

**English Department Self-Study
Washington State University
Fall 2004**

The Curriculum and Planning Committee and faculty of the Department of English in response to a request of the Academic Program Review Committee of the Faculty Senate of Washington State University prepared this self-study. It reviews the Department's programs, activities, and achievements since its last program review of 1994 up to the present where the data are available, and provides information on strengths and weaknesses in curriculum and instruction; learning outcomes and their assessment; research activities and funding levels; resource availability and needs; and special features and services provided to both the Department's students and students at large in the University. Finally, it describes the Department's goals for the future and its planned strategies for achieving those goals.

The study is organized according to headings and answers to questions from a generic format for self-studies provided by the Academic Program Review Committee and contains five appendices and two attachments:

Appendix 1: Productivity Report 2003

Attachment 1: Faculty Vitae

Appendix 2: Faculty Comparison

Attachment 2: Graduate Student Manual

Appendix 3: The New Major

Appendix 4: Undergraduate Program in English: Self-Study, Fall 2002

Appendix 5: The Revised 101 Program

MISSION STATEMENT

The scholarship, teaching, and service activities of the WSU English Department, as they are now practiced and planned for the future, are characterized by a multiplicity of approaches, unified by the Department's commitment to the study, understanding, and production of texts of many kinds. While we practice methodological and curricular diversity in our professional activities, that diversity is focused on our common commitment to encouraging the critically literate citizenship of all students.

We understand the need for interdisciplinarity of approach in a contemporary, world-class university and accept the responsibility for educating students to become critically literate in diverse literatures and cultures, and become proficient communicators able to understand the power of language to shape their worlds. We are dedicated to developing educators, scholars, creative writers, and a wide spectrum of other professionals, all of whom are empowered to contribute and to lead within their chosen professions and the community at large.

We pursue this mission by enabling students to

- read literary and cultural texts carefully and critically.
- produce a variety of high-quality creative and critical texts using appropriate technologies that contribute to literary and cultural discourses.
- develop abilities in critical reading, writing, and thinking necessary for them to communicate successfully with other audiences both inside and outside the university.
- explore the record of the human experience in language.

We are brought to these commitments in the first place by our shared belief that a university can bestow no greater benefit on its students than confidence in their ability to make effective use of language. Building linguistic abilities significantly deepens and clarifies students' thinking, enhancing their work in all the disciplines.

I. FACULTY

Describe the standing of your department as evidenced by national rankings, rankings provided by professional associations in your field, etc. Comment on the continuing productivity and influence of your faculty.

The department as evaluated on traditional measures, such as publications and presentations, is quite productive. Details of productivity for 2003 are presented in Appendix 1. Although extramural funding for literary studies is rarely available, a few outstanding individual faculty consistently secure outside funding, mainly for archival research. Composition and English education faculty have been more successful, often in collaboration with other programs and colleges (i.e., the Writing Program, General Education, and the College of Education) in finding external sources, most notably federal and state educational agencies such as the U.S. Department of Education and the Office of the Superintendent for Public Instruction.

The major professional association in our field, the Modern Language Association (MLA), refuses to rank departments of English along a single scale or standard. In the words of David Laurence, current director of MLA English Programs and of the Association of Departments of English (ADE), the MLA has "consistently and rigorously resisted" such rankings as "inappropriate to the variety, even idiosyncrasy, of institutional contexts, missions, and educational and intellectual/scholarly purposes evident in MLA members' work and the work of the departments in which they are employed."

For departments that grant the Ph.D., the National Research Council (NRC) does provide broad graduate program rankings within specific disciplines by gathering survey data at decade intervals about faculty quality and program effectiveness in "educating research scholars/scientists." The last such rankings, based on data from spring 1993 surveys, were published in 1995 and are no longer current, and the methodology of the surveys has been challenged. For the NRC's study of the matter, see <http://www7.nationalacademies.org/resdoc>.

Describe the balance in your department in terms of senior and junior appointments and diversity (women and underrepresented national minorities). Describe the pool of faculty available to recruit in terms of your needs to achieve an appropriate balance in these categories.

There are presently 33.25 tenured or tenure-track FTE in the Department. (Nine of the total are at the Tri-Cities and Vancouver campuses; the remaining 24.25 are on the Pullman campus.) This total is divided among ranks in the following way:

Assistant Professor

8 FTE (24% of total FTE); 5 women (62.5% of total in rank); 2 faculty of color (25% of total in rank)

Associate Professor

12 FTE (36% of total FTE); 8 women (66% of total in rank); 0 faculty of color in rank

Full Professor

13.25 FTE (40% of total FTE); 3 women (23% of total in rank); 2 faculty of color (15% of total in rank)

There are presently 4 senior instructor FTE in the Department: 1 woman, 3 men; 4 three-year contract instructor FTE, 3 women, 1 man; 18 temporary instructor FTE, 10 women, 8 men.

The Department has striven to maintain faculty members with expertise in Chicano/Latino and African-American literature, with considerable success, but within the last five years we have lost one in the first specialization and two in the latter. We are currently searching for a specialist in American literature who we hope will be able to reinvigorate our offerings in American writers of color in the early periods. American Indian literature is offered by a faculty person (who is of color, but not American Indian). Asian American literature is offered occasionally by faculty in CES in a cross-listed courses. The department currently has only 4 permanent faculty of color (1 Latino, 1 Chicana, 2 Asian), only one of whom specializes in literature/literary criticism.

What is your faculty instructional workload policy? Is it comparable with those of similar departments at WSU or at other similar institutions of higher education?

The instructional load for the Department is 5-courses per academic year, on either a 3-2 or 2-3 rotation. In addition, over 50% of faculty teach sections of English 498, Internship, for variable credits 1-15 (with 3 credits as the functional lower limit and 6-9 as the functional upper limit) and English 499, Special Problems, for variable 1-4 credits (with 3 credits as the functional number most often sought and taught). On the graduate level, they also teach sections of English 590, 600, 700, 702, and 800. This 5-course plus load is universal, except for those who are released for programmatic administrative duties or buy-outs from extra-departmental, but intramural programs, or from extramural grants and programs. It should be specially noted that all student advising, both undergraduate and graduate, and service to department, college, and university committees are done by faculty above the basic 5-course teaching load.

Of the 16 other departments and programs in the College of Liberal Arts, 4 departments that also offer the Ph.D. (Anthropology, Psychology, Political Science, Sociology) have annual 4-course plus teaching loads, and several of them have, in addition, administrative professionals whose primary duties lie in student advising.

Comment on your department's participation in multidisciplinary activity.

As noted in the Mission Statement (above), English is an intrinsically multidisciplinary field, but we often cooperate across departmental lines, as exemplified in the following activities:

- The General Studies Linguistics program is an interdisciplinary major with courses taught in several departments (including English, Anthropology, Philosophy, Foreign Languages and Cultures). We are collaborating with Departments of Anthropology, Foreign Languages and Cultures, Philosophy, and General Studies to create a separate B A degree in Linguistics to strengthen the program and give it more visibility
- We have agreed with the Department of Foreign Languages and Cultures to cross-list each other's lower-division courses in literatures in translation.
- We continued collaboration with Department of Foreign Languages and Cultures on the Film Studies Minor, creating English 150: Introduction to Film as Narrative. We are strongly represented in Film Studies, a minor which is growing rapidly and has a bright future. We hope to recruit a substantial number of students to departmental offerings through new film classes.
- We collaborated with Departments of CES, FLC, Music, and American Studies to propose a diversity cluster hire in the arts and culture.
- The new interdisciplinary degree in Digital Technology and Culture is administered through the English Department.□This degree combines offerings from ten departments, including several departments outside the College of Liberal Arts, to offer WSU students a unique and highly-marketable degree option.□The enrollment in the Digital Technology and Culture degree at WSUV is 80; in Tri-Cities 30; and in Pullman, there are 27 students certified or looking to certify.□The DTC program is working with the Music Department to explore the possibility of a Music concentration in the DTC degree.□At present concentrations are available in Fine Arts, Technology and Culture, and Management Information Systems.
- We have experienced strong growth in the number of students taking English and Humanities courses especially via DDP as part of the new General Studies in Liberal Arts degree for distance learners, and expect that growth to continue.
- We are exploring ways to increase the number of Humanities courses taken by Pullman students doing a General Studies Humanities degree.

- We have several cross-listed courses with American Studies, Comparative Ethnic Studies, and Women's Studies through which our students examine gender, race, ethnicity and other social and cultural contexts. Such courses as Engl/Am St 216 American Cultures, Engl 220/CES 220 Introduction to Multiethnic Literature; Engl 309/W St 309 Women Writers; Engl 409/W St 409 Women Writers in the American West; Engl 311/CES 313 Asian Pacific American Literature; Engl 314/CES 314 Topics in Asian Pacific American Literature; Engl/CES 315 Asian Pacific American Autobiography; Engl 321/CES 331 African American Literature; Engl 322/CES 332 Topics in African American Literature; Engl 341/CES 373 Native American Literature; Engl 345/CES 353 Chicano/a Literature; Engl 345/CES 354 Vanguard Poetics in Chicano/Latino Writers; Engl 410/CES 405 Cultural Criticism and Theory; Engl 471/Am St 471 Cultural Politics Since WWII, and Engl/AmSt 475: Digital Diversity are a reflection of our multidisciplinary curriculum.
- Our curriculum further crosses disciplinary borders as our students are given the opportunity to complete an area of concentration in Gender, Ethnic, or American/Cultural Studies as part of their English Studies program.

II. GRADUATE PROGRAM

The Department is committed to the ongoing enhancement of its graduate programs in literature and rhetoric. Not only have these programs been central to the development of the department's national reputation, but they have proven crucial in recruiting and retaining talented faculty members, they have contributed significantly to the quality of English undergraduate education, and they have led to the successful job placement of hundreds of graduates. As of February 2004, the total number of new applicants for graduate study in the department was 11% higher than it was the previous year; such an increase gives us confidence that we will be able to meet our goal of increasing graduate student enrollments during the next five years.

But departmental FTEs have been reduced by about 50% over the past dozen years, particularly in literary fields, and the department has also lost a significant proportion of its TA resources. Comparison with English Departments among WSU's 22 land-grant peer institutions reveals that only one of those institutions has fewer tenure-track English faculty members than WSU—and it is the sole institution in the group that offers no Ph.D. (For comparison of WSU and its peer institutions as of fall 2003, see Appendix 2.) The average faculty size within the peer group is 46 people, while WSU currently has 30 (seven of whom teach at the urban campuses). And since successful models for structuring English graduate programs have typically emphasized extensive disciplinary coverage, this loss of faculty and resources has had deleterious consequences for the department and its students, especially those pursuing graduate degrees in literature. Over the past several years we have begun to address these problems by modifying the Ph.D. requirement structure, adding a new curricular option (ENGL 590, "Research in English Studies"), and organizing the program so that graduate students—particularly at the doctoral level—take a significantly larger role in planning their courses of study. But the process of revision is necessarily ongoing, and with the help of the annual assessments we

now require of our doctoral students, we plan to continue the task of reconceptualizing graduate literary study in considerably straitened circumstances. Above all, we plan to consider ways in which the increasingly interdisciplinary nature of faculty research in our department can inform and guide programmatic revision.

Describe your success in attracting and retaining graduate students. How would you characterize the applicant pool at the graduate level in terms of quality, size, diversity, etc.? What efforts are you making to recruit and retain students so as to achieve an appropriate ethnic and gender balance in your department? What is the ratio of domestic and international graduate students? Are there graduate students who have been admitted provisionally? Is there a departmental graduate student handbook that can accompany the self study?

As of August 2004, we had admitted 19 new MA and PhD students to our graduate program in English, an increase of 6 students over August 2003. Correspondingly, our graduate enrollments have risen 23% over those of one year ago. All of the 19 new students have Teaching Assistantships (with the exception of one international student, who holds a Fulbright Fellowship), so all have funding. In addition to the 19 new students, we have 24 other fully-funded students in our MA and PhD programs, along with 2 full-time students whose tuition and fees are being covered by other sources. This makes a total of 45 full-time graduate students (17 MA, 28 PhD). Of these 45, 32 are women and 13 are men; 6 are international students (representing Costa Rica, Singapore, China, Germany, Russia, and Jordan); and of the 39 domestic students, 6 may be classified as belonging to ethnic minorities (Native American, Asian American, Chicana/Chicano). Attrition rates are quite low among graduate students in the department; we lost one MA student in the past year due to financial exigencies, and another failed to finish within her two-year term of support, though she still hopes to complete the degree. As for doctoral students, we have had one transfer to the American Studies Program in the past year. We also routinely see doctoral students who fail to complete their dissertations after successfully passing through the earlier portions of their programs; but this is true in all graduate programs. In general we can say that our attrition rates are very low. And WSU Graduate School statistics support this claim: over the past decade (1995-2004) the English Department has granted 111 MA degrees and 48 PhDs, for a total of 159 graduate degrees. We do not have complete statistics on the total number of graduate students admitted during this period, but it is extremely unlikely to be significantly higher than the 15.9 per year that we can deduce from the ten-year degree total. As noted earlier, we admitted 19 students in 2004 and 13 in 2003. The previous year (2002) it appears that we admitted 15 students, and the year before that 13.

The English Department has prepared a Graduate Student Manual which is updated on a regular basis (normally every other year). A copy of the manual is included in this report as Attachment 2.

How is the quality of student performance assessed at various stages of students' graduate careers?

The academic performance of our students is assessed routinely, and in a variety of ways, throughout enrollment. Not only are students graded in the many seminars they take, but they must all pass an oral examination at the end of their degree programs. For MA students, this examination is based either on a thesis or a portfolio, and, in the case of the latter, is preceded by a three-day written comprehensive exam. For PhD students, the final oral examination (the dissertation defense) is preceded not only by successful completion of the dissertation itself, but by a sequence of three week-long written exams (the qualifying examination) and an oral defense of those exams (the preliminary examination). Moreover, there are many smaller and less formal ways in which students are assessed within our program: they observe one another as they teach; they write peer evaluations based on these observations; they present papers before their peers at an annual departmental conference; and they serve on award committees in which their peers' teaching is carefully scrutinized. Finally, the Director of Graduate Studies writes an annual assessment of each graduate student's progress toward his or her degree. These assessments are normally completed at the end of spring semester, and graduate students are required to read and sign them.

What is the attrition/success rate (in terms of advancement to candidacy and graduation) for your department? Are there differences in attrition success rates related to gender and ethnicity?

As noted in the response to question above about attracting and retaining graduate students, the attrition rate of our graduate students is quite low. In the past year (September 2003–September 2004) we have lost two students: one (a male) withdrew from the program due to financial problems; another (a female) transferred to the American Studies Program. There is nothing here to suggest that gender or ethnicity concerns have anything to do with attrition rates.

Evaluate the adequacy of support for your graduate students. How are graduate student financial support decisions reached in your department? Are there opportunities for teacher training for teaching assistantships? Are the TA's meeting the strategic goals of the institution to offer the best undergraduate experience within a research university?

The level of financial support for our graduate students is adequate but by no means ideal. For MA students, the two-year term of support (in the form of a Teaching Assistantship) is appropriate and sufficient. But for PhD students, we would like to see five-year (rather than four-year) support packages, or, at the very minimum, increased support during the summers. Both MA and PhD students often have to suspend their studies while they take full-time jobs elsewhere during the summer months.

Decisions regarding financial support are made primarily by the English Department's Graduate Studies Committee, which reads and evaluates all applications for admission, ranks prospective students, and makes final decisions regarding offers of admission and support (normally in the form of Teaching Assistantships). Some additional support is provided by the WSU College of Liberal Arts and the WSU Graduate School—mostly in the form of special academic scholarships or minority fellowships. Traditionally, the English Department has been reluctant to admit students without also offering them Teaching Assistantships, and it is likely that we will maintain this reluctance, since we believe that an established hierarchy of funded vs. non-funded graduate students is undesirable. Thus, as noted above, 43 of 45 current full-time students have departmental support in the form of Teaching Assistantships.

The training for Teaching Assistants in our program is intensive and thorough: please refer to III Undergraduate Program for details regarding this training.

What is the average time-to-degree for master's students? Doctoral students? How do these averages compare with similar programs elsewhere?

The average time-to-degree for MA students is two years. Very few students take more time than this, and none take less. As for doctoral students, the average time is a bit more than four years. An increasingly large proportion of our students are now managing to finish within the four-year term of their financial support from the department, but there are still some who take an extra year.

How would you describe the climate for graduate study that your department fosters (a) in general, (b) for women, and (c) for historically underrepresented students? If there are problems, what specific efforts are you making to address them?

As noted variously in the answers to questions above, the “climate” for graduate study in the English Department is positive: we make every effort to provide a comfortable and professional environment within which our students may pursue their academic interests. Since over 70% of our current full-time students are women (32 of 45), it would be difficult to suppose that the climate is misogynistic. We also believe that historically under-represented students find themselves welcome in our department. We do not have large numbers of such students (see discussion above), but neither do we receive large numbers of applications from such students. Over the past several years we have routinely been able to offer minority fellowships to one or two students in our program. And our attrition rates, as mentioned above, suggest no correlation between ethnicity and failure to complete a degree.

What assistance is available in career planning and job placement? Comment on your placement record for graduate students who have received their degrees in the last five years.

Traditionally the English Department has offered extensive assistance to graduate students entering the job market. Much of this assistance has been informal—e.g., individual professors helping individual students—but there have also been occasional panel discussions on such topics as writing cover letters and *vitae*, preparing for interviews, and so on. The WSU Career Services Office offers various seminars in which our students can enroll, and of course it also maintains graduate student job-application files, with current letters of recommendation, etc. Our placement record in recent years has been quite good: doctoral students who've finished recently have taken tenure-track jobs at such institutions as California State University at Sacramento, the College of Charleston, the University of Northern Colorado, Minot State University, Gonzaga University, and the University of Massachusetts at Lowell. We have also sent our MA graduates on to doctoral programs at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, the University of Washington, and elsewhere. We believe our placement record is strong because we offer outstanding pedagogical training to our students in addition to their focused and carefully monitored academic preparation.

Describe the graduate core curriculum addressing its breadth of upper-level classes and opportunities to specialize. Are there conjoint graduate/undergraduate courses?

There is no core curriculum in our graduate program apart from two required courses: Composition Methodology (ENGL 501) and Introduction to English Graduate Studies (ENGL 512). Beyond this, students have considerable freedom in selecting classes—particularly at the doctoral level. MA students still have to demonstrate a certain breadth of preparation; this is normally achieved either (1) by taking courses in five different literary-historical periods, or (2) by taking a range of courses representing different facets of rhetorical theory, composition theory, and linguistics. Doctoral students, meanwhile, must take at least ten graded courses prior to beginning their exams, but some of these courses can come from outside the Department's listings. Thus the possibilities for specialization and interdisciplinary exploration are very much enhanced at the doctoral level. There are, at present, only one or two “conjoint classes” between the graduate and undergraduate curricula in English, primarily in our linguistics offerings (ENGL 443/543). But we are currently revising the undergraduate curriculum, and one consequence of this revision may be that we will institute a series of upper-level undergraduate classes that could be offered in conjunction with 500-level graduate “reading courses” (as opposed to true seminars). This proposal will be under discussion during the 2004-2005 academic year as we continue to reshape our undergraduate offerings.

III. UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

Among the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan are major ones related to undergraduate education. For example, WSU plans to increase the quality and diversity of the undergraduate student body, to enhance contact between students and faculty, to continually improve the quality of our program offerings and their delivery, and to improve advising and mentoring.

What is your current departmental situation in relation to the goals and objectives for undergraduate education?

Under Section V Department Plan and Appendix 3, the department's short- and long-term plans for the next five years in faculty and program development are given concretely. These plans explicitly describe our commitment to the WSU strategic goal of "Best Undergraduate Education in Research Institution" and our current situation relative to that goal. The changes in progress now will produce a major renovation in the current undergraduate program by streamlining its overall number of options (reducing them to four rather than six tracks) while offering more direct access for majors to the department faculty's interdisciplinary expertise in literary, pedagogical, cultural, and transcultural studies, as well as in creative and professional writing, rhetoric and literacy studies, digital media, and linguistics.

Describe the goals/objectives and learning outcomes for each degree program in your unit. Describe the unit's efforts in realizing these goals/objectives and in ensuring that the learning outcomes are achieved. Identify critical needs or barriers that impede meeting program goals. Indicate any changes and innovative responses that your unit has used to meet its goals/objectives in the past five years (or since the last review).

As noted above, the department has used the Five-Year Plan review process to begin a major renovation of its major. That plan (revised in the fall of 2003) and a concrete proposal for a newly redesigned undergraduate (passed on 4 May 2004) list these common outcomes.

OUTCOMES: Undergraduates majors in English should acquire

- The ability to read and think critically about complex literary and cultural texts.
- Facility with the specialized terminology of literary and rhetorical forms.
- An understanding of the historical, cultural, political, and aesthetic contexts that inform literary and cultural texts in various media.
- Familiarity with methods and resources of research in the [field].
- The ability to synthesize these knowledges by writing in a variety of forms (interpretive, professional, creative), using appropriate technologies, for a variety of audiences.

These specific learning outcomes should be examined in context in Section V Department Plan (under C Undergraduate Program) and in Appendix 3. These outcomes, which are in the process of being implemented, evolved from the objectives and learning outcomes

that have been in effect in the undergraduate program since it was systematically redesigned in 1997-1998.

For a brief history of the implementation of the current program, see Appendix 4 (see especially section I “Overview of Post-1992 Program Changes in the English Major”). The following briefly summarizes the program as it stands now:

OUTCOMES: Undergraduate majors in English should develop high-level skills in critical thinking, analysis, and writing vital to living examined lives and to pursuing effective careers, leadership positions, and public service. Majors should be able

- To explore literature by diverse voices past and present, writing and related information technologies, and various methods of cultural interpretation
- To pursue pre-professional training for careers in professional or creative writing, publishing, teaching, business, or law
- To build a foundation for advanced graduate study or professional training
- To combine the major with second majors or minors in other disciplines

OPTIONS IN THE MAJOR:

1. The **General** option involves core requirements, common to all options, that emphasize literary study, writing, and a four-course concentration in such areas as creative or professional writing, American literature, linguistics, or gender studies.
2. The **Graduate-Study Preparation** option is designed for students interested in preparing for advanced study in English, cultural or gender studies, rhetoric and composition, creative writing, linguistics, and other related fields.
3. The **English/Teaching** option is for students planning careers in secondary teaching. Courses are coordinated with the College of Education and certification requirements.
4. The **English/Prelaw** option is for students planning to enter Law School. Majors build a foundation for applying to law school and for careers in the legal professions.
5. The **English/Business** option is for students seeking careers in business and requires courses in economics, management, marketing, and related computer applications. Students are eligible for the 4 & 1 program in the College of Business and Economics providing a bachelor's degree in liberal arts and an MBA in five years.
6. The **Creative Writing** option is for students who seek to develop skills in poetry, fiction, and creative nonfiction, who aim for MFA degrees in creative writing, and/or who plan to pursue careers in creative fields and related editing and publishing arenas.

The department's efforts to carry out and assess the objectives of this undergraduate program are described in Appendix 4. Figures on current enrollments in these options are not available; for AY 2002-03, see Appendix 4, Section II.

Describe methodologies used to evaluate the success in meeting the goals/objectives and learning outcomes. Examples might include exit interviews, achievement in capstone courses, portfolios, results on licensure exams or standardized tests, employer questionnaires, percent matriculating to post-baccalaureate programs, student placement, positions and salary of graduates, employer or advisory board feedback, etc. Appendix 4 describes the programmatic methods used to evaluate the success of the current undergraduate major; copies of the checklists, exit questionnaires, and fall 2002 undergraduate student survey used in that process; and summaries of the results. Resources do not permit the department to track student placements in post-baccalaureate programs or salaried positions beyond queries on the exit questionnaire, summarized in Attachment I of Appendix 4.

As is clear from the appendices to this study, the department systematically assesses its non-major writing courses and undergraduate major offerings and implements changes based on the assessment results (see especially Appendix 4 for summaries of changes that have resulted from such assessments). Writing courses are regularly assessed by the department's Composition Committee; foundation courses and Humanities offerings are the responsibility of the Undergraduate Studies Committee; beginning in the spring of 2004, assessment of overall program effectiveness and coherence was given as an on-going charge to the Curriculum and Planning Committee.

Outline current and proposed changes in the program resulting from the assessments described above that have led or will lead to improvements in quality, effectiveness, or efficiency.

Appendices 2 and 4 present in detail the changes we have begun to implement in the 101 program and the changes we propose to implement in the undergraduate major.

Discuss the magnitude and contribution of your faculty toward courses offered to the University at large. These might include service courses taught by your faculty, whether or not required of your majors.

- **English 101:** The Department offers approximately 100 sections of English 101 per academic year. This serves about 2,500 students who will become majors in all departments and programs of the University. The new 101 Program emphasizes writing from sources as a way to prepare students for the scholarly focus of a research university, and at the same time to enable all students to learn the academic literacies and integrity that will as much as possible eliminate plagiarism, certainly unintentional plagiarism, from this university.
- **English 201:** The Department offers 15 sections of English 201 per academic year. This course serves nearly 400 students per year from departments other than English. 201 develops students' research abilities and critical consciousness for writing across the disciplines.
- **English 301:** The Department offers 11 sections of English 301 per academic year. This course serves nearly 275 students per year from departments other than English.

301 provides students with advanced engagement with the gathering of evidence, argument construction and related discourse issues and conventions

- **Technical and Professional Writing:** The Department has a long-standing, heavy service obligation to the University at large in the teaching of English 402/403, Technical and Professional Writing. Beginning 25 years ago, when the course was designed and taught regularly for the first time, a hand-full of departments beyond English, mostly in the College of Engineering and Architecture, required or recommended the course for their students. In AY 1979-80, we taught 8 sections of English 402, one of 403 (Technical and Professional Writing for ESL students). Since then, the number of departments and programs requiring or highly recommending the course has grown to 26, ranging from all engineering disciplines, including computer science, to the social sciences, humanities, sciences, and business and economics. We currently teach on average 40 sections a year, including Summer Session, for a total head count of 1,000 students per AY plus Summer Session, or 3000 SCH.

This remarkable growth, of course, requires a commensurate growth in faculty FTE, but the Department has not been able to meet that growth in the most reliable ways. In 1979-80 AY, the 8 sections/1 section of 402/403 were taught by two full-time, tenure track faculty members and two part-time instructors. In 2004-05, of the over 40 sections of 402/403 only 1 or 2 will be taught by full-time tenure-track faculty members (the only two faculty members in our department in this area); the rest will be taught by 8-10 part-time instructors. Clearly, increased reliance on part-time instructors is an unreliable and unaccommodating way (from both students' and instructors' points of view) of meeting a critical demand in the upper-level curriculum of the University.

- **ESL:** Similarly, the Department has a long-standing and ever-growing service obligation to the University in the teaching of ESL courses to both international students and bilingual American citizens. Due to budget constraints, the department has unfortunately been unable to offer English 103 (our most introductory writing/reading course, which does not grant graduation credit) and English 106 (our oral proficiency course). We have also had to stop offering English 500, which was a class in dissertation- and thesis-writing for ESL graduate students throughout the university. The Department has had to shift those resources to English 104 (the first ESL writing course which grants graduation credit), 105 (the ESL course parallel to 101 which meets the W writing requirement), 303 (a new class designed to serve the needs of ESL students who get needs work on the junior portfolio), and 403 (introduced in the discussion of our technical writing courses). From Fall 2003 through Summer 2004, over 300 students took English 104, 105, 303, or 403. We expect the need for ESL courses to continue to increase in the future as enrollments of international students and ESL-speaking American citizens increase. Advising was provided to over 500 students.
- **General Education Requirements:** English offers a wide array of courses that meet

other general education requirements. Many of our courses offer arts and humanities (H) credit (including English 108, 209, 210, 220, 261, 305, 306, 308, 309, 335, 341, 366, and 368), intercultural or humanities (G) credit (including English 311, 321, 341, and 345), American diversity (D) credit (including English 216 and 220), and Tier III (T) credit (including 409, 410, 415, and 419, 470, 471, and 475).

The Humanities courses offered by the English Department are primarily service courses, taken by students across the university to fulfill GER requirements. More than 90% of the students enrolled in our large freshman-level HUM courses (101 and 103) are non-English majors, and even HUM 302's enrollments are almost half non-majors. HUM 410 is always filled by students in majors such as fine arts and history as well as those in English seeking a Tier III GER course.

- **Distance Degree Program:** The department offers a wide range of courses for DDP (including upper-level writing courses and GER courses which can be used in most degree programs). Humanities 303 is a popular choice for students taking the Bachelor of Arts in Humanities offered online by Distance Degree Programs.

Describe departmental participation in the honors program. How is undergraduate research encouraged?

Every year the Department offers several sections of English 198 (Honors Composition), English 199 (Honors English Composition and Literature) and Humanities 198 (Honors Humanities), and individual faculty members regularly offer UH 260 (Special Topics Seminars) and 440 (Domain of the Arts). English faculty typically direct a number of honors theses every year in both critical and creative areas. For non Honors College students, undergraduate opportunities for research are available through senior seminars, independent study, undergraduate conferences, and a wide range of upper-level courses.

What efforts are made to encourage superior prospective undergraduate students to enter the major and retain them to completion of the degree? What efforts are made to increase the diversity of undergraduate majors and to retain them to completion of the degree?

As part of its efforts to recruit superior undergraduate students and increase diversity among those enrolled in the major, the department uses a range of direct and indirect methods. It teaches an introductory literature course (Engl 199) taken by every Honors College student in his or her first year at WSU (some students, of course, have satisfied this requirement with AP or running start credits). It has developed endowed funds for scholarships for exceptional students in a range of its offerings, including English Teaching and Creative Writing. The department has also nominated, sponsored, and mentored undergraduate students participating in the McNair Achievement Program since its inception; the goals of the latter program are "to increase the number of underrepresented students in PhD programs and, ultimately, diversify the faculty in colleges and universities across the country." Finally, the department's faculty advisors and English Club officers and literary magazine editors maintain connections with a range

of organizations involving students of color, with the GLBA, with the College of Education's Future Teachers of Color program, and with the Multicultural Student Center's tutoring programs.

Describe the departmental advising program. What role does the faculty play?

All of our undergraduate advising is done by our regular faculty on top of their five-course load. All undergraduate programs for majors and minors are tracked by the staff program coordinator. Students are urged to consult advisors both for registration and for planning postgraduate studies and careers.

How does your department monitor the quality of its undergraduates at the different stages of their studies, and how does it handle under performing majors?

Since advising is done by faculty members in our department, students are supposed to meet with their advisors at least once every term, so they are always monitored by faculty. The strengths and weaknesses of every major are evaluated in writing at the end of English 302 by his or her instructor (see Appendix 4). The department tracks the performance of its majors on the WSU Writing Portfolio. (The performance of our majors is the highest in the CLA.)

What efforts are under way to improve instruction? What sources of evidence (e.g., student evaluations, peer evaluation, etc.) do you use to assess the quality of teaching in your department? How is good teaching effectively encouraged? Comment on the contact between faculty and undergraduate students.

We conduct assessment principally through end of program portfolio reviews, established by various already existing standing committees: Undergraduate Studies, Graduate Studies, Composition, Creative Writing, English Teaching (in collaboration with committees in the College of Education), and Digital Technology and Culture.

Other mechanisms, such as student teaching evaluations, are traditional, but they have in the last three years undergone significant review and alteration to reflect the differences in course subject matter, methods of course delivery, and student learning outcomes. We plan regular review of student evaluation methods in the next two years and will make changes in our evaluation methods appropriate to the changes in the program. Personal contact of tenure-track faculty and instructors with students is a key strength of the English major, which emphasizes discussion-oriented courses, enforces enrollment limits for senior seminars, all writing courses, and all creative writing workshops, and encourages independent study.

How are Teaching Assistants trained, supervised, and evaluated?

- **Training:**

TAs take Engl 501 to introduce them to theories and practices of teaching academic research and writing in an Engl 101 setting. They study writing processes, invention, revision, audience analysis, assessing writing, genre, grammar and usage, working with non-native speakers of English, the relationships of language, racism, and diversity, electronic writing environments, developing effective writing assignments, and the features of an effective syllabus.

They are also trained as tutors in our Engl 102 program, which gives them experience working 1-on-1 with 4-6 students, as well as facilitating peer group work. 102 tutors attend weekly meetings, which are a place to ask questions about how to improve individual and group tutoring. There are two sets of meetings, a more general one for tutors, and one that focuses on adapting the pedagogy from 102 in the Engl 101 classroom.

TAs attend weekly 101 staff meetings. This is a setting where classroom issues are raised and addressed. In these meetings assessment and related matters of programmatic integrity are treated in depth. There is a peer-mentoring program connected to the 101 meetings. This peer mentoring gives new TAs the opportunity to observe 101 classes before they begin teaching.

To qualify to teach ESL courses, TAs must take the section of Engl 598 devoted to ESL issues.

- **Supervision:**

TAs receive mentoring and classroom observation by both the Assistant Director of Composition and the Director of Composition. This process of classroom observation includes an hour meeting afterwards to go over the classroom experience and also do in-depth analysis of course materials, including syllabus and writing assignments. We discuss their teaching, both strengths and areas for improvement, as well as their philosophy of pedagogy and professional goals.

TAs in ESL classes are mentored and observed by the ESL specialist.

- **Evaluation:**

TAs are evaluated by their students at the end of every semester. The Director of Composition meets with TAs to review and interpret student evaluations, which is also a part of training. We also support a teaching portfolio, as a way for the TAs to formally reflect on their own teaching.

- **Informal training, supervision, and evaluation:**

The English graduate student organization—EGO—puts on colloquia, and the TAs have a file on the 4th floor as a way to share assignments. Many TAs also choose to receive training as a Placement Exam Reader, not only to help support themselves, but

also to learn about norming procedures; thus they must continually remind themselves of the criteria for 101 as they assess the placement exams. Some TAs also choose to participate in Gen Ed 302, which exposes them to the writing needs of other majors. TAs who are interested in teaching Engl 402 must also take Engl 534. Engl 101 and 402 are the only classes that require formal training to teach.

The majority of help the more outgoing TAs receive comes directly from peers, who give activity suggestions and assignment ideas. Naturally, some of this information originates in 501 and the weekly 101 meetings, but much is informal. These informal aspects of teacher training and retention are often crucial to the success of individual TAs.

What measures other than the improvement of teaching itself could help improve the quality of instruction (e.g., classroom facilities, effective instructional equipment)?

In 1997, the classrooms in Avery Hall were upgraded with video projectors, stereo sound, and built-in CD players, and in their ability to reproduce music and film soundtracks in stereo are still ahead of most other classrooms on the campus. In 2004 two new laptops were purchased for departmental use (one Windows, one Mac) with DVD players installed in them which allow us to show DVD at its true resolution in these classrooms, unlike the system which distributes video from ISS at a considerably lower resolution.

However, one of the video projectors has died and another is on its last legs, capable of projecting only a very dim image. ISS tells us that we are not high on their list for replacement equipment, but we urgently need functioning video equipment in all our classrooms, particularly for our Humanities classes, which involve art presentations and drama on DVD, and for film studies classes.

English faculty in film studies have developed a proposal for rooms equipped with higher quality video equipment, involving line doublers, multi-format players, and surround sound, but as yet have not succeeded in getting this proposal funded, though the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts has supported the request.

IV. SUPPORT SERVICES

Assess the quality of the research and teaching environment with respect to

a. Instructional & research departmental budget

Within the last 12 years, the Department of English has gone from a position of barely adequate funding to one of seriously inadequate funding. This decline has paralleled (in large part been caused by) significant funding reductions at both the University and College of Liberal Arts levels. In all but one of the last 12 years, the University, the College, and therefore the Department have realized either flat or reduced funding levels. In the last 6 years alone, our budget has been cut an approximate total of 23.5%. This has meant a net loss of 6 faculty FTE and 2 staff FTE and a significant reduction in the operating budget (non-instructional), including the complete loss of all state-funded travel. The only positive factor in this picture is the Department's reasonably good-sized endowment funds. Income from the Jerard, Buchanan, Thompson, and Peterson trust funds permits the department to maintain some support for faculty and graduate student travel to professional meetings, research and salary supplements for a few faculty (the Buchanan professorships), start-up needs for new faculty and maintenance of technological needs of existing faculty, support for undergraduate and graduate student scholarships, and occasional support for colloquia, workshops, and appearances of visiting writers and scholars. It should also be specially noted that some support for graduate student research (both travel and equipment) has been supplied through the generosity of individual faculty who have been awarded either department- or college-endowed professorships.

But it needs to be noted further and pointedly that real cuts in the permanent baseline budget (PBL) have two significantly negative effects: reliance on ad hoc, temporary funding from the central administration to maintain instruction from a large cadre of part-time, temporary instructors for historically increasing student FTEs and a growing depletion of the level of state support in areas historically supplemented by endowed funds: travel, research, scholarships, and special events. What we see as a clear, and growing erosion of our financial capital will mean, unless consciously and fiercely fought off, eventual erosion of our intellectual capital, at least as it is expressed in our increasingly tenuous professional environment.

b. Instructional & research space

Except for the conversion of existing classroom space to add to the size of the Avery Microcomputer Lab, our instructional space has remained the same and is adequate.

c. Instructional & research equipment

Support for instructional and research equipment has been the only area where we have seen adequate, and in some years, even increased support. All university classrooms have been equipped with centrally controlled video equipment and ethernet connections

for Internet hook-ups. The Avery Microcomputer Lab has been upgraded three times to include at present 50 advanced-level workstations, and a separate advanced computer lab for instruction in and production of sophisticated desk-top publication and digital animation presentations. The Humanities Research Center, primarily funded by the CLA and dedicated currently to graduate student and some instructor use, has had only one major upgrade and is otherwise not holding in maintaining up-to-date reasonably sophisticated hard- and software levels. All faculty offices are equipped with up-to-date computers and software programs.

Funding for this equipment has come largely from University and College omnibus equipment budgets, but as we have noted earlier, funding for start-ups and maintenance has increasingly come from the Department's endowed funds or from a percentage of profits from our Summer Session program returned to us by the College.

d. Administrative, clerical and technical support staff

The administrative, clerical, and technical support staff has realized significant cuts in the past three or four years. From an original six staff members, including a separate Fiscal Tech position and an Undergraduate Program Coordinator, we have contracted to four members: Administrative Manager (who also now manages fiscal matters), a combined Undergraduate and Graduate Program AP coordinator, and two secretarial support staff. These personnel are aided by several time-slip, work-study students on a regular basis. Our technical (technological) support is now supplied by a separate TA line, currently held by an MA student in American Studies. The abundant work of supporting the instruction of the Department is getting done with dedication and energy, but there is no room to spare. We have reached the minimum level necessary to maintain our programs.

e. Library holdings

The University's Libraries have also been chronically under-funded and subject to a series of debilitating cuts. This has affected the English Department particularly in the area of acquisitions and maintenance of serials, several of which in the medieval and early modern periods having been discontinued. But the administration and faculty of the Libraries have always maintained good and thoughtful relations with the Department, and through the regular efforts of a librarian with an English and humanities subject/content assignment and an English faculty library liaison, the best uses of advanced technology in managing library holdings have diminished the worst effects of an insecure funding environment.

V. DEPARTMENTAL PLAN

The departmental plan is an explanation of your department's strategic plan for faculty and program development over at least the next five years. This part of the document should address the following broad themes and should take into account the goals and objectives of the University's Strategic Plan. Make clear how your departmental strategic plan evolves from your present situation.

A. FACULTY

Describe the overall goals of your department with regard to faculty recruitment. What do you consider the optimal size of your department to be? What are the trends in your discipline nationally in terms of teaching and research specialties and how does this relate to your recruitment plans and to future student demand, both undergraduate and graduate?

As indicated earlier in this report, the department has suffered a drastic reduction in faculty FTEs over the last ten to twelve years. At the same time, our interests and responsibilities as a faculty have broadened (with greater emphasis on composition and rhetoric and new and growing responsibilities in technical communication and creative writing). At a time when our department should have been growing, it was, in fact, shrinking. Because our traditional area of expertise is literary studies, not surprisingly, retirements and other departures have been concentrated in literary studies. Because of changes in the field, many of these departed faculty members have not been replaced by faculty in literary studies and so our literary studies programs have been particularly hard hit. The importance of literary studies has not been reduced, but our faculty in this area has been—almost by half in the last twelve years. To maintain a serious literary studies Ph.D., we need more faculty. To meet our needs in all of our areas of responsibility we need more faculty, but clearly our need in literary studies is most acute. We are now very much the smallest of the English departments among our Ph.D.-granting peer institutions. If we are to provide a real graduate education to our graduate students, particularly our Ph.D. students, the department must not only stop shrinking, but also must grow at a regular, if not accelerated, rate. As our Five Year Plan indicates in detail, specific additional faculty in literary studies will be requested, three in the next two years, three additional in the next five years. If the department is to reach a reasonable critical mass, to say nothing of any optimal size, for departments of its kind, we will need to grow from the current 33.25 tenure-track FTE to 42 tenure-track FTE, six in literary studies, three in rhetoric and composition, professional and creative writing in the next five years.

Proposed Actions

- Actively seek new tenure lines, particularly in literary studies.

While we seek to increase the size of the faculty, we also need to increase diversity within the faculty. Within the last five years, the Department has lost a faculty member in Chicano/Latino literature and two faculty in different periods of African American

literature. American Indian literature is offered by a faculty member (who is of color but not American Indian). Asian American literature is offered occasionally by faculty in CES in a cross-listed course. The department currently has only 4 permanent faculty of color (1 Latino, 1 Chicana, 2 Asian), only one of whom specializes in literature or literary criticism.

Proposed Actions:

- Remain conscious of and be aggressive in the recruitment of women and people of color for permanent faculty positions.
- Attract visiting professors of color—both those whose research or creative work concerns issues of race and those with other interests.
- Continue to explore possibilities within the Provost’s Cluster Hire program. It should be noted that the Department has already collaborated with the Departments of Comparative Ethnic Studies, American Studies, Music and Theatre Arts, and Foreign Languages and Cultures on a proposal for a cluster hire of faculty of color.
- Participate in planning for the Plateau Center for American Indian Studies and urge that faculty be appointed to teach Native American Literature. Continue development of the department's summer Native Women's Writing Workshop (now three year's old) in cooperation with the Plateau Center.

B. GRADUATE PROGRAM

List improvements your department wants to make in the graduate program. Outline steps you plan to take to improve the quality and increase the number and diversity of your graduate students. Include relevant data on student enrollment projections and student interests in the field. Briefly, summarize any changes you anticipate making in your graduate offerings.

A larger program than we currently have would tend to optimize conditions for graduate education, enhance the level of intellectual exchange in and out of seminars, promote bolder and more frequent initiatives in interdisciplinary work for students and faculty, permit a broader range of research projects, and make us more attractive to applicants at both the MA and PhD levels. Our proposed actions are in line with the university objective to “increase graduate student enrollment to 25% of total student enrollment.”

Proposed Actions:

- Continue to increase the total number of graduate students in our program, both at the MA and PhD levels. As noted above, we raised graduate seminar enrollments by 23% between the fall of 2003 and the fall of 2004, and while growth such as this cannot be long sustained, we hope to continue smaller-scale growth for the next two or three years until student numbers return to a level we consider appropriate for a faculty of our size. If, meanwhile, we are successful in increasing the overall size of our faculty, we will seek to enlarge the graduate student population still further.

- Increase the number of graduate students studying rhetoric and composition. This goal, a subset of that listed above, is desirable because the number of students in the rhetoric and composition program is somewhat low in proportion to the number of available faculty in that field.
- Continue to work toward a standard 2/2 teaching load for all faculty involved in graduate training within our department. The current standard teaching load is 3/2, or five courses per year; supervision of graduate theses, portfolios, and dissertations thus constitutes instructional responsibility above and beyond the five expected courses (as does advising and mentoring of undergraduate research). We would like to reduce the load to 2/2, or four courses per year, so that faculty will be able to devote greater time and energy to the range of graduate and undergraduate student projects with which they are involved.
- Participate in the design of the proposed online MLS degree (Master of Liberal Studies). We know that a large demand for graduate training exists among place-bound high-school teachers in Washington, and we believe that the MLS will be attractive to this constituency. An online graduate degree, coupled with a co-sponsorship in the Inland Northwest Writing Project, would help establish the English Department and the College of Liberal Arts as leaders in secondary education and writing throughout the state. The MLS degree will involve collaboration among several humanities departments, and, as we understand it, will be administered within the dean's office of the College of Liberal Arts.
- Find further means of improving the professional work environment for graduate students, particularly in ways we can highlight in advertising and recruiting. One such improvement would be to equip all graduate student offices with computers and full internet access. We would also like to be able to provide a fifth year of teaching support for doctoral students, additional summer funding, additional money for travel and research, and funding for student memberships in relevant professional societies and organizations.
- Join the Graduate School and the University Writing Program in their collaboration to extend ESL resources to graduate students across the university. If WSU continues to recruit and enroll increasingly large numbers of international students, it will need to find ways to strengthen its support for ESL. The Department of English, with its commitment to English literacy and its capable graduate student population, will be central to any such effort.

C. UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

List improvements your department wants to make to enhance your undergraduate program. Outline steps you plan to take to improve the quality and diversity of the undergraduate students admitted to your department. Include relevant data on student enrollment projections and student interest in the field. Briefly summarize changes you anticipate making in your undergraduate offerings.

Proposed Actions:

- The English Department is in the process of revising the entire undergraduate major. We developed the conceptual framework for a new program of study in a year-long process in 2003-2004. A proposal for the new major was approved by the department on 5 May 2004 to enable the USC and faculty taskforces to proceed with the changes called for by the Curriculum and Planning Committee and with designs for new introductory, gateway, and upper-division courses as well as a new option. See Appendix 3 for proposed changes and Appendix 4 for an overview of the current major and enrollments as of AY 2002-03.
- We will continue the ongoing reform of the English 101 program, started at the beginning of 2004. See Appendix 5.
- Create new elective courses (fulfilling GER requirements) that would 1) draw from the interests and training of faculty more broadly, 2) connect different areas of the English major, and 3) be designed to address specific goals in the University and College Strategic Plans. Possible examples:
 - Parables of Technology: A team-taught course cooperatively designed by faculty in literature, composition/rhetoric, creative writing, digital technology, film studies, and science fiction. Topics might include the historic interface of technology and imperialism; popular culture and the disappearance of the book; technology and ecology; technology and violence; eugenics.
 - The Literature of Black Protest: David Walker to Malcolm X; Harriet Jacobs to Toni Morrison; Frederick Douglass to Martin Luther King; William Wells Brown to Ralph Ellison.
- Build permanence and stability in the **Creative Writing program** (including the option within the major and related extracurricular programs). Hire a new tenure-track faculty member with expertise and interest in Creative Writing and at least one other area of English studies, such as literature, composition and rhetoric, or English education, a cost-effective strategy with the added benefit of integrating different areas of the department.
- Continue to seek outside funding for *LandEscapes* with the aims of attracting more student staff with the promise of financial support for staffers; creating an online version of the magazine; and increasing its visibility beyond the borders of the Pullman campus. We hope to free up department money to support the Visiting Writers Program and other programs in the literary arts.
- Inaugurate annual **Undergraduate Research Symposium** to present, celebrate, and publicize the most outstanding research and writing by our majors.
- Expand English as a Second Language (ESL) services to undergraduate students. The University Strategic Plan and the CLA Area Plan both emphasize a commitment to promoting diversity, while recognizing that students with non-traditional backgrounds require special support. The English Department's ESL

program provides essential support for undergraduate students who are not native speakers of English. This group now includes over 600 international students and several hundred American citizens and permanent residents. With our present resources, we are only able to provide services to 355 of these students yearly. To help all ESL students gain the language skills they need to succeed at WSU, we wish to do the following:

- Improve assessment and placement to help students to get the coursework they need.
- Continue to offer our current classes for non-native speakers.
- Extend ESL courses to provide greater explicit teaching of other language skills, including reading and speaking.
- Create a dedicated course aimed at students with limited English proficiency who graduate from U.S. high schools.

Appendix 1: Productivity Report 2003

A. Productivity Measures

1. Faculty professional productivity.

Productivity is measured primarily by publications seeing print. Since the acquisition of grants is such a rare occurrence in English fields, they are only weighted insofar as publications arise from such grants.

Other measures of productivity—such as contracts conferred or invitations to present at national and international conferences—are recognized during annual evaluations. Accordingly, two sets of productivity are offered: one based on publications out; another based on overall productivity.

Number of tenured and tenure-track faculty: 31.75 (Law = .25, Kuo= .50)

- a) productive (in print): 26 = **82%**
 b) productive (broader): 27.25 = **86%**

2. Number of majors (Undergraduate, Post-Bacs, and Graduate) per Expended Faculty FTE (State Funded).

Although the heading claims to include post-bacs and graduate and the footnote claims that second majors are included in the figures, internal tallies suggest that the numbers reflect declared undergraduate majors only. Second majors (another 70) and graduate students (another 50) would bring the ratio to 9.04.

3. Number of student FTE (AA) per Expended Faculty and Graduate FTE (State Funded).

The ratio contained in the attached spreadsheet reflects the need to avoid large lecture-hall format classrooms for the teaching of writing and literature.

4. Number of SCH (AA) in individualized instruction (e.g. 499, 600, 700, 800, and other appropriate courses as justified by the Chair) per Expended Faculty FTE (State Funded).

A thriving graduate program is reflected in the large numbers of hours expended in independent course hours.

5. Ratio of External Grant and Contract Funds to Departmental PBL.

Since the mid-1980s external funding has not been available within the literary arts. That the department's faculty can acquire external funding at all is commendable.

B. Productivity Assessment Narrative

The Department of English has strengths in the traditional areas of literature and literary criticism, but also in rhetoric, expository writing, creative writing, and technology. Literary faculty continue to be recognized, thanks to their consistent productivity through traditional publications media, the editing of well-received journals, *ESQ*, *Poe Studies*, cross-disciplinary work, mainly through the visual arts, and through their work in webbed environments. Faculty in rhetoric and composition studies have been asked to consult or present nationally and internationally. As with the literary faculty, rhetoric and composition faculty's particular brand of interdisciplinarity is a recognized strength, with faculty combining rhetoric with postcolonial studies, women's studies, ethnic studies, cultural studies, history, and political economics, as well as the more traditional crossovers with philosophy, critical theory, cognitive psychology,

ethnography, and pedagogy. Creative writing faculty continue to garner national recognition. English courses—in rhetoric, writing, and digital animation are often cross-listed (with Fine Arts, Women's Studies, CAC, American Studies, and Communications). Within technical and professional writing and within English education, faculty continue to receive recognition for their successes in digitized instruction and online, distance learning, this year being the first for an autonomous degree in Digital Technology and Culture, which itself draws heavily on the collaboration of other departments: Anthropology, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, Fine Arts.

The Department of English continues to serve the literacy needs of the entire university and the greater community, including the Yakema Indian reservation—through its first-year composition program, other writing courses (like Professional/Technical writing, required by other colleges in the university), its support of the rising-junior portfolio, the university's writing across the curriculum initiatives, and outreach programs made available through the CO-TEACH grant and the Preparing Future Faculty program, now continuing beyond its national funding years as part of the Department's graduate programs. Also, Department faculty and graduate students help to support the literacy and literary needs of the Honors College and General Education (with English faculty having oversight of Humanities courses). The undergraduate program, then, stands out for its involvement in university-wide initiatives, for its meeting the needs of programs within the College of Liberal Arts and without in writing, technology, and literature. Additionally, the undergraduate program continues to meet the needs of students wishing to discover more about writing poetry, fiction, and creative non-fiction, as the creative-writing component of the department continues to grow, offering courses in Port Townsend Centrum event, readings throughout the country, and an active, popular Visiting Writers Series.

The graduate program's recognition is evident in the numbers of queries and applications that are submitted, both in rhetoric and composition studies and in more-traditional literary fields. Our applications for admission are up 17% in 2003 for fall 2004 enrollment. Once through the programs, students find ready placement in community colleges as well as in private industry. This year alone has seen the successful placement at Evergreen State College, California State University at Sacramento, and University of Hawaii at Hilo, to name a few. Students enter the marketplace with special fluency in digital instruction—both among literature faculty and among writing faculty—and with special fluency in theories concerning people of color and women. Ours is a strong graduate faculty.

Yet despite the strong reputations Department of English faculty enjoy throughout the country and abroad, faculty teaching loads remain high at five courses per year. Ratios of SCH/FTE reflect the needs of the curriculum to maintain smaller classes commensurate with writing-intensive courses. The Department does not and cannot run large lecture sections, yet we serve the needs of the entire university in our teaching.

Appendix 2: Faculty Comparisons Washington State University compares itself to the following 22 institutions. Each is a land-grant school with a vet med program. The Washington state legislature recognizes these schools as WSU's peers. UO and UW are here for regional comparison.

	Full-Time Faculty	Literature	Rhetoric & Comp.	Linguistics	Creative Writing
Auburn University (PhD English Studies; MA English; Master of Technical and Professional Communication)	36	28	4	2	2
Colorado State U. (MFA Creative Writing; MA Communication Development; MA English Education; MA in Literature; MA in Rhet & Comp; MA in TESL/TEFL (multiple))	45.5	23	6.5	7	9
Cornell U. ⁱ MFA Creative Writing, PhD English Language and Literature	51	45	0	0	6
Iowa State U MA English (Creative Writing, Literature); MA RCPC (Rhetoric, Comp & Professional Communication); MA in TESL; PhD in Rhetoric and Professional Communication	68	26	24	9	9
Kansas State U. MA English (Creative Writing; Cultural Studies; Language, Rhet & Comp; British or American Literature)	37	23	9	2	3
Louisiana State U. MA English, MFA Creative Writing; PhD English	49	39	5	1	4
Michigan State U. MA English, PhD English; MA Digital Rhetoric and Professional Writing; PhD in Rhetoric and Writing (in separate Department of Writing, Rhetoric and American Cultures (38 tenure-line faculty))	51	37	6	4	4
Mississippi St. U. ⁱⁱ MA English	20	14	0	2	4
North Carolina St. U. MA English; MS Technical Communication; MFA Creative Writing; PhD in Communication Rhetoric and Digital Media (new, interdisciplinary with Communication Department)	62	42	11	2	7
Ohio State U. ⁱⁱⁱ MA English; MFA Creative Writing; PhD English	68	48	9	2	9
Oklahoma State U. MA, PhD in English (all periods of British and American literature, Native American literature and language, creative writing, literary theory and criticism, film, rhetoric and professional writing, composition and rhetoric, linguistics, and teaching English as a second language (TESL).)	34	22	4	4	4
Purdue U.	61	38	13	6	4

MFA Creative Writing; MA & PhD Literary Studies; MA & PhD in Rhet&Comp' PhD Theory & Cultural Studies; MA & PhD ESL & Linguistics

Texas A&M	53	41	5.5	3.5	3
MA, PhD English Literature, American Literature, Rhetoric and Composition, Linguistics, Creative Writing, Discourse Studies, and Women's Studies					
UC Davis ^{iv}	36	29.5	1.5	0	5
MA Creative Writing; PhD Literature					
U. of Florida	60	43	5	3	9
MFA Creative Writing; MA, PhD English					
U. of Georgia	52	37	4	7	4
MA, PhD English; MAT English					
U. of Illinois ^v	54	39.5	5.5	0	9
MFA Creative Writing; MA, PhD Literature; MA, PhD Writing Studies					
U. of Minnesota	41	28	3	1.5	8.5
MFA Creative Writing; MA, PhD English					
U. of Missouri	42	28	4	3	7
MA, PhD English					
U. of Tennessee	42	31.5	5	2	3.5
MA English; MA Writing; PhD English, PhD Creative					
U. of Wisconsin	55	34.5	5	7	8.5
MA English (literature, applied English linguistics); PhD literature, comp&rhet, language & linguistics					
Virginia Tech	33	22.5	5.5	2	3
MFA Creative Writing; MA Textual Studies					
U. of Oregon ^{vi}	34	32	2	0	0
MA English; MA English-Film Studies; PhD English-Film Studies, Folklore, Literature, Medieval Studies, Rhet & Comp					
U of Washington ^{vii}	58	42	4	3	9
MA English literature & language; MAT; MAT ESL; MFA Creative writing; PhD English Literature and Language (areas of study within literature and language: Language and Rhetoric, Critical Theory, Textual Studies, Medieval and Early Modern, Restoration/Eighteenth Century, Romantic/Victorian, Modern/Postmodern/Cultural Studies, American Literature)					
Washington State^{viii}	31.5	18	11	1	1.5

Appendix 3: The New Major

We have four goals for our program, which lie at the heart of our larger concern of how to best serve WSU's undergraduate students:

1. **update our program**
2. **simplify it**
3. **showcase faculty strengths**
4. **make it more attractive as an undergraduate major**

The Five Year Plan and the proposal for the new major passed on 4 May 2004 listed these common outcomes:

- Ability to read and think critically about complex literary and cultural texts.
- Facility with the specialized terminology of literary and rhetorical forms.
- Understanding of the historical, cultural, political, and aesthetic contexts that inform literary [and cultural] texts [in various media].
- Familiarity with methods and resources of research in the [field].
- Ability to synthesize these knowledges by writing in a variety of forms (interpretive, professional, creative), using appropriate technologies, for a variety of audiences.

STRUCTURE AND RATIONALE FOR NEW MAJOR

I. Lower Division Entry Course (3 credits; required, all options)

A. Transfer, junior-level students, and others declaring the major could enter the major with an Introduction to Literature course, a second-level writing course such as Engl 201 Writing and Research, Engl 251 Introduction to Creative Writing, or another lower-division offering (Engl 150 Introduction to Film as Narrative; Engl 2XX: Introduction to Shakespeare [under development], a lower-division World or Anglophone literature or Humanities offering, etc)

B. First and second-year Pullman campus students would be offered an "Introduction to English Studies" GER course, team-taught with lecture and discussion sections, featuring lively samples of the range of issues and subject matters and skills offered in the major's options. The course would be on the broad model of other departments' introductory GER field courses (Com 101, Psych 101, Soc 101, for example) and replace Engl 209/210.

II. Upper-Division Gateway Course (3 credits; required, all options).

Suggested title: "English Studies: Theory and Practice." This upper-division gateway course would be a theoretically informed common foundation for students in all four options and would replace Engl 302: Writing About Literature [W, M], our current gateway course. Ideally team taught, the course would cover the range of disciplines and subject areas in the new major (textually and culturally grounded literary studies, pedagogy and literacy/linguistic studies, creative writing, rhetoric and discourse studies, and professional writing. Ideally team-taught in writing-intensive sections, this gateway course would potentially feature outcomes similar to those for the major as a whole.

III. Four Upper-Division Readings Courses (12 credit hours): Transnational Literatures in English Sequence

All four courses to be required in (I) Literary Studies option; number required for (II) English Teaching, (III) Creative Writing, and (IV) Professional Writing and Rhetoric options to be determined.

The sequence imagines a four-course core that situates literatures in English in their multiple, often conflicted, histories. Rather than assume singular, hermetic nationalist histories of "British" and "American" literature--in which writers of color and transcultural literatures frequently occupy a peripheral role at best--this sequence would focus on literature within the processes of cultural contact, movement, and exchange. Special attention would also be paid to the social, political, and cultural forces that have constituted "British" and "American" literatures as objects of study.

The sequence does not pretend to an idea of comprehensive "coverage"; rather, each course would explore a number of issues and problems that are staged within literary and cultural texts in the historical range under consideration. The study of language, aesthetics, and literary/rhetorical forms within their cultural, historical, and political contexts will be a central feature of all four courses. The topics listed as bullets are indicative rather than inclusive.

IV. Upper-Division Elective Courses, Various Options (18-27 credit hours)

In all options, total credit hours available for designing requirement selections and groupings depend upon number of the readings courses that are required.

Literary Studies Option

18 additional credit hours would match 36 total of current General Major; presumably these would involve some selection of six upper-division courses in literature including Shakespeare, Humanities, cultural rhetoric, literary criticism, special topics/genres, and a senior capstone experience. Also see section VI below.

English Teaching Option

If all four readings courses are required, then 27 additional credits would be available if current 45 credit-hour total in English Teaching is retained. Presumably these would include a version of current required set of credential/method-related courses (Engl 325 Young Adult Lit., Engl 326 Grammar for Teachers, Engl 323 Teaching English, and Engl 324 Comp./Rhetoric for Teachers) plus an additional 15 selected from literature, linguistics, world lit, creative writing, etc.)

Creative Writing Option

Requirements would be basically as currently designed, substituting new gateway course for Engl 302; it is recommended that the proposed 20th/21st-century readings course be included as one of option's four required upper-division literature courses.

Professional Writing and Rhetoric Option

Option to be designed (see below). It is suggested that two of the above readings courses be required and that students emphasize one of two tracks, while selecting courses from both.

V. As part of above option sequences, redesign senior capstone experience to create a system of undergraduate research, internship, and advanced writing opportunities relevant to students' chosen emphases.

VI. It was originally suggested that we retain a version of the Engls 380-389 sequence (three American literature and seven English/British literature courses) by renumbering these literary history courses at the 400 level. However, now that we have begun designing these four transnational literatures in English sequence as 300-level courses, it has been suggested that these replace the 380-389 sequence and we teach a series of topics courses at the 400 level.

VII. Consider conjointly listing 400 level courses with comparable graduate seminars and teaching them on alternate-year rotation as advanced "readings" courses enrolling both undergraduates and graduate students. Conjoint classes are an efficient mechanism for offering advanced courses while avoiding current enrollment problems in graduate seminars. Literature and English Teaching option students would have opportunities to elect advanced courses in particular literary periods; and the graduate program could predictably offer M.A. students such courses on a regular basis. (M.A. students would presumably take a fair number of such readings courses in fulfilling distribution requirements; Ph.D. students would take those helpful for exam and special area preparation while concentrating their course work in research seminars. This suggestion has been reviewed but not approved by the Graduate Studies Committee.)

WORK IN PROGRESS

Starting fall 2004, we set up small group taskforces now in the process of designing six new courses and one new option. We will submit our new courses and option to the catalog committee for temporary status by December 1, 2004 and will advise students into these courses for Fall 2005. We will revise these courses over the next ten months and submit them to the catalog committee by October 1, 2005 for permanent status.

I. Introduction and Gateway Group

One committee to plan and design two courses:

Course 1: "INTRODUCTION TO ENGLISH STUDIES"

Introduce students to the range of subjects and skills in the department.

Reflect the strength and diversity of the English Department
GER course. Replaces English 209-210.

Course 2: GATEWAY "ENGLISH STUDIES, THEORY AND PRACTICE"

Writing intensive (listed as W and M course in the catalog). Cover subject areas of new major: literary studies, literacy studies, creative writing, and professional writing.

Textually/culturally grounded. Reflect the strength and diversity of the English Department.
Replace English 302.

II. Transnational Literatures in English Groups

Situate literary and cultural texts in their multiple, often conflicted, histories. Focus on literature within the processes of cultural contact, movement, and exchange that challenges the singular,

hermetic nationalist histories of "British" and "American" in which writers of color frequently occupy a peripheral role. Consider the social, political, and cultural forces that have constituted "British" and "American" literatures as objects of study. Does not assume comprehensive "coverage."

Four committees to plan and design one course each:

Course 1: THE MAKING OF "ENGLISH": LITERATURE, LANGUAGE AND CULTURE BEFORE 1600

- Rise of vernaculars/politics of language use
- Forms of nationhood: literature and the formation of an "English" culture
- Negotiations between England, the "Celtic fringe," and the European continent
- Literary and cultural representations of--and from--the Americas
- Literature and religious crisis
- Literature and the market: patronage, print, and performance
- Medieval Rhetorics

Course 2: 17th- AND 18th-CENTURY TRANSATLANTIC LITERATURES

- Enlightenment universalism and cultural particularism
- The novel as a social form
- Tradition, revolution, and resistance in Britain and the Americas
- The Black Atlantic and the middle passage
- Imagining the world: literatures of exploration, colonization, and travel

Course 3: 19th-CENTURY LITERATURES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE AND THE AMERICAS

- Literatures of contact in Africa and the American West
- Literature of the country and city: urbanism, industrialization, mechanization, concepts of space and place
- Gender, domesticity, and the separation of spheres
- Romanticism and Transcendentalism
- Emerging regional literatures; literatures by American writers of color
- Literature and science

Course 4: 20th- AND 21st-CENTURY GLOBAL LITERATURES IN ENGLISH

- Literature in the age of mass culture and information technologies
- Modernity and postmodernity
- Literature and changing gendered and sexual identities
- Literature and social movements
- Ethnic, postcolonial, diasporic literatures

III. Professional Writing and Rhetoric Group

Will replace English/Business and English/Pre-Law options in "old" major.

Use to recruit business and pre-law students by recommending minors in philosophy, political science, business.

One group to create a new option to the English undergraduate major and to plan and design new courses.

Require two Transnational Readings courses. Students emphasize one of two tracks—professional writing or rhetoric/culture—while selecting courses from both. Professional writing (draw on current courses such as Engl 355 Multimedia Authoring, Engl 356 Electronic Research, Engl 402 Technical and Professional Writing, Engl/Am St 475 Digital Diversity, as well as new courses in process of redesign in language and linguistics and in process of approval for DTC -- Engl 340: Language, Texts, and Technology, Engl 455: Advanced Multimedia Authoring, Engl 480: Rhetorics of Information, Engl 4XX: Usability and Interface Design). Rhetoric and Culture (draw on current courses such as Engl 301 Rhetorical Conventions, Engl 401 History of Rhetoric--to be renumbered at 300 level and retitled "Principles of Rhetoric"--Engl 308 Lit. Criticism; new 300-level courses in Rhetoric and Race, in Civic Rhetorics, in Forensic Rhetoric and the Law; and Engl/CES 405/410 Cultural Criticism and Theory).

Appendix 4: UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM IN ENGLISH: SELF-STUDY, FALL 2002

I. OVERVIEW OF POST-1992 PROGRAM CHANGES IN THE ENGLISH MAJOR

In the spring and fall of 1997, the Department of English began a reevaluation of the undergraduate program in English by surveying faculty, currently enrolled Pullman campus English majors, and requirements at other colleges and universities. On the basis of these data, of changing faculty interests and strengths, and of departmental concern with a decline in certified majors since 1992, the Undergraduate Studies Committee proposed and the department approved in spring 1998 a major revision in the curriculum, which was phased in beginning in the fall of that year on the Pullman and Vancouver campuses (the latter, which offers primarily the General and the Teaching options in the major, is just beginning to develop an assessment process and will be included in future self-studies).

The new curriculum abandoned a long-standing “coverage” model for the major, one heavy in required survey courses, in favor of requirements that focused on core skills and knowledges and that provided majors the flexibility to build a concentration of four courses (including a senior seminar or project or internship) in a particular area of intellectual interest. Concentration areas were broadly defined to include English literature, American literature, the novel or drama, World literature/Humanities, writers of color, literature and gender identity, literature and cultural studies, language and linguistics, and professional or creative writing and rhetoric.

Whatever area of concentration a major elected, the revised curriculum’s core requirements emphasized the following outcomes: high-level skills in writing and critical reading and thinking, knowledge of a range of English and American literature in different genres and time periods, ability to apply various critical/theoretical approaches to understanding written discourse, knowledge of debates over canon construction, experience in studying literature within historical and cultural contexts, and knowledge of contributions by writers of color. Foundation course guidelines designed around these outcomes were established for the major’s introductory literature courses and for Engl 302 Writing about Literature, classes required of all majors (please consult the guidelines for these “Foundation Courses,” available online to majors, at <http://libarts.wsu.edu/english/undergraduate/foundation.html>).

The new requirements continued to offer majors the opportunity to pursue preprofessional interests in business, publishing, law, teaching, and other fields; the formal preprofessional catalog options in 1998 included Graduate School Preparation, English Teaching, English Pre-Law, and English/Business. In response to changes in Washington State certification requirements, a revision of the English Teaching option, for which a “Teaching Concentration” was defined, was completed in spring 2001. In response to the growth of interest and a planned addition to the tenure-track faculty in creative writing, a new option in the field of Creative Writing was added in spring 2002 (requirements for these various tracks may be reviewed online at <http://libarts.wsu.edu/english/undergraduate/optionreqs.html>). Finally, the General Studies track in Electronic Media and Culture, which the English Department administers on the Pullman campus and with which its faculty are heavily involved on the Vancouver and Tri-Cities campuses, remains in the development stages in relationship to the English major curriculum.

II. Effects of Curriculum Changes on Enrollments

The effects of the revisions in the major on Pullman enrollments are unclear. Certainly the decline in certified majors the department had experienced from 1992 to 1998 leveled off in 1999—officially the data list 183 or 184 certified English majors in each year from 1999 to

2001. While there was no significant growth in first majors under the new curriculum through 2001, there may have been in students pursuing second majors or second degrees in those years (we note here that the university data for majors have never included students pursuing second majors, and typically not students pursuing second degrees because the latter generally begin simply by declaring the second major).

In the current academic year (2002-2003), the department's own data suggest modest growth in enrollments on the Pullman campus is underway. As of October 2002, there were 200 active, on-campus first majors and an additional 19 second major or second degree candidates, as well as approximately 9 Electronic Media and Culture General Studies majors.

Please also note that the above figures may significantly understate the actual number of majors who will complete the degree. Thus there are 11 English majors not included in the above totals who are off campus, have filed all materials for graduation, but still lack a few credit hours needed for graduation. In addition, the department tracks certified majors who have been recently enrolled but are no longer at WSU, have not yet declared for graduation, but evidently plan to complete their English degrees through the university (students in this category can include those who study aboard without WSU enrollment, those who have temporarily stopped enrolling for financial reasons, etc). The department finds that such students often return and often require advising help before they do so. The following lists them by the semester of their last regular enrollment since the fall of 2000:

Spring 2002:	8
Fall 2001:	3
Sum 2001:	3
Spring 2001	10
Fall 2000	12

III. Assessment of New Curriculum by Graduating Seniors

Since the implementation of the new requirements, the department has asked each graduating major on the Pullman campus to complete a comprehensive "Exit Questionnaire." The questionnaire, and a summary analysis of responses from 129 students who have or are graduating under the new requirements, are reproduced in Attachment I. As is reported therein, 86% of respondents indicated that their level of satisfaction with the major was 'strong' or 'outstanding.' When each of these graduating seniors was asked to assess his or her command of the various skills and knowledges specified as outcomes of the major, the average response across all items was 'strong.' In spite of these clear indicators of an effective program, other items on the questionnaire suggest the need to re-evaluate faculty advising, to re-examine the balance in the requirements between English and American literature and writing/rhetoric courses, and to re-consider the levels of choice that can be supported in the face of increasingly scarce faculty resources and the increasing demand for new areas like creative writing.

IV. Assessment of Current Offerings by Fall 2002 Students

For this self-study, the end-of-program "Exit Questionnaire" assessment results were supplemented with a synchronic survey of Pullman students (majors and nonmajors alike) enrolled in core English course offerings in the fall of 2002. The survey questionnaire and a summary of its results are included in Attachment II. Indications of majors' desire for

improved advising and additional flexibility in requirements seems to reinforce the information summarized in Attachment I. The responses to the fall 2002 survey from majors and nonmajors alike indicate continued demand for (and desire for additional choices in) courses in creative writing, recent literature, rhetorical and literary theory, cultural studies, linguistics, and a wide range of other areas—all difficult demands to meet in an era of shrinking resources.

ATTACHMENT I: English Major Exit Questionnaire Responses

Exit questionnaires from graduates of the revised undergraduate curriculum, which students could begin in the fall of 1998, have been systematically but not exhaustively collected since the spring of 2000. The following summary, representing students who have graduated or plan to do so by December 2002, was compiled by Melissa Baty for the Undergraduate Studies Committee and outlines responses from a total of 129 senior English majors. A copy of the questionnaire, which is designed to assess the curriculum's goals and planned outcomes, is included at the end of this attachment.

Part I of the questionnaire consists of 12 questions asking students to assess the skills and knowledges they have gained from the major, with particular emphasis on the writing skills, critical perspectives, and literary breadth central to the program's design. For purposes of tabulation each of the five available responses to these questions was assigned a numerical value (ranging from 1 'not at all' to 5 'outstanding'). As shown in the following table, none of the responses to individual questions averaged below 4 ('strong'). Granting the limitations of self-assessment, the results imply that our graduates believe the program is successful in giving them the skills and knowledges it attempts to provide. Note however that the most recent graduates (43 students) assessed their overall skills and knowledges at a combined average level of 3.9, a result marginally below the 4.2 average of the first 29 students who did the same self-assessment in the spring and fall of 2000. If the change is statistically significant, it could be the product of increasing rigor in our majors' standards of self-evaluation, insofar as the overall level of satisfaction with the major has remained remarkably high (see responses to Question 4 below).

In addition to the above self-assessment, students were asked to evaluate their opportunities to study topics and writers they preferred. Thirty-six percent ranked such opportunities as 'strong or outstanding,' while 42% designated them 'adequate.' For those students who did not designate an option within the major, 34% chose minimal in response to this question.

Part II of the questionnaire asks students to assess three general aspects of the undergraduate English program--faculty advising, quality of teaching and course design, the relevance of preparation within specific options--as well as their overall satisfaction with the major. It provides room for comments in regard to these questions, and separately asks which feature(s) of the major students found most rewarding. On more recent questionnaires, students are also asked to indicate their short and long-term postgraduation career plans.

Question 1: Quality/Usefulness of Faculty Advising

Overall, 70% of students assessed advising as 'strong' or 'outstanding.' While a majority of students in each of the major's options assessed their advising at these levels, for the English Teaching students the margin was slim (52%).

Suggestions and praise fell into a variety of categories. Out of those students volunteering comments, areas of discontent included being shuffled among many advisors (14 responses), advisors' lack of knowledge of requirements (10), and inadequate time spent by the advisor (8).

Twenty students specifically stated they were pleased with the helpfulness of their advisors; general praise went to the office staff for their help, particularly Liz Sanders (staff coordinator for undergraduate programs), and many students credited Alex Hammond (Director of Undergraduate Studies) for ensuring their timely graduation. Suggestions included assigning students to advisors within their option, keeping advisors aware of changes in requirements, and providing more help for transfer students.

Question 2: Quality of Teaching/Course Design

All responses to this question fell into the ‘adequate’ or higher levels. Sixty-eight percent of students designated ‘strong’ as their response.

In their comments, students often indicated that primary sources of satisfaction were professors (enthusiasm and/or knowledge; 20 responses) and depth of course material (10 responses). They also provided a variety of reasons for dissatisfaction. The latter included minimal interaction/communication in classes (4), a lack of interaction outside of the classroom (such as in office hours; 3 responses), and the ineffectiveness of graduate students’ teaching in upper-division courses (2). Suggestions for improvement included more courses in teacher preparation and methods (from 4 secondary education students), more seminar-based courses (4 responses), and student input into the material covered in classes (3).

Question 3: Relevance of Additional Requirements in Preprofessional Options

This question asked students in the Graduate Study Preparation, English/Teaching, English/Pre-Law, and English/Business Options to assess the relevance of requirements to career goals. Of 59 students responding, 39% felt the relevance to be strong and 36% felt it adequate. Few students had comments or suggestions in this area; those who did were specific. In the business option there were two suggestions: more technical writing and more class choices beneficial to those seeking an MBA. In pre-law, two students suggested more logic and ethics requirements. Grad-prep students gave praise to the literary theory course. Within the English/Teaching option, students suggested that more courses specifically address how to teach high school literature (3) and techniques on how to teach writing at the middle-school levels (2). They also suggested better communication between the Teaching & Learning and English departments (2). Three students in this option would like to see the requirement of Engl 300 Computers in English dropped because of the elementary level of the skills emphasized in the course.

Question 4: Overall Satisfaction with the Major

In response to this question, 86% indicated that their level of satisfaction was ‘strong’ or ‘outstanding,’ while 12.5% specified ‘adequate’ and 1.5% ‘minimal. Many students offered no comments/suggestions or simply made generic statements of satisfaction and/or praise. While overall satisfaction dominated, students provided a wide variety of ideas to improve the experience within the major; a sampling of the recurring suggestions includes more courses featuring modern writers (6 responses), more writers-of-color courses (4), and more offerings in creative writing (3). Other responses ranged from requests for more courses aimed at the writing process, for more American literature courses, and for more professionally based courses to requests for less emphasis on canonical literature and less on literature. About 3 students responded with specific topic suggestions.

Final Question: Most Rewarding Feature(s) of the Major

The answers to this open-ended question varied widely, but by far the most common response designated the interaction the students had with the staff and faculty (32 responses) as the most rewarding feature of the program. Other common responses included the knowledge of literature gained (13) and the opportunity to improve writing skills (11). Other responses included the following (the list is a sampling): opportunity to improve critical thinking ability, small class sizes, discussion-based course formats, the range of choices available to fulfill requirements, and the realization of how English connects with other disciplines.

Career Plans: On Exit Questionnaires distributed beginning late fall of 2001, the Undergraduate Studies Committee has included an additional question requesting students to indicate their short term and long term career plans following graduation. Although the question appeared on the last 43 Exit Questionnaires returned to the department, only a few respondents answered both parts of the question, several responded with multiple options, and some gave no response at all.

Short term:

A year off, then graduate school: 4

MBA: 1

Literary job: 1

MFA: 1

Graduate School: 9

Computer-based work: 1

Publishing: 3

Editing: 1

Technical writer: 3

Professional writer: 1

Teaching: 5

Wildlife officer: 1

Church pastor: 1

Unsure: 1

Vacation: 1

Any employment: 1

Law school: 2

Long term:

Writer: 5

Graduate school: 4

Professor: 3

Return to earn another degree: 4

Actor: 1

Superintendent: 1

[Summaries prepared by Melissa Baty]

Attachment I: English Major Exit Questionnaire Responses

ENGLISH MAJOR OPTION	OVERALL SELF ASSESSMENT: SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE	OPPORTUNITY TO STUDY PREFERRED TOPICS	FACULTY ADVISING	TEACHING, COURSE DESIGN
Business (11)	4.1	Not at all: Minimal: 2 Adequate: 3 Strong: 4 Outstanding:	Very poor: Minimal: 2 Adequate: 3 Strong: 5 Outstanding: 1	Very poor: Minimal: 2 Adequate: 5 Strong: 4 Outstanding:
Creative Writing (2)	4.3	Not at all: Minimal: Adequate: 1 Strong: Outstanding: 1	Very poor: Minimal: Adequate: Strong: 2 Outstanding:	Very poor: Minimal: Adequate: Strong: 2 Outstanding:
General (26)	4.3	Not at all: Minimal: 6 Adequate: 10 Strong: 9 Outstanding: 2	Very poor: Minimal: 2 Adequate: 6 Strong: 12 Outstanding: 6	Very poor: Minimal: Adequate: 4 Strong: 16 Outstanding: 7
Grad. School Prep. (10)	4.3	Not at all: Minimal: Adequate: 5 Strong: 4 Outstanding: 1	Very poor: Minimal: Adequate: 2 Strong: 4 Outstanding: 4	Very poor: Minimal: Adequate: Strong: 8 Outstanding: 2
Pre-Law (11)	4.1	Not at all: Minimal: 1 Adequate: 7 Strong: 1 Outstanding: 2	Very poor: Minimal: 1 Adequate: 2 Strong: 7 Outstanding: 1	Very poor: Minimal: Adequate: 4 Strong: 6 Outstanding: 1
Prof. Writing (4)	4.4	Not at all: Minimal: Adequate: 2 Strong: 2 Outstanding:	Very poor: Minimal: 1 Adequate: 2 Strong: 1 Outstanding:	Very poor: Minimal: Adequate: Strong: 4 Outstanding:
Secondary Ed. (27)	4.0	Not at all: Minimal: 4 Adequate: 14 Strong: 7 Outstanding: 2	Very poor: Minimal: 5 Adequate: 8 Strong: 8 Outstanding: 6	Very poor: Minimal: Adequate: 2 Strong: 22 Outstanding: 2
None Designated (38)	4.1	Not at all: Minimal: 13 Adequate: 12 Strong: 11 Outstanding: 2	Very poor: 1 Minimal: 2 Adequate: 3 Strong: 16 Outstanding: 16	Very poor: Minimal: Adequate: 9 Strong: 24 Outstanding: 5
TOTALS: (129)	4.2	Not at all: Minimal: 26 Adequate: 54 Strong: 37 Outstanding: 10	Very poor: 1 Minimal: 13 Adequate: 26 Strong: 55 Outstanding: 34	Very poor: Minimal: Adequate: 21 Strong: 88 Outstanding: 20

ENGLISH MAJOR OPTION	RELEVANCE TO CAREER GOALS	OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH MAJOR
Business	Not at all: Minimal: 5 Adequate: 5 Strong: 6 Outstanding:	Not at all: Minimal: 2 Adequate: 2 Strong: 5 Outstanding: 4
Creative Writing	Not at all: Minimal: 1 Adequate: 1 Strong: 1 Outstanding:	Not at all: Minimal: 1 Adequate: 1 Strong: 1 Outstanding: 1
General	Not at all: Minimal: 2 Adequate: 3 Strong: 16 Outstanding: 5	Not at all: Minimal: 2 Adequate: 3 Strong: 16 Outstanding: 5
Grad. School Prep.	Not at all: Minimal: 3 Adequate: 3 Strong: 3 Outstanding: 4	Not at all: Minimal: 3 Adequate: 3 Strong: 5 Outstanding: 5
Pre-Law	Not at all: Minimal: 1 Adequate: 2 Strong: 7 Outstanding: 1	Not at all: Minimal: 4 Adequate: 4 Strong: 3 Outstanding: 4
Prof. Writing	Not at all: Minimal: 1 Adequate: 1 Strong: 1 Outstanding:	Not at all: Minimal: 1 Adequate: 1 Strong: 4 Outstanding:
Secondary Ed.	Not at all: Minimal: 2 Adequate: 11 Strong: 7 Outstanding: 7	Not at all: Minimal: 2 Adequate: 2 Strong: 18 Outstanding: 7
None Designated	Not at all: Minimal: 5 Adequate: 5 Strong: 26 Outstanding: 7	Not at all: Minimal: 5 Adequate: 5 Strong: 26 Outstanding: 7
TOTALS: (60 total under career goals question)	Not at all: Minimal: 3 Adequate: 21 Strong: 24 Outstanding: 12	Not at all: Minimal: 2 Adequate: 16 Strong: 78 Outstanding: 33

**ATTACHMENT I (CONTINUED): ENGLISH MAJOR PORTFOLIO
EXIT QUESTIONNAIRE (CONFIDENTIAL UNTIL AFTER GRADUATION)**

Name: _____ **Concentration** _____ **Option** _____

PLEASE EVALUATE YOUR COMMAND OF THE FOLLOWING SKILLS:

1. Ability to use a range of methods of analysis in analytical writing:

Not at all	Minimal	Adequate	Strong	Outstanding
------------	---------	----------	--------	-------------

2. Ability to integrate primary and secondary source material into critical arguments:

Not at all	Minimal	Adequate	Strong	Outstanding
------------	---------	----------	--------	-------------

3. Mastery of standards of quality in prose style and final editing:

Not at all	Minimal	Adequate	Strong	Outstanding
------------	---------	----------	--------	-------------

4. Mastery of needs and expectations of professional audiences:

Not at all	Minimal	Adequate	Strong	Outstanding
------------	---------	----------	--------	-------------

5. Ability to write well-focused, well-organized, well-supported, and well-argued essays:

Not at all	Minimal	Adequate	Strong	Outstanding
------------	---------	----------	--------	-------------

6. Understanding of critical perspectives used in study of literary and related forms of discourse.

Not at all	Minimal	Adequate	Strong	Outstanding
------------	---------	----------	--------	-------------

7. Understanding of how theoretical and ideological assumptions shape interpretation:

Not at all	Minimal	Adequate	Strong	Outstanding
------------	---------	----------	--------	-------------

8. Awareness of important tools for and uses of research in literary and cultural study

Not at all	Minimal	Adequate	Strong	Outstanding
------------	---------	----------	--------	-------------

9. Awareness of the standards and ethics governing the use of others' ideas and findings

Not at all	Minimal	Adequate	Strong	Outstanding
------------	---------	----------	--------	-------------

PLEASE ASSESS YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE FOLLOWING AREAS:

1. English and American Literature by diverse voices from various genres and periods:

Not at all Minimal Adequate Strong Outstanding

2. Cultural, historical, and aesthetic rationales for reading selections in literature courses:

Not at all Minimal Adequate Strong Outstanding

3. Subject matter and understandings demanded by your Area of Concentration in the major:

Not at all Minimal Adequate Strong Outstanding

EVALUATE OPPORTUNITIES IN MAJOR TO STUDY THE TOPICS/WRITERS YOU PREFER:

Not at all Minimal Adequate Strong Outstanding

EXIT QUESTIONNAIRE (PAGE 2) NAME: _____

PLEASE ASSESS THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS OF THE ENGLISH MAJOR:

1. (Students in all options) Level of quality and usefulness of the faculty advising you received:

Very Poor Minimal Adequate Strong Outstanding

COMMENTS ON STRENGTHS, SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT, IN ADVISING:

2. (Students in all options) Overall quality of teaching and course design in your courses for the major (exclude any non-English courses that may be required by your option):

Very Poor Minimal Adequate Strong Outstanding

COMMENTS ON STRENGTHS, SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT, IN TEACHING:

3. For students in Graduate Study Preparation, English/Teaching, English/Pre-Law, and English/Business options, the relevance of additional option requirements for your career goals:

Not at all Minimal Adequate Strong Outstanding

COMMENTS ON STRENGTHS, SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT, IN OPTIONS:

4. (Students in all options) Overall satisfaction with the English major:

Not at all Minimal Adequate Strong Outstanding

COMMENTS ON STRENGTHS, SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

WHAT FEATURE(S) OF THE UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR DID YOU FIND MOST REWARDING? WHAT ARE YOUR POST-GRADUATION PLANS, BOTH SHORT AND LONG TERM?

ATTACHMENT II: English Department Undergraduate Survey Responses, Fall 2002
 [Compiled by Melissa Baty for the Undergraduate Studies Committee]

The attached survey, designed by the Undergraduate Studies Committee in consultation with the Undergraduate English Club, was distributed during the week of October 21 by English Department faculty and instructors who were teaching 57 classes on the Pullman Campus (multi-section composition classes were excluded). 27 classes returned the survey. The responses came from 174 English majors representing all options/concentrations, 43 English minors, and 313 non-English majors (the large number of the latter due to the various sections of Humanities 101 and 103 included in the survey). Of those who designated a major outside of English, not including “undeclared” students, approximately 39% were associated with the sciences, 29% with the liberal arts, and 32% with business or communication.

Question 1 asked English majors to assess the quality and usefulness of faculty advising in the program. 23% ranked the advising they received as ‘very poor’ or ‘minimal,’ 33% as ‘adequate,’ and 44% as ‘strong’ or ‘outstanding.’ The students who responded with comments to explain dissatisfaction found fault with the continual shifting around from advisor to advisor; receiving misinformation or no useful information; lack of help for transfer students; difficulty in reaching their advisor in a timely manner; a lack of any knowledge for requirements; being hurried out of the office. Suggestions included: training for advisors regarding requirements and options, having advisors assigned to the specific options within the major, and outreach to transfer students. Two-thirds of the “very poor” responses came from those in secondary education. A general note of praise went to Liz Sanders (staff Coordinator for Undergraduate Programs) for her help, as well as to Alex Hammond (Director of Undergraduate Studies) and Barbara Monroe (Coordinator of English Education).

Question 2 asked majors about satisfaction with the range of courses and areas of study within the major. Fifty-one percent of the students ranked their satisfaction with these elements of the program as ‘strong’ or ‘outstanding’ on this scale.

Specific recurring requests for course topics not now (or rarely) available included literature from the later 20th century, different genres (like science fiction), Beat generation, Old English literature, Russian literature, world literature, as well as courses dealing with specific playwrights and drama and courses combining the study of artistic movements and literature. A sampling of courses not offered with sufficient frequency included grammar, creative writing, film and literature, and teaching-oriented, computer-oriented, and required courses offered only in alternate semesters. Other common requests were to require less British literature and more recent literature (7 specific requests). While mostly satisfied, nearly every student had suggestions for new course topics.

Question 3 asked majors to assess the various feedback mechanisms available to them in the department. (courses evaluations, complaint procedures, and representation on the Undergraduate Studies Committee). Surprisingly, 86 percent of responses indicated at least an adequate satisfaction with the devices in place; however, 39 suggestions were made for possible improvements as well. Many students responded favorably to the suggestion of a listserv for announcements and information about the English Department. Other responses included a

suggestion/comment box in the office, a newsletter either via email or class hand-outs, instructors giving information, well-publicized open meetings, a website for suggestions, a student-selected course each semester by vote, mid-semester course evaluations, and open-ended course evaluations rather than a numerical scale. A general concern of those who took the time to make suggestions was that they felt they would not be heard and no action would be taken; in one student's words, "We don't need more ways to complain, we need more results from the complaints."

Questions 4-6 addressed both English majors and anyone taking an English/Humanities course in which the survey was given.

Question 4 asked students to specify which English and Humanities courses the students were currently enrolled in and why. [English majors and minors frequently were enrolled in too many courses concurrently to make tabulating efficient; non-majors were simpler to count.]

a. The response of English majors:

Of those who answered, 98 indicated they were taking their current classes to complete requirements. Some of these students also were in the group of 46 who indicated they were in at least one class they chose primarily for their interest in it. The English majors who had not yet determined their concentration or did not designate it on the survey were the only group to have a higher percentage of enrollment in classes for interest rather than requirement.

b. The response of English minors:

Of those who answered, 17 chose their class primarily based on requirement (note that , except for students in professional writing, English minors have open choice of which classes to take; with requirements emphasizing only the number of credits and level of courses). 18 responses cited interest as their motivation for taking the particular class. Two students enrolled in their courses based on which professor was teaching it.

c. The response of non-English majors:

Of those who answered, 86 designated requirement as to why they chose their course, while 37 chose it based on interest. Lower-division Humanities courses had the highest percentage of students enrolled for interest over requirement. Classes with high numbers of students outside the major this semester (not taking into account the lower-division Humanities) included English 305 / 306 Shakespeare (at least 10 each), English/ Humanities 335 Bible as Lit. (at least 10), English 339 Film as Lit. (at least 16), and English 251 Intro. to Creative Writing (at least 11). Students outside the major and minor reported enrollment in 29 different English and Humanities courses.

Question 5 asked the students about the most enjoyable English or Humanities class they had taken, and the reason why it was so exemplary.

a. The response of English majors:

These responses varied across the entire spectrum of classes; recurring classes designated as favorites included English 305/306 Shakespeare (38 designated one or the other Shakespeare course as their most enjoyable, including a significant 21 secondary education students) and English 302 Writing about Lit. (14 responses). Seventy-one of those responding cited the professor (enthusiasm, knowledge, etc.) as the reason why the course was so exemplary, and 26 specific professors were named for their efforts. A sampling of other reasons for the enjoyment of the course included the student's interest in the subject matter, the discussion format of the course or its good balance of discussion/lecture, the atmosphere, and the small class size.

b. The responses of English minors:

English minors mirrored the majors quite closely; out of the 28 responses, 8 designated one of the Shakespeare courses as their most enjoyable, while the rest of the courses had only one or two recurring designations as favorites. Eight students cited the professor as the reason they enjoyed the course (seven professors were named), and six cited the course topic.

c. The response of non-English majors:

Lower-division English and Humanities were designated as the most enjoyable classes taken by non-majors; 24 different classes were cited at least once. English 335 was cited seven times, English 337 seven times, and English 209 five times. Twenty-seven responses gave the professor as the reason why the course was exemplary; thirteen faculty members were individually named at least once.

Question 6 first asked whether the student would take more English or Humanities courses if given the opportunity; if the reply was affirmative, the students was also asked to designate which category of course he or she would choose. [Students often gave more than one response, which accounts for the higher number of responses than students counted.]

a. *The response of English majors:*

Literature 36	Cultural studies 23
Expository Writing 1	Pedagogy 9
Professional Writing 14	Humanities 23
Creative Writing 59	Linguistics 15
Rhetorical/Literary Theory 25	

Other courses specified by English majors included additional film, proofreading/grammar, and mythology classes, as well as courses in which students could pick the works they studied. Responses from students in each of the concentrations included two or more requests for more creative writing classes.

b. *The response of English minors:*

Literature 15	Cultural studies 4
Expository Writing --	Pedagogy --
Professional Writing 5	Humanities 4
Creative Writing 16	Linguistics 2
Rhetorical/Literary Theory 1	

-Other courses included web-based work to integrate literature and computers.

c. *The responses of non-English majors:*

Literature 40	Cultural studies 42
Expository Writing 3	Pedagogy --
Professional Writing 15	Humanities 42
Creative Writing 90	Linguistics 17
Rhetorical/Literary Theory 13	

Other responses as to what students would like to take included a poetry-specific course or a course focused on playwrights; three responded they would take English 306 Shakespeare [post 1600] due to what they have experienced in English 305; two requested a course on the analysis of children's books. Ninety-two students (29% of non-English major students who responded) stated they would not take another English or Humanities course due to lack of interest or a poor experience in an earlier such course; 12 indicated they would take more courses but were not specific, and eight stated they might do so in the future.

English Department Undergraduate Survey Responses Fall 2002: English Majors

ENGLISH MAJOR OPTION	RESPONSE TO FACULTY ADVISING	RESPONSE TO RANGE OF COURSES/AREAS OF STUDY	RESPONSE TO INPUT MECHANISMS	TOTALS (FOR OVERALL SATISFACTION)
Business (12) Jr: 2 Sr: 8 Transfer/AA: 3	Very poor: 1 Minimal: 1 Adequate: 4 Strong: 5 Outstanding: -	Not at all: 2 Minimal: - Adequate: 5 Strong: 3 Outstanding: 1	Not at all: 2 Minimal: - Adequate: 3 Strong: 5 Outstanding: 1	Not at all: 5 Minimal: 1 Adequate: 12 Strong: 13 Outstanding: 2
Creative Writing (19) 1 st : 1 Soph: 1 Jr: 3 Sr: 9 Transfer/AA: 7	Very poor: 2 Minimal: 2 Adequate: 7 Strong: 7 Outstanding: 1	Not at all: - Minimal: 1 Adequate: 7 Strong: 8 Outstanding: 3	Not at all: - Minimal: 1 Adequate: 9 Strong: 9 Outstanding: -	Not at all: 2 Minimal: 4 Adequate: 23 Strong: 24 Outstanding: 4
General (14) Jr: 2 Sr: 10 Transfer/AA: 4	Very poor: - Minimal: 1 Adequate: 1 Strong: 10 Outstanding: 1	Not at all: - Minimal: 2 Adequate: 6 Strong: 5 Outstanding: -	Not at all: - Minimal: 1 Adequate: 7 Strong: 4 Outstanding: 1	Not at all: - Minimal: 4 Adequate: 14 Strong: 19 Outstanding: 2
Grad. School Prep. (10) Jr: 5 Sr: 2 Transfer/AA: 2	Very poor: - Minimal: 4 Adequate: 2 Strong: 3 Outstanding: 1	Not at all: 2 Minimal: - Adequate: 3 Strong: 4 Outstanding: 1	Not at all: - Minimal: 3 Adequate: 5 Strong: 1 Outstanding: -	Not at all: 2 Minimal: 7 Adequate: 10 Strong: 8 Outstanding: 2
Pre-Law (8) Jr: 3 Sr: 3 Transfer/AA: 1	Very poor: - Minimal: 1 Adequate: 1 Strong: 4 Outstanding: -	Not at all: - Minimal: - Adequate: 3 Strong: 3 Outstanding: -	Not at all: - Minimal: 1 Adequate: 3 Strong: 2 Outstanding: -	Not at all: - Minimal: 2 Adequate: 7 Strong: 9 Outstanding: -
Prof. Writing (5) Sr: 4 Transfer/AA: 3	Very poor: - Minimal: 1 Adequate: 2 Strong: 2 Outstanding: -	Not at all: - Minimal: 1 Adequate: 1 Strong: 3 Outstanding: -	Not at all: - Minimal: 1 Adequate: 3 Strong: 1 Outstanding: -	Not at all: - Minimal: 3 Adequate: 6 Strong: 6 Outstanding: -
Secondary Ed. (64) 1 st : 1 Soph: 13 Jr: 22 Sr/5 th : 17 Transfer/AA: 10	Very poor: 6 Minimal: 9 Adequate: 23 Strong: 16 Outstanding: 7	Not at all: - Minimal: 5 Adequate: 19 Strong: 30 Outstanding: 3	Not at all: 1 Minimal: 7 Adequate: 28 Strong: 17 Outstanding: 3	Not at all: 7 Minimal: 21 Adequate: 70 Strong: 63 Outstanding: 13
None Designated (46) 1 st : 5 Soph: 8 Jr: 4 Sr: 16	Very poor: - Minimal: 11 Adequate: 18 Strong: 15 Outstanding: 4	Not at all: - Minimal: 3 Adequate: 21 Strong: 17 Outstanding: 5	Not at all: 2 Minimal: 3 Adequate: 20 Strong: 13 Outstanding: 3	Not at all: 2 Minimal: 17 Adequate: 59 Strong: 45 Outstanding: 12
TOTALS: (174) 1 st : 7 Soph: 22 Jr: 41 Sr: 69 Transfer/AA: 30	Very poor: 9 Minimal: 30 Adequate: 58 Strong: 62 Outstanding: 14	Not at all: 4 Minimal: 12 Adequate: 65 Strong: 73 Outstanding: 13	Not at all: 5 Minimal: 17 Adequate: 78 Strong: 52 Outstanding: 8	Not at all: 18 Minimal: 59 Adequate: 201 Strong: 187 Outstanding: 35

ATTACHMENT II (CONTINUED): ENGLISH DEPARTMENT UNDERGRADUATE SURVEY

Major: _____ **Option (if any):** _____ **Minor (if any)** _____

WSU class (circle one): First year, Sophomore, Junior, Senior

Number of transfer credits or AA degree (if applicable) _____

FOR ENGLISH MAJORS ONLY:

1. Assess the level of quality and usefulness of the faculty advising you received:
Very Poor Minimal Adequate Strong Outstanding

Comments on strengths, problems, and/or suggestions for improvements :

2. Are you satisfied with the range of courses and areas of study in the major?
Not at all Minimal Adequate Strong Outstanding

What (other) courses, topics, or areas of study would you like offered which are not now available or are not available with sufficient frequency?

- A.** Majors now provide input to the department about the undergraduate English experience through course evaluations, exit-interview responses, and representation on the Undergraduate Studies Committee through the English Club. Are these mechanisms sufficient?
Not at all Minimal Adequate Strong Outstanding

What other means (such as a listserv?) would you like to have available for making suggestions for change or expressing preferences about course offerings to the department?

FOR ALL STUDENTS (USE REVERSE IF NECESSARY):

4. Which English/Humanities classes are you currently taking and why those particular classes?
5. What has been the most enjoyable English/Humanities class you've taken? What made it so exemplary?
6. If you had the opportunity, would you take more English/Humanities courses? If so, in what areas (the department offers courses in literature; expository, professional, and creative writing; rhetorical and literary theory; cultural studies; pedagogy; Humanities; and linguistics)?

Appendix 4: The Revised 101 Program

The following progress has been made to date in revising the English 101 program with the grant funding support received from the Office of Undergraduate Education Spring, 2004. The new program is focused on writing from sources. When a portfolio-based assessment structure was adopted, it was decided that it was necessary to train TA's and instructors for this significant change during Fall, 2004, transitioning to program-wide implementation of the new program during Spring 2005.

Work Completed

- Spring 2004:
 - Proposal emphasizing a writing from sources model of teaching that uses a portfolio-based assessment structure adopted for the new 101 program. Portfolios chosen to support student learning, teacher training, programmatic consistency across 101 sections, and both formative and summative assessment opportunities.
 - Mission statement of new program developed: the 101 program gives students opportunities to understand and practice a research-based writing process and in the development of that process learn about the relationships between language, knowledge, and power.
 - WPA FYC outcomes and WSU critical thinking rubric approved as framework for design and development of assessment rubric for English 101 portfolios.
 - Negotiable/non-negotiable elements of new 101 program established.
 - Textbooks supporting the new 101 program's writing from sources emphasis selected, approved, and adopted: Elaine P. Maimon and Janice H. Peritz, *A Writer's Resource: A Handbook For Writing and Research*. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2003; James D. Lester, *Composing From Sources*. New York: Pearson Longman, 2004.
 - First rubric development workshop completed.
 - TA Training-Teaching Portfolio Assessment model adopted.
 - Learning community links with Gen Ed 110 proposed as an element of the new 101 program.
 - Three TAs (Asao Inoue, Siskanna Naynaha, and Wendy Olson) who helped construct the new 101 program foundations committed to assist with August Orientation and the Weekly 101 staff meetings to implement the new program.
- Summer 2004:
 - New Assistant Director of Composition hired: Beth Buyserie.
 - Learning community links with the WSU General Education program approved by composition committee.
 - Syllabi and curriculum co-constructed by Gen Ed 110 and Engl 101 TA's and instructors for participation in Fall 2004 learning community links.
 - Syllabi for piloting Fall 2004 portfolio-based, first-year composition courses developed by Charles Mathews and several other 101 teachers.
 - August New Graduate Student Orientation revised to introduce outcomes-based pedagogy to new TA's.
 - Syllabi and curriculum for English 501, "Seminar in the Teaching of Writing:

Methodology of Composition," redesigned by Robert Eddy to support changes in program.

- Fall 2004:
 - New Graduate Student Orientation, introducing and highlighting elements of the new 101 program, completed in August.
 - New schedule for staff meetings developed by Inoue, Naynaha, and Olson to support training for 101 student portfolios and TA teaching portfolios.
- August 2004:
 - Peer mentors appointed to first-year TA's from the pool of existing TA's and instructors by Eddy, Buyserie, Inoue, Naynaha, and Olson.
 - Pilots for portfolio-based English 101 courses begin.
 - Pilots for portfolio-based learning community links with Gen Ed 110 begin.
 - Pilot for portfolio-based English 100 begins (Olson).
 - Pilot for redesigned English 501, "Seminar in the Teaching of Writing: Methodology of Composition," begins (Eddy).
 - Implementation of new staff meetings commences (Inoue, Naynaha, and Olson).
 - TA training for teaching portfolios begins-to be addressed throughout the semester during staff meetings (Inoue).
- September 2004
 - Workshop scheduled to discuss and develop assessment rubric for English 101 portfolios (facilitated by Inoue, Naynaha, and Olson).
 - Norming session scheduled to begin training in reading student portfolios (facilitated by Inoue, Naynaha, and Olson).
 - August New Graduate Student Orientation assessed via survey (Olson).
- October 2004
 - Second workshop scheduled to discuss and develop assessment rubric for English 101 portfolios (facilitated by Inoue, Naynaha, and Olson).

Work to be completed

- November 2004:
 - Another norming session scheduled to continue training in reading student portfolios (facilitated by Inoue, Naynaha, and Olson).
- December 2004:
 - Assessment rubric for English 101 portfolios completed.
 - End of the semester portfolios/papers collected for the beginning of ongoing program assessment.
 - Reflections on mentoring program and teacher training solicited to help the program continue developing mentoring relationships that are truly assistive to both mentors and mentees.
 - Interim report to Office of Undergraduate Education completed (Eddy, Buyserie, and

Olson).

- Spring 2005
 - Program-wide portfolio assessment implemented.
 - Curriculum for English 598 revised and implemented to support new program by Eddy. Discussions and activities around the teaching portfolio, portfolio assessment, assignment design, teaching from sources, teaching documentation, as well as reflection on pedagogical implications, etc. will be the focus of these sessions.
 - Staff meetings continue to be devoted to ongoing development of each element of the 101 program.
 - Two portfolio reading sessions scheduled to support portfolio-based assessment structure (facilitated by Inoue, Naynaha, and Olson).
 - Teaching portfolios from TA's submitted.
 - Ongoing assessment of learning community links initiated (Naynaha and Olson).
 - Application for grants from external agencies written to support the ongoing implementation of learning communities in the English composition program (Naynaha and Olson).
 - Portfolios and teacher reflections on new program collected for ongoing programmatic assessment.

Appendix 5: The Revised 101 Program

The following progress has been made to date in revising the English 101 program with the grant funding support received from the Office of Undergraduate Education Spring, 2004. The new program is focused on writing from sources. When a portfolio-based assessment structure was adopted, it was decided that it was necessary to train TA's and instructors for this significant change during Fall, 2004, transitioning to program-wide implementation of the new program during Spring 2005.

Work Completed

- Spring 2004:
 - Proposal emphasizing a writing from sources model of teaching that uses a portfolio-based assessment structure adopted for the new 101 program. Portfolios chosen to support student learning, teacher training, programmatic consistency across 101 sections, and both formative and summative assessment opportunities.
 - Mission statement of new program developed: the 101 program gives students opportunities to understand and practice a research-based writing process and in the development of that process learn about the relationships between language, knowledge, and power.
 - WPA FYC outcomes and WSU critical thinking rubric approved as framework for design and development of assessment rubric for English 101 portfolios.
 - Negotiable/non-negotiable elements of new 101 program established.
 - Textbooks supporting the new 101 program's writing from sources emphasis selected, approved, and adopted: Elaine P. Maimon and Janice H. Peritz, *A Writer's Resource: A Handbook For Writing and Research*. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2003; James D. Lester, *Composing From Sources*. New York: Pearson Longman, 2004.
 - First rubric development workshop completed.
 - TA Training-Teaching Portfolio Assessment model adopted.
 - Learning community links with Gen Ed 110 proposed as an element of the new 101 program.
 - Three TAs (Asao Inoue, Siskanna Naynaha, and Wendy Olson) who helped construct the new 101 program foundations committed to assist with August Orientation and the Weekly 101 staff meetings to implement the new program.
- Summer 2004:
 - New Assistant Director of Composition hired: Beth Buyserie.
 - Learning community links with the WSU General Education program approved by composition committee.
 - Syllabi and curriculum co-constructed by Gen Ed 110 and Engl 101 TA's and instructors for participation in Fall 2004 learning community links.
 - Syllabi for piloting Fall 2004 portfolio-based, first-year composition courses developed by Charles Mathews and several other 101 teachers.
 - August New Graduate Student Orientation revised to introduce outcomes-based pedagogy to new TA's.
 - Syllabi and curriculum for English 501, "Seminar in the Teaching of Writing:

Methodology of Composition," redesigned by Robert Eddy to support changes in program.

- Fall 2004:
 - New Graduate Student Orientation, introducing and highlighting elements of the new 101 program, completed in August.
 - New schedule for staff meetings developed by Inoue, Naynaha, and Olson to support training for 101 student portfolios and TA teaching portfolios.
- August 2004:
 - Peer mentors appointed to first-year TA's from the pool of existing TA's and instructors by Eddy, Buyserie, Inoue, Naynaha, and Olson.
 - Pilots for portfolio-based English 101 courses begin.
 - Pilots for portfolio-based learning community links with Gen Ed 110 begin.
 - Pilot for portfolio-based English 100 begins (Olson).
 - Pilot for redesigned English 501, "Seminar in the Teaching of Writing: Methodology of Composition," begins (Eddy).
 - Implementation of new staff meetings commences (Inoue, Naynaha, and Olson).
 - TA training for teaching portfolios begins-to be addressed throughout the semester during staff meetings (Inoue).
- September 2004
 - Workshop scheduled to discuss and develop assessment rubric for English 101 portfolios (facilitated by Inoue, Naynaha, and Olson).
 - Norming session scheduled to begin training in reading student portfolios (facilitated by Inoue, Naynaha, and Olson).
 - August New Graduate Student Orientation assessed via survey (Olson).
- October 2004
 - Second workshop scheduled to discuss and develop assessment rubric for English 101 portfolios (facilitated by Inoue, Naynaha, and Olson).

Work to be completed

- November 2004:
 - Another norming session scheduled to continue training in reading student portfolios (facilitated by Inoue, Naynaha, and Olson).
- December 2004:
 - Assessment rubric for English 101 portfolios completed.
 - End of the semester portfolios/papers collected for the beginning of ongoing program assessment.
 - Reflections on mentoring program and teacher training solicited to help the program continue developing mentoring relationships that are truly assistive to both mentors and mentees.
 - Interim report to Office of Undergraduate Education completed (Eddy, Buyserie, and

Olson).

- Spring 2005
 - Program-wide portfolio assessment implemented.
 - Curriculum for English 598 revised and implemented to support new program by Eddy. Discussions and activities around the teaching portfolio, portfolio assessment, assignment design, teaching from sources, teaching documentation, as well as reflection on pedagogical implications, etc. will be the focus of these sessions.
 - Staff meetings continue to be devoted to ongoing development of each element of the 101 program.
 - Two portfolio reading sessions scheduled to support portfolio-based assessment structure (facilitated by Inoue, Naynaha, and Olson).
 - Teaching portfolios from TA's submitted.
 - Ongoing assessment of learning community links initiated (Naynaha and Olson).
 - Application for grants from external agencies written to support the ongoing implementation of learning communities in the English composition program (Naynaha and Olson).
 - Portfolios and teacher reflections on new program collected for ongoing programmatic assessment

-
- i Cornell has a separate department of Linguistics, with 18 full-time faculty. Cornell also has a separate “John S. Knight Institute for Writing in the Disciplines,” with numerous staff; 1 is an assoc. dean and full prof., 5 are senior lecturers, 1 a lecturer. Other instructors are 2 senior lecturers and 1 lecturer. There are 2 admin. staff and 3 post-doc. fellows. http://www.arts.cornell.edu/knight_institute/staff/staff.html
 - ii Mississippi St. has no Ph.D.; “Freshman English” page at <http://www.msstate.edu/dept/english/FreshPage.html>
 - iii 10 faculty portraits indicated no area of specialization, so we have counted only 68 out of 78 full-time faculty. OSU has a separate Dept. of Linguistics, with 18 full-time faculty members.
 - iv In addition to faculty listed, UC Davis English dept. has 25 “Federation Faculty,” who appear to be non-tenure-track lecturers. UC Davis also has a separate Linguistics Dept. with 9 tenure line faculty. Linguistics and Creative Writing are in separate departments.
 - v Illinois has a separate Linguistics Dept. with 14 tenure line faculty
 - vi Oregon has a “Structured Emphasis” in Composition (but no separate degree) taught by 2 full-time faculty members. Oregon has a separate Linguistics Dept with 8 tenure line faculty
 - vii U Washington has a separate Linguistics Dept. with 13 tenure line faculty
 - viii This count includes all branch faculty. It does not, however, include Couture or Law, who do not teach courses at this time. This should be compared to 1979 when the WSU English Department had 42 full-time faculty; all specializing at least in part in some aspect of literary studies.