

UWG Comprehensive Program Review - Template

College/School	Arts and Humanities	Year			2012-2013
Department	English and Philosophy				
Academic Program	English, Undergraduate B.A.				
Program Level	Undergraduate				
Students (From IRP)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Graduates Last Five Years	31	35	27	36	36
Majors Last Five Years	206	249	270	301	309
Pre-majors Last Five Years	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

1) Learning Outcomes: In the boxes below, please provide the following information: A) academic program learning outcomes B) a data summary of student performance related to the learning outcomes for this program; (include a link to data tables from which this summary was created, if applicable); C) a summary of the curriculum, pedagogical, and assessment modifications that resulted from this performance data and 4) a discussion of future assessment plans.

A) Program Learning Outcomes

Mission Statement

The Department of English and Philosophy offers a strong and diversified program of courses and degree programs; provides support at all levels for departments, colleges, and programs campus-wide; and serves the community and the region.

The English and Philosophy faculty are committed to the following principles:

Educating students at all levels to be literate, linguistically proficient individuals with a firm grounding in the cultural and critical contexts of Western thought;

Equipping students at all levels with the critical thinking and communication skills--both written and oral--that will allow them to pursue careers in a variety of professions, such as teaching, law, business, editing and publishing, writing, and research;

Offering a variety of writing-intensive, discussion-oriented classes that encourage active student participation and that incorporate current applications of technology;

Excellence in teaching at all curricular levels;

Integrating teaching and research, and actively recruiting students to participate in research and learning at the undergraduate and graduate levels; and

Contributing to the local community and to the region at large by offering public service through the service of its professional faculty and through academic and cultural programs that are open to the university and the general public.

Definition of Discipline and Major Field

The Department of English seeks to educate students to be literate, linguistically proficient individuals with a firm grounding in the cultural and critical contexts of Western thought. The major in English implies that human experience

can be effectively understood, appreciated, and communicated through the written word. It furthermore recognizes that humankind knows and learns through aesthetic cognition as well as through intellectual analysis. Undergraduates in this discipline thus study the English language and its historically produced canons of literature in order to learn about themselves and to become more aware of the human condition.

Learning Outcomes of the Major Program

Overview: The English major should acquire a reasonably broad knowledge of Western literature, focused skills in written expression, a technical understanding of the English language, an ability based on critical theory to analyze literary works, facility in research procedures, an awareness of how literature contributes to the shaping of cultural history, and finally the self-knowledge and intellectual curiosity that characterize liberally educated persons. Ultimately the English major, having developed in all these areas, should be able to exercise the perspicacity and balanced judgment required of an informed citizen-scholar.

Students are expected to master the methods employed in the field of English studies, as measured initially in ENGL 3000 (Research and Methods) and at the completion of their course of study in ENGL 4384 (Senior Seminar), a course that requires students to demonstrate advanced writing skills (including peer editing and multiple stages of preparation) and apply current theoretical and practical issues in the critical analysis of literary texts.

Students are expected to achieve competence in knowledge of the content areas that are covered by a representative range of course offerings of the Department, as measured by course assessments, the Senior Seminar, and post-baccalaureate surveys and standardized examinations.

Students will demonstrate in both oral and written work a discipline-specific critical facility through convincing and well-supported analysis of related material.

Students will demonstrate their command of academic English and the tenets of sound composition by means of thesis-driven analytical prose.

Students will become conversant with representative literary texts and selected critical issues in literary history that allow for integration of the aims of the discipline.

Expected Results of the Program (Learning Outcomes)

Students will demonstrate that they:

I. Are adept writers in command of standard written English and of options for effectively presenting ideas and evidence.

The student should be able to use and respond to complex structures of discursive prose.

The student should demonstrate fluency in a grammatically accurate and rhetorically engaging style of writing.

The student should conceive, arrange, and articulate ideas logically and clearly.

II. Are familiar with the characteristics and development of the major literary genres.

The student should be able to identify the formal elements of fiction, poetry, and drama.

The student should have a broad understanding of how these genres changed and evolved over time.

III. Are conversant with the content and defining traits of representative literary periods.

The student should be acquainted with the most influential British and American writers and their major works.

The student should be able to enumerate seminal features of the periods comprising Anglo-American literary history.

IV. Are aware of prevailing theories, approaches, and practices related to the study of literature and language.

The student should demonstrate knowledge of the practice of literary criticism, both procedurally and substantively, in analyzing literary works.

The student should be able to differentiate such critical methodologies as are employed by formalist, psychoanalytic, archetypal, and poststructuralist readers.

V. Are capable of critical thinking that takes into account the variety of human experience and significant differences among cultural value systems.

The student should understand how culture is a variable matrix in the production of literary texts.

The student should be able to recognize how literature inscribes and often challenges cultural ideologies and myths.

The student should be acquainted with the contributions of writers outside the British and American canons.

VI. Can convincingly analyze, interpret, and explicate literary texts in light of pertinent critical assumptions.

The student should be capable of conducting independent research on a literary topic.

The student should be able to synthesize the results of such research in a correctly documented paper written in accordance with current professional standards.

VII. Can relate the facts and ideas of the discipline to other fields and explore their correspondence, particularly within the context of Western intellectual history.

The student should be acquainted with the relationships between literature and other expressions of culture, such as art, music, philosophy, and religion.

The student should understand the points of congruence and complementarity between literature and other disciplines within the humanities and sciences.

B) Data Summary

Method:

Quantitative Assessment of Learning Outcomes: The capstone project in the English department's Senior Seminar (ENGL 4384) currently acts as the major, cumulative assessment of the English program. All English majors—both English literature and English Education tracks--matriculate in the course after completing at least 18 of the requisite 30 hours of upper-division English classes. Each seminar—organized around a major theoretical or critical issue--is capped at 12 students to create a seminar environment and to enable professors to work closely with each student during the first eight weeks in which s/he stages the course topic and critical contexts and the subsequent eight weeks in which students research and write the final paper, all of which are peer-edited and published in a course anthology. All of these anthologies, dating back to the inception of the senior seminar in 1996, are archived in the department library. Each section of the senior seminar is organized around a unique topic, and the English department offers two or three sections per semester during the regular academic year.

The assessment data summarized below stems from two years of data or nine (9) sections of ENGL 4584. While data from the senior seminar goes back much further, we selected this two year period because of significant changes that we made to our assessment of the senior seminar beginning at that time. These changes included revisions made to the rubric used to assess the senior seminar essays (so that it is linked to the department learning outcomes above and to SACS learning outcomes) and the development of an extensive online student survey of the English program, which all students enrolled in ENGL 4384 are required to take. These artifacts are included in the Appendix to this Program Review.

The rubric used to assess the senior seminar essays is based on six major areas, which are keyed to the department's learning outcomes (above). The areas are 1) Thesis and Argument (Outcome I); 2) Organization (Outcome I); 3) Language (Outcome I); 4) Comprehending, Synthesizing, and Evaluating Literary Periods and Genres (Outcome II, III); 5) Understanding and Applying Cultural and Interdisciplinary Contexts (Outcome V, VII); and 6) Comprehension and Application of Critical Technique and Perspective (Outcome IV, VI). Each essay is evaluated by two readers (neither is the course instructor) and is given a score in each area (4 = Exemplary; 3 = Proficient; 2 = Proficient; 1 = Developing; and 0 = Unacceptable). A total, cumulative score is give as well. It is from a rich data field of 84 essays and just as many student surveys that the department derives its assessment data. A summary and a cumulative assessment of the data is included in the Appendix to this Program Review.

Quantitative Summary:

Overall, 72 students out of a total of 84 met the program's expectations of an essay score (at or above 12 points). The cumulative analysis of scores in each area for each essay is included in the Appendix, but the overall averages for each area are as follows:

Learning Outcome	Average	Level
Thesis & Argument (Learning Outcome I)	2.64	Proficient
Organization (Learning Outcome I)	2.68	Proficient
Language (Learning Outcome I)	2.66	Proficient

Literary Period and Genre (Learning Outcomes II, III)	2.67	Proficient
Cultural and Interdisciplinary Contexts (Learning Outcomes V, VII)	2.84	Proficient
Critical Technique & Perspective (Learning Outcomes IV, VI)	2.57	Proficient

Qualitative Assessment of Program: In addition to the quantitative assessment of student skills linked to the learning outcomes that are reflected in the data above, the department requires all students enrolled in the capstone seminar (ENGL 4384) to complete a survey of the program that is keyed to the department’s learning outcomes and to goals outlined in the University’s Strategic Plan. This survey allows students as they finish the program to assess what they have learned, to provide concrete statements regarding the program’s strengths and weaknesses, and to offer suggestions for improvement. The assessment includes both quantitative data (students provide numerical ratings in response to specific questions) and qualitative commentary. The overall quantitative results of the survey based on 97 student respondents is below:

ENGL 4383 English Capstone Senior Seminar Survey Questions	5 (Strongly Agree)	4 (Agree)	3 (No Opinion)	2 (Disagree)	1 (Strongly Disagree)	0 (Not Applicable)
1. The English program taught me how to think more independently and critically (liberal education).	71	24	1	1		
2. The English program has given me opportunities for experiential learning, such as conference presentations, workshops, and other collaborative, participatory activities in the classroom.	52	39	3	3		
3. The English program has given me opportunities to develop my professional skills.	29	57	5	5	1	
4. My coursework in the program effectively engaged me with the material and its connection to larger social issues. (ethical and civic awareness)	47	40	4	4	2	
5. My coursework in the program was relevant to my professional goals.	43	41	9	3		1
6. The English program gave me opportunities to be involved in activities outside the classroom,	42	45	6	4		

such as Sigma Tau Delta events, the Eclectic and other forms of community engagement.						
7. Whenever I met with my advisor, I was advised effectively.	38	35	13	9	2	
8. My English survey courses and Practical Criticism (ENGL 2110, 2120, 2130, 2180, 2190, 2300/3000) prepared me well for work in my upper division courses.	40	44	4	7		2
9. My courses in the English program complemented courses in other disciplines.	31	45	12	6	1	2
10. My writing skills improved as a direct result of my coursework in the program.	67	28	1	1		
11. The English program had high expectations of my writing.	64	27	6			
12. The English program had clear and consistent expectations of my writing.	37	42	6	11	1	
13. Overall, I am satisfied with my experience in the English program.	57	36	2	1	1	
14. The English program met my expectations.	48	43	4	1	1	
Senior Seminar Questions**						
17. Senior Seminar worked well to conclude my learning experiences in the major.	51	37	4	4	1	
18. This particular Senior Seminar has allowed me to expand on my learning as a writer in the English program.	57	32	3	4	1	
19. I learned a lot from the reading and writing assignments in this Senior Seminar.	47	43	3	4		
20. The reading and writing assignments in this Senior Seminar enabled me to challenge myself.	64	29	3	1		
21. The class sessions in the Senior Seminar were well-organized.	46	37	4	6	2	2
22. The class sessions in this Senior Seminar were engaging.	61	31	3	2		

23. Overall, I feel that the structure and organization of this Senior Seminar was effective.	48	41	4	2	2	
24. This Senior Seminar has allowed me to use and expand on what I learned about literature in the English program.	51	37	4	3	2	
*97 out of 101 students who received a grade (A-F) in the course completed the survey.						
**Questions 15, 16, 25, & 26 are qualitative.						

In response to program specific questions, the results above indicate that a significant majority of students in response to each statement responded with either “strongly agree” or “agree” in every area. In aggregate response to either “strongly agree” or “agree,” students responded to program specific questions in the 73-79% range to three questions (#7, 9, and 12); in the 84-87% range to 5 questions (#3, 4, 5, 6, and 8,); and in the 91-95% range to six questions (#1, 2, 10, 11, 13, and 14).

C) Summary of modifications based on the data

Overall, we believe the quantitative and qualitative assessment measures above reveal that the program continues to be successful in teaching specific skills associated with disciplinary content (literary history, genre, cultural contexts, theoretical applications, and methods) and with writing within the discipline. The program is also successful with equipping students with a broad range of professional skills in the areas of writing (multiple modes) critical reading, critical thinking, and cultural/textual analysis that are essential for success in many other professional fields. This success is reflected not only in the work that students produce—which we have evaluated and assessed—but also in students’ own very positive quantitative and qualitative assessment of our program. We believe that our current curricular structure is strong and does not need major revisions. Our current curriculum underwent a major restructuring less than ten years ago, and we have seen consistent improvement in the level and consistency of performance among students in our program over that time. Minor modifications to have been made to our curriculum have been made since that time based on our ongoing assessment process.

Despite this overall success, the program has identified key areas where modifications are needed as a result of our ongoing assessment work during this current cycle.

I. Assessment Process: We are pleased with both the senior seminar essays and the senior seminar surveys as integral assessment instruments. During the last assessment cycle, faculty agreed that more work is needed in how we use our assessment rubric to assess the senior seminar essays. Essays are assessed by two different faculty members (neither of which is the seminar instructor). In most instances, there was very close consistency (within 1 point) between how each faculty member assessed each major area. In a number of instances, these evaluations varied more considerably. In the future, we plan to add a third

evaluator for each essay and we plan to offer additional training to faculty (assessment norming) on how the rubric should be used to assess the essays. Additional modifications to our assessment process are outlined in the following section (Future Assessment Plans). We believe those additional assessment measures which we plan to implement strategically in the future will provide us an even stronger gauge of student learning in relationship to our learning outcomes.

II. Writing Expectations: Writing encompasses a significant portion of student assessment in the senior seminar essays and is a major element in our program learning outcomes. Overall, students in the program are proficient in meeting the program's expectations when it comes to writing. What is clear from the assessment of the senior seminar essays and students' evaluative comments from the senior seminar is that the program maintains very high standards when it comes to writing. Our most talented, dedicated students are meeting these expectations with remarkable success and with very measurable results. Other students struggle with meeting these expectations. The survey results are indicative of this. The aggregate response to question #11 ("The English program had high expectations of my writing") was 91%, but the aggregate response to question #12 ("The English program has clear and consistent expectations of my writing") was among the lowest average on the survey at 79%. Faculty realize that absolute consistency is not possible, nor may it even be desirable, since students in the program are trained to write in many different professional modes for which expectations sometimes differ. The program takes clarity and consistency of expectations seriously. It is one of the reasons why the program designed and approved a comprehensive rubric that is used to assess writing in all major level English courses. However, the program needs to create a stronger culture of consistency that moves from the rubric to mentoring and professional development workshops that will allow us to implement the expectations in the rubric in a more consistent way. More effective and consistent communication of these expectations to students in every course is another important way we will seek to modify our program to improve performance in this area.

III. Advisement: Question # 7 on the student survey asks, "Whenever I met with my advisor, I was advised effectively." Out of all of the questions on the survey, this one received the lowest aggregate rating (73%). Over the past year, the department has been discussing ways to improve its advisement process, and we have already implemented some new measures to address this concern. We acknowledge that it is an area of improvement, a significant one that can have implications for retention, progression, and graduation. Currently, all English majors are assigned to tenure-track faculty for advisement. Some first-year students who are still in the core are advised by the department's Academic Coordinator, a professional staff member, but the majority of students are advised by tenure-track faculty. We do so because we believe that these faculty are the most knowledgeable about our curriculum (recommending specific content classes, discussing what required areas are needed to complete the major, etc.) *and* are best suited to advise students about their future professional goals as well. The problem over the past several years has been that the number of tenure track faculty in our program has been drastically reduced (many have been serving administrative appointments outside the department or have been on faculty leave), which has left remaining tenure track faculty with very heavy advisement loads. The average advisement load has been over 20 students per faculty member and in some instances the average has been closer to 25. While every assigned student does not take advantage of advisement, most are required to do so to have the advisor hold removed before registration. Faculty have struggled to meet the time demands that good advisement requires, given their other obligations in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and committee service. We need to find a way to address this issue, but we are reluctant to turn advisement over completely to professional

staff outside the department. We do not have funds in our budget to hire additional advisement staff in our department. We have considered using lecturers as advisors, but their current teaching and tutoring load (they tutor every week in the University Writing Center) is so extensive that it would be difficult to shift any of these responsibilities to them. This is a resource issue the department will continue to discuss.

The program realizes, however, that it cannot wait on resources to address this issue, so we are working to implement other ways to address this student concern. One is to improve our communication with students—beyond the advisor/advisee relationship—about advisement and curricular requirements. Already we have begun to place more advisement materials online at the program’s website and send out periodic emails to students through our major listserv about advising issues and concerns. When the program learns of a specific concern, we will—if applicable—send out a general announcement to all other students, since many others will at times have the same question or concern. Every semester we publish our course listings that include course descriptions written by faculty, textbooks, requirements, and information that designates where each course counts in our major program. This spring, we are implementing group advisement meetings and workshops for students during the period before registration so that students can meet with some of our most experienced faculty advisors to ask questions. We hope these processes will improve communication.

Finally, the program needs to improve the process by which it mentors and trains faculty to become effective advisors. This includes being more proficient with using WolfWatch for advisement purposes. While periodically discuss advisement issues and questions in our program meetings, we need to develop more specific, targeted strategies for equipping faculty to become effective advisors.

D) Future Assessment Plans

While our quantitative and qualitative data connected to the Senior Seminar course provide a thick description of professor to student and peer to peer interaction and performance on the culminating course's scholarly paper component, faculty believe that creating three more formal assessments that span the English major will allow us to better and more precisely assess student learning as they progress through the major. We also feel that adding a couple of additional assessments prior to the senior seminar will allow us to test critical thinking and analytical writing skills, content knowledge in literary history, and expanding knowledge in literary criticism in formative ways prior to the final, summative data that the Senior Seminar paper provides. To that end, the English program is considering three new assessments for future program assessment. While these three new assessment measures will not necessarily be implemented all at once, the program believes these measures would strengthen our understanding of how successfully we are teaching and how successfully students are learning.

Assessment Plan I (ENGL 3000-Research and Methods): Students already compose critical essays in the English program's gateway to the major course, Research and Methods (ENGL 3000). In the future, we will view one of the critical essays that students complete after mid-term as a program assessment. This piece of analytical writing, demonstrative of our student's burgeoning abilities to closely read and interpret a text, would best occur at the end of the semester to ensure that students have had the benefit of as much professor instruction as possible before composing the work to be evaluated. Each professor teaching a section of the course will utilize the same essay assignment and rubric in keeping with course objectives in order to ensure parity in data results and equity across course sections. A formative program

entrance assessment like this will book end the summative assessment in the Senior Seminar nicely, since comparing and contrasting student entrance and exit scores can provide a snapshot of overall growth in writing and analytical skills. From larger data trends, faculty could also choose to modify or reinforce activities in one or both courses.

Assessment Plan II (Genre Studies): A second addition to the assessments in the English program will occur in the program's genre courses—ENGL 4106, 4109, and 4295. Instead of a formal paper, this assessment will take the form of an essay or paragraph question on an examination. Students will be asked how a particular text from the course exemplifies genre convention or serves as an exemplar of a particular subset of the genre studied in the course.

Assessment Plan III (ENGL 4188-Individual Authors): A third and final addition to the list of assessments in the English program, one that will measure students' depth of understanding of a particular author's influence, is an assignment in ENGL 4188, the single author course. Each major must take a single author course in Area B of the program, and each single-author professor will be asked to use a similar final project assignment and rubric in order to assess formally for data cycle results. Such a final project would illustrate students' understanding of a major artist during a particular literary or cultural movement.

The Senior Seminar project, the long, scholarly piece on which students work for eight weeks of the semester in ENGL 4384, will remain the culminating assessment of the English program. However, the current departmental rubric approved for the Senior Seminar assessment will be revised, and the aforementioned new assessments can be evaluated using new rubrics that address learning outcomes related to genre, literary history, and cultural and interdisciplinary contexts.

Once implemented, each of these four major assessments will allow for an improved understanding of student development in our degree program. For each, we will vary modes of evaluation so that students may showcase learned skills in a variety of ways. Each new assessment will possess a rubric derived from SACS outcomes and common assignment to ensure parity.

2) Program History and Context: In the box below, please write a brief (since the last CPR) history of this program at UWG (including current strengths and weaknesses)

I. History

Since the last comprehensive program review , highlights of the program’s major changes, innovations, and accomplishments include the following:

1. Transition from the former College of Arts and Sciences to the new College of Arts and Humanities.
2. A major restructuring of the undergraduate English major which included new required areas in literary history, in genre studies, and in writing and language. An introductory course in research and methods and a capstone seminar frame these required content courses.
3. The creation of an English Education track within the major. The program committed two tenure track lines to hire English faculty who are specialists in the field of English Education, developed new courses in methods, writing pedagogy, and curriculum, and revised other content area courses to meet the specific needs of students who are preparing to become teachers. English faculty supervise and mentor students during their field placements which culminate in a semester- long teaching internship in an area school. The education track has experienced tremendous growth since its inception and now includes almost 100 majors (a third of our total majors in the program). It has also revitalized the program’s connections to English teachers in the area and to local schools and has fostered innovative, cooperative programs with area schools and teachers.
4. The creation of an interdisciplinary Film Studies Minor and continued growth in the Creative Writing Minor.
5. The creation of *LURe* (Literary Undergraduate Research), a national peer-reviewed journal, dedicated to publishing undergraduate research in literary studies. The journal was a joint scholarly venture between faculty and undergraduates in our program.
6. The creation of new professional internships for selected students in our program, including internships with a regional magazine (*West Georgia Living*) and with the *New Georgia Encyclopedia Online*.

II. Strengths

1. Dedicated Teachers and Innovative Teaching. The program has been very successful in recruiting excellent teaching faculty at all levels, in supporting new course development, and in encouraging innovation in teaching practices.
2. Undergraduate Research. Faculty in the program are actively committed to mentoring and working with students both in and beyond the classroom, providing them with opportunities to produce their own creative works and scholarly research. Evidence of this includes *LURe* (cited above); the department’s annual undergraduate literary conference in which students from core and major level classes are invited to present their own papers and creative works; student presentations at national literary conferences, like *NCUR*; and student participation in campus-wide activities like *Big Night* and *Eclectic*.

III. Challenges.

1. Effective administration and management of a large, multifaceted department that includes the First-Year Writing Program (ENGL 1101 and 1102); the University Writing Center; the undergraduate literature major; the English Education track, minor programs in Creative Writing, Africana Studies, and Film Studies; and a graduate program. Securing adequate resources to meet the programmatic

needs of these different areas is a constant challenge, as is meeting the overall course/seat demands that these different programs require in order to remain viable.

2. Retention and recruitment of faculty is an annual concern that affects faculty morale and the long-term stability of the program. While compressed faculty salaries and the absence of any salary increases over several years are a major contributing factor, equally challenging in our department is the large number of temporary instructors. These instructors—most of whom teach in the core—are among our most talented and dedicated teachers, but the temporary nature of their positions creates enormous instability, particularly in our first year writing program. Last spring and summer, the department had to hire 8 new full-time instructors and several new part-time instructors. The work required to recruit, hire, train, and mentor so many new faculty every year keeps the program from focusing on other vital areas that need work and weakens the program's ability to implement consistent, quality instruction across 90+ sections of 1101 and 1102.
3. Reduction of DFW rates in ENGL 1101 and 1102. Many aspects of the First-Year Writing Program have been remarkably successful since the last CPR. We implemented the Shared Text Program that brought national, award-winning writers to campus to work with FYW students. We also implemented a common writing handbook (*The Writer's Resource*) that was customized for students in the FYW Program at UWG. However, the program continues to work on reducing the DFW rates in these courses. We see this work as vitally connected to CCG (Complete College Georgia) initiatives and to UWG's own strategic plan. Future plans associated with the FYW program are outlined in the next section.

3) Program Planning: Please write a brief narrative on the future plans for this academic program, including how these plans support the UWG strategic plan.

Based on the ongoing assessment of the program, the following plans have been developed recently or are in the process of development and implementation.

I. First Year Writing Program: Over the past year, the department has been working on changes to ENGL 1101 and 1102 in the core. The impetus behind these changes was, in part, recommendations emerging from the President's Commission on Student Retention, Progression, and Graduation (RPG) and the UWG Complete College Georgia Plan (CCG) which highlighted the need to reduce DFW rates in core classes, including ENGL 1101 and 1102. The department has taken those recommendations seriously, and both instructors and tenure-track faculty have been actively involved in the analysis of the problem and in offering concrete proposals to address it. The problem of DFW rates is a complex one that is affected by many factors, some of which are not within the scope of the program to resolve. However, the program is examining ways to restructure these courses—especially ENGL 1101—to address these concerns. The initial stages of those plans will be implemented in the fall along with new assessment measures that will allow the program to gauge more student progression through ENGL 1101 and 1102. These changes include such things as fostering more consistency in teaching and grading across large numbers of sections; work on the sequencing of assignments in the early stages of ENGL 1101; and placing more tenure-track faculty into ENGL 1101 and 1102 sections.

II. QEP Initiatives: While the SACS Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is a university-wide initiative, the English program recognizes it will have a significant role to play in its implementation. The program already has been actively involved in making recommendations that may go into the final QEP plan once it is approved, and at that stage will begin work on implementing those approved changes within the core. These plans are related to some of the work already in progress in Section I above.

III. Summer IGNITE and UWise Programs: Another strategic recommendation that emerged from the RPG Commission and that is linked also to UWG's CCG plan is the need for academically-focused summer programs that will help entering freshman students (especially those identified as potentially at risk) in making a successful transition to college. One of the key places where these student struggle is bridging the distance between writing instruction in high school and expectations for writing in college-level courses. Two of these programs—one for students in the sciences and other for students entering UWG—were implemented last summer. These programs are administered through other units on campus, but English faculty have been instrumental in the design and teaching of one of the academic courses offered in this program. The emphasis on writing instruction links the work in these programs to the plans outlined in Sections I and II above.

IV. Tenure Track Appointment in Rhetoric and Composition: This past year, the program submitted a request to hire a tenure-track appointment in Rhetoric and Composition. This position was approved and the program is currently in the process of interviewing prospective candidates for this appointment. Once hired, the program plans to begin work on developing new writing-oriented courses in the major (and in the graduate program), including additional courses on writing pedagogy. The program has discussed creating a new professional writing track or minor that would allow students to develop skills associated with writing (and the teaching of writing) in different professional settings. The program also believes that hiring a specialist in this area can assist us with the ongoing work of revising our writing courses in the core and in offering professional development training for faculty who teach writing.

4) Strategic and Financial Outcomes from the Previous Review: Please summarize any changes to the budget and staffing in this program since the last comprehensive program review

I. Personnel and Staffing:

Currently, the English program includes the following:

Faculty

17 Tenure-Track Faculty

9 Lecturers

21 Full Time Instructors

6 Part-Time Instructors, teaching 1-2 sections each semester.

English Office Staff

1 Budget and Personnel Coordinator

1 Academic Coordinator / Publications Specialist

1 Senior Secretary

2 Work Study Students

University Writing Center Staff

1 Director (faculty member)

1 Writing Center Manager

1 Part-time Front Desk Assistant

In addition to these positions, the department includes a Program Director for Philosophy, an Associate Chair for the English Program, a Graduate Program Director, and faculty coordinators for English Education and the minor programs.

Changes:

Staff—Despite growth in the number of faculty and in the number of students in our program, there have been no additions to the department’s office staff over the past five years.

Faculty—Since 2007, the number of faculty has increased from 43 full time faculty to 48. However, those increases have all come from the ranks of full-time instructors. Next year, we will see some adjustment to those numbers once when we add two new tenure track faculty members and welcome back another tenure track faculty member who has been away on administrative reassignment. This will help the department better meet course and seat demands in the major tracks, in the graduate program, and in the minor program areas. However, this will also mean a reduction in the number of full-time instructors which will affect our ability to staff enough sections in the core, even as we allocate more tenure track faculty to that area. The current number of lecturers is down from 11 last year, when two lecturers resigned their positions. Those positions have not been replaced, but the program requested those two lecturer lines plus four additional lines to create more stability in the FYW program. Without the additional lecturer lines, we will be forced to nonrenew several very talented teachers who are in temporary instructor lines. The department has resisted national trends to hire more part-time faculty and that number has remained relatively consistent over the past five years.

University Writing Center: Data shows that students from across campus regularly use the UWC to assist them with writing assignments in core-level and major courses. It is truly a *University Writing Center*. Since the last CPR, the provost’s office has allocated additional funds in support of the UWC which have certainly helped stabilize the operation this academic support unit. The COAH Dean has also been an invaluable resource in supporting the UWC, especially in the summer when additional tutors are needed. However, it often falls to the English program to supplement the budget for the UWC and to provide additional tutors. Currently, all instructors and lecturers in the program tutor three hours per week in the UWC (both fall and spring semesters). The program also allocates some of its more advanced graduate students to work as tutors as part of their GA assignments. Even with this support, however, the UWC cannot keep up with student demand for tutors, even as it offers more instructional workshops and online services to assist students. More resources are needed, just to keep up with the current demand. And this demand will likely increase if plans to implement a writing-oriented QEP are approved. Despite these challenges, the UWC continues to find ways to extend its areas of service. For the first time ever this spring, the UWC offered tutoring on the Newnan Campus at a satellite center there. The UWC is also proposing plans to expand into satellite centers across campus (if locations and resources can be found) to make opportunities for tutoring and assistance more widely available to students. The UWC Director has sent proposals for reorganization and expansion to the dean. Funding for additional tutors also needs to be located.

Administrative Structure: In 2010, the program proposed and received approval from the Provost to create an Associate Chair in English position. This appointment, which comes with a one course administrative reassignment per semester, has been vital to meeting the many administrative demands associated with such a large program.

II. Budget and Resources:

Like many departments across campus, the program suffers from inadequate resources in its operating budget, especially as it attempts to support such a large number of faculty and academic programs. The program’s resources for things like faculty travel for professional develop typically lag behind other departments on campus. At the same time, the program’s operating budget *has* increased since its last CPR. The current COAH Dean has made it a priority to strategically identify funding deficiencies in operating budgets in COAH departments, and, as a result, our program has seen an increase in our operating budget. The program is grateful for his leadership in this vital area. As the program looks ahead, however, there may be important initiatives that we will not be able to fund at current levels. Funding issues with the University Writing Center are described above. Without additional funding, we will very likely not be able to award the same number of GRAs as we have over the past two years, and this will most certainly affect our

graduate enrollment and our ability to expand tutoring opportunities in the UWC. These are the main challenges that we currently face.

Office Space: While not exclusively tied to budget, the department increasingly faces shortages in faculty office space that current locations in the TLC and Pafford cannot accommodate. The COAH Dean has been instrumental in helping us to manage these space issues by converting some underused classroom space to office spaces. These, however, are only temporary solutions, and next year we will again face a shortage of office space for full-time faculty. The larger problem is that faculty from our program are spread out over two different buildings and on different floors. This makes creating a cohesive faculty community increasingly difficult. It also adds to the strain on our budget since we have to provide additional copier equipment and other office support in multiple locations.

5) Program Quality: Please evaluate the overall quality of this academic program.

The overall quality of the program remains very high. Assessment measures attest to the high level at which students achieve the program's learning outcomes; student evaluations and other evaluative measures attest to excellent teaching and innovative instruction; student surveys from the capstone seminar reveal that students very satisfied with the quality of the major and the professional training and preparation it provides; the high frequency of undergraduate research reveals that students are applying what they learn to professional settings beyond the classroom. Faculty are very productive as scholars, and their professional work supports and enhances the program's dual emphasis on excellence in teaching and on undergraduate research.

6) Program Viability: Please discuss the long term viability of this program

Given the current number of majors in the program and the consistent pattern of growth in the major over the past five years, we believe the major program remains very viable from an enrollment perspective. Last year, for the first time ever, our program was listed among the top five largest enrolled majors on campus. While these enrollment increases are only one sign of viability, they do cut against many reports of national trends that show declines in the number of majors in the arts and humanities. We believe this speaks to the remarkable strengths of our program—our talented and actively engaged teaching faculty and our vibrant offering of engaging courses and academic/social enrichment programs—that make our department a home and a valuable professional resource for many students. Even beyond our own majors, students from a variety of major and minors from across campus take courses in our program; even more, faculty in our program provide courses that are required for a number of other majors and minors, including Computer Science, Education, Mass Communications, Film Studies, Creative Writing, Africana Studies, Global Studies, Gender Studies, and Women’s Studies.

The creation within the last ten years of an English Education track within the major program has further enhanced the long term viability of the program, since increasing the number of teachers *and* improving the quality of teacher education have been important mandates at the state and national level. The number of students in our English Education program has grown dramatically over the past five years and now is close to 100, roughly a third of our total majors. The growth of English Education has energized our department; it has led to the development of new courses—like “Shakespeare for Teachers”—and has prompted faculty to become more engaged in discussions about the art of teaching at all curricular levels.

Perhaps most importantly, the program continues to make vital, significant contributions to the university through its multiple offerings in the core curriculum, especially ENGL 1101 and 1102, which form the basis of students’ first- and second-year experiences here at UWG. Every semester English faculty teach over 100 sections of courses in the core. Most of these are ENGL 1101 and ENGL 1102, which provide an important foundation in critical thinking and writing for students. However, English faculty also make significant contributions to the core in other areas, include Area B (ENGL 2050 and XIDS 2002) and Area C (ENGL 2060, 2080, 2110, 2120, 2130, 2180, 2190, and XIDS 2100). The viability of the program in these areas is also evident in how actively the program has been engaged in rethinking and revising—its courses in the core to reflect changes in our student population (and how they learn) and changes in USG and UWG initiatives, such as Complete College Georgia. One specific example of this is the work faculty have done over the past year to revise ENGL 1101 and ENGL 1102 in response to concerns about DFW rates. While this work is ongoing and continues to be driven by the assessment of student performance in these classes, many of these revisions to 1101 and 1102 will be implemented in the fall.

Finally, the program remains viable from a financial perspective. In terms of faculty, English is one of the largest academic units at UWG; however, it continues to be productive in generating revenue for the university. The program makes a significant contribution to the overall productivity of UWG. Specific details related to the program’s vitality in this area can be found in the Program Profile in the Appendix.

7) Program Productivity: Please discuss the productivity of this program in terms of both faculty and students.

I. Faculty Productivity

Faculty productivity in the areas of professional development, teaching, and service has remained consistently high. Achievements in the area of Professional Development include the following highlights:

Recent Book and Monograph Publications by Tenure Track Faculty:

- Dr. Patrick Erben, *A Harmony of the Spirits: Translation and the Language of Community in Early Pennsylvania*. UNC Press, 2012
- Dr. Lisa Crafton, *Transgressive Theatricality, Wollstonecraft, and Romanticism*. Ashgate Press, 2011.
- Dr. Stacy Boyd, *Black Men Worshipping: Intersecting Anxieties of Race, Gender, and Christian Embodiment*. Macmillan, 2011.
- Dr. Katie Chaple, *Pretty Little Rooms*. Press 53, 2011.
- Dr. Chad Davidson and Dr. Greg Fraser, *Analyze Anything: A Guide to Critical Reading and Writing*. Continuum Publishers, 2012.
- Dr. Greg Fraser, *Answering the Ruins*. Northwestern University Press, 2009.
- Dr. Chad Davidson and Dr. Greg Fraser, *Writing Poetry: Creative-Critical Approaches*. Palgrave-Macmillan, 2008.
- Dr. Chad Davidson, *The Last Predicta*. Southern Illinois UP, 2008.

Other Recent Professional Achievements by English Faculty:

- Dr. Margaret Mitchell is coeditor of *LIT: Literature Interpretation Theory*, a nationally peer-reviewed journal published by Routledge/Taylor and Francis Publishers.
- Dr. Chad Davidson developed and implemented the department’s new Italy Study Abroad program (2012)
- Dr. Josh Masters was named UWG Honors Professor of the Year (2011)
- Dr. Emily Hipchen was named UWG Faculty Advisor of the Year (2011)
- Dr. Greg Fraser was name Georgia Writer / Poet of the Year (2011)
- Dr. Lisa Crafton worked with English majors to create LURe (Literary Undergraduate Research), a peer-reviewed undergraduate journal that publishes literary essays from a national pool of submissions.
- Dr. Meg Pearson received the COAS research award (2010)
- Dr. David Newton was the first UWG faculty member selected for the USG Executive Leadership Institute (2010)
- Dr. Greg Fraser was selected as a Fellow of the Sewanee’s Writer’s Conference (2010)
- Dr. Emily Hipchen received the J. William Fulbright Scholar Award (2008).
- English Faculty (Hipchen, Erben, Shelnutt, Newton) received external research fellowships or research grants.

Self-reported data from the past three department annual reports is provided below. This data includes contributions from lecturers and instructors who receive no reassigned time for professional development, yet many of whom are professionally active and contribute extensively to service work on campus and in the community.

Area	FY10	FY11	FY12
Number of Tenure Track Faculty	19	18	17
Number of Lecturers	11	11	11
Number of Full-Time Instructors	18	18	17
Number of Part Time Faculty	8	8	7
Scholarship and Professional Development			
Number of books and/or monographs published by faculty	2	2	4
Number of book chapters published by faculty	4	7	1
Number of peer-reviewed articles or creative works published	28	32	35

by faculty			
Number of shorter works published by faculty	24	23	12
Number of papers presented by faculty	31	26	22
Number of other presentations delivered by faculty	14	24	15
Number of in-house publications published by faculty	5	7	2
Number of juried exhibits completed by faculty	0	4	1
Number of other exhibits or performances completed by faculty	15	9	3
Number of faculty who served in journal editing/reviewing positions	28	16	16
Number of faculty who participated in notable continuing education efforts	11	22	20
Number of faculty who traveled abroad for research purposes	3	4	2
Number of new course developments completed by faculty	8	15	
Number of faculty who participated or led a study abroad program	3	4	
Percentage of tenure-track faculty participating in academic advisement * Unless on faculty leave, all tenure-track faculty participate in advisement.	18 of 19	17 of 18	15 of 17
Faculty Service			
Number of faculty who served in honors organizations	3	7	2
Number of faculty who held positions in professional organizations	8	12	7
Number of faculty who served as advisors to student organizations	13	11	9
Number of faculty who participated in cooperative consulting efforts	1	4	4
Number of faculty who served on institution (UWG) wide committees	15	16	13
Number of faculty who served on USG system committees	2	4	3
Number of faculty who participated in public service activities	32	49	28

II. Student Productivity

Students in our program serve on the editorial staff of *Eclectic*, a national, award winning journal that publishes creative works by students in a variety of disciplines.

Students in our program—in cooperation with English faculty—designed and implemented a new national peer-reviewed journal, LURe (Literary Undergraduate Research) that publishes undergraduate research in literary studies.

Undergraduate English majors are submitting papers and creative works for presentation at national undergraduate conferences and at national academic conferences in literature. Last year eleven undergraduate majors presented at the National Conference for Undergraduate Research (NCUR).

Since the last CPR, undergraduate English majors have been accepted into M.A. and Ph.D. programs at Notre Dame, Emory University, Ohio State University, the University of St. Louis, the University of North Texas, Auburn University, the University of Alabama, the University of Georgia, the University of South Carolina, and Georgia State University,

among others.

Two students from our program received Fullbright Scholarships after graduation.

Students graduating from the English Education program who applied for high school English teaching positions have had a very high success rate in employment in area schools.

Evaluation of this Comprehensive Program Review

1) Administrative Review by the College/School Dean: Analysis and evaluative response regarding the quality, viability, and productivity of the program. Also evaluate the quality and depth of the evidence the program has provided to support its case. Finally, discuss your plans to incorporate this review into the unit's strategic and financial plans.

The BA in English is clearly one of the strongest, most viable, and productive programs in the College of Arts and Humanities. It has grown steadily in terms of number of majors and number of graduates during the period under review. This report provides ample evidence that the faculty who teach in the program are among the most productive scholars and writers in the University. The assessment plan detailed here is one of the most impressive I've seen, and its results demonstrate that the scholars and creative artists among the faculty are excellent teachers as well. The high level of achievement of students in meeting the challenging learning outcomes of the program is proof of this, and I admire the use of multiple evaluators with the use of the rubric to measure that achievement. Another noteworthy accomplishment is the highly successful secondary education track within the program, which is sending English educators into the schools of our region and beyond armed with strong content knowledge and skills set as well as a grasp of sound pedagogy.

While student achievement as measured by classroom assessments is clear, equally impressive is student productivity in other areas, including presentation in local and national venue (the program is well represented each year at the National Conference of Undergraduate research), the presence of magazines like *LURe* (created by undergraduate students) and *Eclectic*, and a strong showing in terms of admission to prestigious graduate programs. The program is, finally, a strong contributor to the vibrancy of campus life.

The department also takes very seriously its commitment to general education, in which its presence is vital to the success of the general population of UWG students. It has been hard at work examining its policies for English 1101/1102 to address high DFW rates for these courses that impact progression, retention, and graduation in ways crucial to the success of the University's Complete College Georgia Plan. In fact, though the assessment data here largely gives the department plenty to crow about, the faculty have identified significant areas for improvement, including new assessments earlier in the program than the Senior Seminar, professional development workshops to improve consistency in faculty expectation of student performance, and plans for group advising to supplement one-on-one advising.

As the report indicates, with the help of the Provost we were able to increase the department's operating budget modestly for FY13 and expect to do so again for FY14. Workload for tenure-track faculty has been a concern as their numbers have decreased in recent years by administrative assignments. This should be alleviated somewhat by the return of one faculty member and the hire of a new position in Rhetoric and Composition as well as a replacement position in Film Studies who will reside in the department. This office is ready to consider requests from this growing department for new faculty, committed to stabilizing the teaching core by converting more limited-term positions into the lectureships (thought that does require some new funding), and increasing if at all possible through the upcoming budget development process support for Graduate Assistantships to offset the growing demand of the University Writing Center. We are also currently looking into the possibility of converting additional underutilized space into faculty offices.

2) Faculty Review (UAPC or COGS): Analysis and evaluative response regarding the quality,

viability, and productivity of the academic program, and the quality and depth of the evidence the program has provided to support its case. Include recommendations for the future of the program.

Program Quality

The assessment plan of this program measures results at various check points throughout the program. The qualitative and quantitative data provide a good picture of how outcomes are being met. There is also evidence that change is being made based on assessment results, including adding new assessment tools that will allow continuous monitoring of the program.

Program Viability

Enrollment in the program is high and seems to be growing. Creating the new English education track has also helped to increase program numbers. Creating new minors draws more students to the program. The program courses attract students from various majors across campus and courses within this program contribute significantly to the core curriculum. The current model for First Year Writing Programs appears to be working, but it is clear resources are stretched thin for this program.

Program Productivity

Both faculty and students of the program engage in scholarly activity. The program review reports on the creation of a national peer-reviewed journal. The department notes undergraduate research as a strength of the program and the faculty seem committed to mentoring students. Students are also involved in internships. The program enhances learning opportunities for student by creating the English education track and minors in film studies and creative writing.

The program is highly productive given the variety of programming and the limited resources.

Depth of Evidence

The review provides a good deal of evidence to support program quality, program viability, and program productivity. Qualitative and quantitative data collected over the past two years gives a good indication of how successful this program has been in meeting its intended outcomes.

Future Recommendations

Other programs have mentioned how program goal align with the institutional strategic plan. Adding something of this nature to the program review may be helpful.

Continue to advocate for more resources, particularly tenured or at least permanent faculty positions. Consider hiring part-time tutors for the Writing Center, which could include degreed individuals as well as a peer-tutoring group made up of students who have successfully completed First Year Writing classes. Use levels such as Tutor I, Tutor II, and Tutor III, Tutor IV to determine salary. Include specific requirements for each level. For example, a student could be hired as a Tutor I if s/he passes ENGL1101 and ENLG1102 with an A and is recommended by an instructor. Or, a new hire with a B.A. in English or related field or years of experience qualifies for Tutor II level.

3) Response to the Faculty and Administrative Review by the Provost's Office

This is clearly one of the most effective and productive programs in the COAH. Students continue to graduate in large numbers. Faculty members are engaged in the management of the program and in their discipline. As such, this program will continue on its normal review cycle. Additionally, the program review process is resource neutral. Requests for additional resources should be submitted through the normal budgeting process.

Jon Anderson
Deputy Provost

Please attach to this report the annual student learning assessment reports since the last Comprehensive Program Review.