation can only remain speculative until the department has a better idea of what goals their students—enrolled or prospective—have for their MA in English *and* what careers their students have chosen after graduation. The overall framework for a very good MA program already exists; its identity and its distinctiveness remain to be determined.

Signs of a need for focus and coherence in the graduate program are also evident in issues of recruitment, in an apparently tenuous relationship with the ISU Graduate School, in a lack of coordination with the Alumni Office in tracking and communicating with graduates, in resources for graduate students, and in demands upon graduate assistants.

In addition to consideration of the academic requirements of the program, there are several other avenues that the department might explore to develop the process of re-examining the program:
- Reconsideration of the teaching load graduate assistants must carry. We agree with those we talked to that a course load of two sections of writing courses per semester is too much. Both education and instruction have to suffer under these circumstances.
- Concerted effort to increase the GA stipend, which at $7000 a year is very low, and is especially so given the 2/2 teaching load. The core of the successful recruitment of promising candidates is the ability to offer adequate funding.
- Pursuit of external funding for assistantships in partnerships with external agencies and community colleges.
- Development of an alumni newsletter to create better and continuing communication with graduates. In addition to creating ties among alumni and faculty, the newsletter can create interest in the Department's program and its ongoing revision, maintain good will, and become an understated foundation for encouraging planned giving for those interested in doing so. The increased interest in departmental proceedings will encourage feedback from alumni for purposes of assessment, in addition to generating a growing network of contacts for students (graduate and undergraduate), faculty, and English alumni themselves, all joined by a common interest in English and its programs.
- Addition of a Professional Writing "specialization" to the graduate program.
- Consistency in the culminating experiences for graduate students. It is unclear just how and why the Thesis, the Master's Paper, and the Creative Project operate

within the program and how the latter two projects function outside of the purview of the Graduate School and still result in a Master of Arts in English.

- Consideration of revising the present course of study and teaching for graduate assistants. Build upon the already excellent training GAs receive in ENG 685, Seminar in Teaching English. Perhaps in the first semester GAs could take this required course in writing pedagogy and in the second semester be mentored in the writing classroom by a faculty member. During the second year, GAs who are approved to teach could teach on their own, under what is now the current system of supervision.
- Creation of stronger ties—academic, institutional, and with increased resources— with the Writing Center. GA appointments in the first year could be comprised of tutoring and consulting, which along with their study in writing pedagogy and involvement in a mentoring system would enhance their training.

Of course, we note that one of the key considerations in the re-examination of the graduate program in English will be a determination of the balance of resources and staffing between the undergraduate program and the graduate program.

II. Faculty: Staffing and Resources

Given the current state of teaching, research, and service within the department, we feel it is necessary to address current and future staffing needs.

The Self-Study Report states—in Section III, "Faculty"—that in Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 the ratio of tenure-line to adjunct (mostly part-time) faculty was 56% to 44%. This ratio puts the number of adjunct faculty, whether part- or full-time, well beyond the high end of national trends in adjunct hiring. As the Report further indicates, adjuncts teach from one to four classes in a semester and they "teach a sizeable proportion of our classes," primarily General Education writing classes. Ratios, however, no matter how remarkable or discouraging, can tell only part of the story in this case, especially when considering a program's common purpose, its integration and coherence, and its ongoing maintenance and progress. Tenure-line faculty members are crucial for the effective development and ongoing improvement of a program, both in the short- and long-term, and it is programmatically unwise to expect adjunct faculty to be able to take a strong hand in such development. This places the responsibility squarely on the shoulders of tenure-line faculty. In addition, adjunct faculty teach 40% of the sections offered by the department which, remarkably, is just about the same percentage that tenure-line faculty teach (the remaining percentage taught by graduate assistants). Tenure-line faculty teach fewer and fewer General Education writing courses. Any way one looks at it, in terms of actual staff *and* in terms of the wealth of contributions English faculty make to university and department programs, the number of tenure-line appointments in English needs to grow and deserves to grow. The continuing dependence on adjunct appointments only addresses a small part of the much larger question of how best to move the department and university forward and in many ways results in much more enduring and hard-to-remedy long-range problems, which the department is now evidently experiencing. We concur, then, with the observations made by many faculty members, directors, and the

chairperson that the department needs to increase the number of tenure-line appointments for the department, and we believe the priority in future hiring should be on tenure-line appointments. In addition, we believe that current adjunct faculty members who have the appropriate training and credentials should be invited to apply for these positions.

In our meeting with adjunct faculty, we found a group of dedicated, committed, energetic teachers who feel "valued" by their chair and faculty colleagues, but live by semester-to-semester contracts. Clearly and with no bitterness, they described their frustrations, most having to do with salaries, tentative expectations of being re-hired, loss of benefits, and "living in limbo" from semester to semester. Most teach lower-division courses in General Education writing and literature, but we were surprised to find some who taught upper-division courses in advanced composition and technical writing. According to figures supplied in the Self-Study Report, under the very best conditions—that is, teaching four courses per semester for two semesters—the average nine-month salary amounts to only $15,588: a low number that sadly speaks for itself. The university's pay scale and credit hour rate produces, no doubt, wide fluctuations in actual salaries to individual adjuncts. The fact is that these salaries would make it very difficult to consolidate enough funding for a tenure-line hire, but this is a strategy worth considering. We would recommend, at least, that in the short term, adjunct hiring be made full-time and entail a nine-month contract where possible. Moreover, while increasing the percentage of tenure-track faculty within the Department is salutary, the fact remains that adjunct faculty will probably remain a significant constituency within the Department, whose contributions must be valued and whose welfare must be maintained.

We would also recommend to the department the 1997 AAUP *Statement from the Conference on the Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty* and the 1999 *Report by the ADE Ad Hoc Committee on Staffing*. The assignment of more tenure-line faculty to first-year writing courses is an effective way to emphasize the integration of writing and literature within its undergraduate curriculum; it will also serve as an effective means of recruiting into the major.

The valuable contributions of the tenure-line members of the English Department to other college and university programs must be recognized by the university when making decisions about funding for faculty positions. Part of a measurement of faculty productivity should be a consideration of the large role that the department plays in Foundational Studies or general education. The extensive first-year writing program alone entails a need for administrative energies from the Director of Composition and the Chair of the department unparalleled in any other department in the college.

Recruitment of new tenure-track faculty could be expected to infuse the department with additional intellectual currency in the discipline of English Studies. Such an expectation was affirmed by our lunch and interview with five pre-tenure faculty members. During our time with them, it was clear that they brought a willingness to serve fully, a desire to do their best for students in the classroom, and an aspiration to continue to do engaging research and creative work. We urge the department to reinstitute, or breath life back into, a system of formal, structured faculty-mentoring for probationary faculty. This is an

observation we heard several times during our two-day review. Mentoring all probationary faculty should not devolve upon an already overworked chairperson.

III. Recommendations for Strategic Planning

To pull these recommendations into a coherent whole to bring to the ISU strategic planning process, we note that the strong components of the Department of English are a tremendous asset. The potential for creating a strong coherent program from the disparate elements is equally strong, and we would recommend that be your focus for the strategic planning process next spring. Specific recommendations in Sections I and II can and should be brought into the larger coherent vision for the department. Extending the positive collaborative process begun with your self-study will assuredly enable you to create a common vision. A coherent vision for the department should forge necessary links between undergraduate and graduate programs so that the full power of the department is seen to address individual student needs as well as the needs of the surrounding area. To maintain the good professional relationships between tenure-line and adjunct faculty, the vision should ideally encompass the roles that adjunct faculty play and will most likely continue to play in the department.

Two ways to envision such a coherent program emerged from our meetings, one in terms of the department's ability to anticipate and meet the needs of current students and of ISU's service area and the other in terms of how the department functions. The two are interdependent, but it may be useful in the strategic planning process to consider them separately.

<u>Anticipating and meeting needs</u>

Anticipating and meeting the needs of students, both undergraduate and graduate, may well depend upon strategic assessment of the needs of business and education in the surrounding area and a frame of mind to turn concerns into opportunities. We've mentioned above some means for conducting such assessment, but the department collectively already has considerable knowledge to build on. One significant opportunity is nascent in observations made above about the need for focus and coherence in the graduate program; a second lies in curricular offerings that could span undergraduate and graduate programs.

Anticipating Needs—Contributing Factors

- Many of your graduate students are location-bound.
- Many of your undergraduates matriculate in your graduate program; some continue in the ISU doctoral education program.
- Of your 11 graduate students currently on assistantship, all are TAs teaching 2 classes per semester for the two years of the MA program.
- TA preparation for teaching consists of a two-day orientation before the Fall Semester; a single class (ENG 685) taken concurrently with the first semester of teaching (ENG 101); 3 observations the first semester and 2 the second; and paper

grading review fall (3 sets) and spring (2 sets). The last three sessions of ENG 685 are devoted to preparation for teaching ENG 105 in the spring.

- Teacher training carries elective credit. [We wonder: does this reflect the departmental value placed on preparing grad students to teach their discipline? Or is this a pragmatic issue because only TAs may participate in teacher training?]
- A significantly large number of your MAs teach at Ivy Tech or at ISU as adjuncts; few go on to MFA or Ph.D. programs.
- Of the 20 adjuncts, most have taught as TAs at ISU.
- ISU English has 400 FTEs in the prison.
- Ivy Tech is competing with ISU for students

Need for Pedagogical Emphasis

These factors together suggest the need for a strong pedagogical emphasis in your graduate program, whether students are interested in teaching literature, writing, or creative writing.

The teaching load in the current TA training model is excessive for inexperienced teachers upon whom rest not only instructional responsibilities but also a significant public relations role in retaining undergraduate students.   More intensive preparation for a semester before TAs teach their own classes would improve the quality of teaching and learning in their first classes, arguably contribute to improved retention, and demonstrate that teaching is valued by the Department and the University.   Such an argument would certainly be in keeping with ISU's legacy.

As an example of such intensive preparation, the Ball State English Graduate Program requires that new TAs participate in an intensive, immersive set of teaching-learning experiences their first semester (fall); successful completion of that program permits them to begin teaching their own two sections in the BSU Writing Program in the spring. The TA obligation is 6 hours each term. The fall TA requirement includes two courses, ID 601, Teacher Preparation, and ENG 605, Teaching in English Studies (composition pedagogy theory), as well as placement with a veteran mentor teacher in the Writing Program. For a course portfolio in ID 601, students develop a Teaching Philosophy as well as a rationale and a syllabus for the first of the required Writing Program classes, review several rhetoric/reader texts, and write a final reflective essay integrating their inquiry and practice in a current statement of their pedagogical awareness. In addition, they demonstrate teaching for peers, critique one another, and participate at least weekly in an extensive online discussion of class readings and their own focused inquiry.

Key to success of the intensive TA program is the mentoring by veteran Writing Program faculty. In addition to regularly attending and observing the mentor's writing class and responding to 2-3 sets of student papers for discussion with the mentor, the TA prepares and teaches one unit during the fall term. The mentor provides close observation and coaching throughout the unit, and the ID 601 professor (most often the Writing Program Director) provides another perspective through one observation during the unit. In the spring the mentor observes and coaches the TA as well as reviewing the TA's responses

to student work. The year-long structured mentoring relationship most often continues informally for the remainder of the student's time in graduate school, modeling a valuable professional relationship.

For a two-year MA program, TAs would teach six rather than eight classes, but such a model would recognize that teaching writing is more than service in exchange for an assistantship. It would recognize TAs' dual roles as student and teacher and the faculty responsibility to mentor them into the profession. Implementing such a distributed mentoring model that draws on the expertise of those in the classrooms TAs would enter will require confronting squarely not only the roles adjuncts play in the department but the issues of adjunct contracts and salaries. Fortunately, strategic planning recognizes long term vision and goals that can be implemented in stages.

Need for Professional Writing and Technology

The factors also suggest that the concentration of ISU graduates in the area calls for greater options than are clearly available now, particularly those that build on your emphasis in writing.

Professional and technical writing, certainly on the spectrum with creative writing, could flesh out the writing options at both the undergrad and graduate level and attract majors (and minors to complement other majors) and graduate students with defined goals that do not include teaching. The department could make a strong case for one or perhaps two tenure-line positions in professional or technical writing, building that option over the next several years as part of a coherent vision for the strategic plan. The first tenure-line position should carry with it the commitment from the department and ISU to provide the necessary digital resources; it may be prudent as well to offer that first hire a share in the decision-making about those resources.

As a department, acting collaboratively on such opportunities may allow you to shape further needs while providing the bonds for a coherent vision for the department. To seize those opportunities, the department may want to consider how programs—and the people involved—intersect and interact. We recommend an intentional implementation of a scholar-mentor model as a central component of a coherent vision.

The Scholar-Mentor Model

A graduate program exists at the nexus of academic roles of learning and teaching. As such it provides opportunity to make visible the mentoring relationships through which young scholars are mentored into their professions. The TA training program outlined above works through a scholar-mentor model. But full implementation of such a model would make visible each of the following:

- Senior faculty mentor new faculty
- Graduate faculty teach/model for/mentor graduate students

- Writing program faculty model for/mentor graduate students, teach undergraduates
- Undergrad faculty model for/mentor graduate students, teach undergraduates
- Graduate students teach undergraduates, serve as models, occasionally as mentors

With the exception of the first relationship identified in the mentoring relationships above, the groups of faculty and students are generally associated with programs that identify curriculum and expectations for growth in knowledge and skills. Currently the TA requirements involve the graduate program (only insofar as TAs need teaching assignments), the writing program, and General Education/Foundational Studies. Programs that could be more fully involved and integrated into a coherent vision with the scholar-mentor model include the graduate program, undergraduate majors, the writing program, the Writing Center, and the Schick Lectures. In meetings with the Graduate, Composition, and Schick Committees and graduate students, we learned about various opportunities that had been made available to graduate students in the past with the Schick Committee, the Writing Center, and various research opportunities. Even in limited numbers, such graduate assistantships could expand the options for mentored experiences that would help meet the diverse needs of those seeking MAs in the department. Additional options could emerge with an emphasis in Professional Writing, including the development of internships on and off-campus.

Invisible in the scholar-mentor model are the distinctions between tenure-line faculty, adjunct faculty, and graduate students, distinctions that can belie the apparent growth model. The ratio of adjunct to tenure-line faculty in the Department (44% to 56%) and the high percentage of classes adjuncts teach further emphasize the need to include them in the strategic planning process and in the department's vision. If and as those ratios change, there should be no surprises. But more importantly, since adjunct faculty are integral to the department's ability to offer its programs, they should be integral as well to a program-defined scholar-mentor model. Their wisdom and experience can make them valuable mentors to the TAs as they take on new roles in the classroom. Further, they may provide valuable perspectives on the current MA program and its potential.

Conclusion

The professionalism, dedication, thoughtfulness, and intellectual energy we found among faculty, staff, and students during our visit strongly suggest that through collaborative effort the department will meet the challenges they've set for themselves in revising the undergraduate curriculum and that they will bring the same energy to review of the graduate curriculum to create a coherent vision for the department. The significant work leading to changes in department policies and procedures has already laid the foundation on which to build a vibrant future.