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## Table 1
**English Department Degree Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>PHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching English as Second Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
English Department Major & Minor Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level and Major</th>
<th>Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Majors</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching English as Second Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Majors and Minors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majors</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Levels</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Levels</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Unduplicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majors</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Levels</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Levels</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching English as Second Language</td>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Degree Majors and Minors</td>
<td>All Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>All Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Unduplicated</td>
<td>All Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4
English Department Courses & Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 to 199</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 to 299</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 to 399</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 to 499</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 599</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 plus</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Level</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 to 199</td>
<td>11,061</td>
<td>12,384</td>
<td>12,432</td>
<td>13,595</td>
<td>14,361</td>
<td>14,598</td>
<td>15,615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 to 299</td>
<td>7,686</td>
<td>8,211</td>
<td>9,609</td>
<td>11,337</td>
<td>11,832</td>
<td>11,331</td>
<td>12,498</td>
<td>12,312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 to 399</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>2,406</td>
<td>2,004</td>
<td>2,344</td>
<td>2,262</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>2,194</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 to 499</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 599</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 plus</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,204</td>
<td>24,610</td>
<td>25,721</td>
<td>28,916</td>
<td>28,931</td>
<td>29,604</td>
<td>31,168</td>
<td>32,001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1285</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching English as Second Language</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1403</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1123</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1254</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
English Department Average Undergraduate ACT Score and Undergraduate GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>25.57</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>25.62</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>25.61</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>26.18</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>25.70</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.22</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>26.22</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Year</td>
<td>Grade Distribution</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Course GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>D-F-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL INFORMATION
1. **Strategic Plan**

Upload as Attachment 1 the department’s Strategic Plan.

We thought it would be helpful to the reviewers to see our annually-updated progress report from the last Program Review. This has been part of our Annual Report every year and is Attachment 1A--Progress on English Department 2005 Action Plan Updated 2008-2013

The second attachment is the Strategic Five-year Plan that we created in 2012, included here with updates from the 2012-2013 Annual Report as Attachment 1B--English Department Strategic Five-year Plan 2012

The third attachment is the report from our 2012 retreat on ideas about “strategic research areas” for the department: Attachment 1C--Strategic Research Areas from Retreat 10-18-12

Because the review committee has been asked to evaluate us in relation to our “aspirational peers,” we are also attachment a memo that we sent to Dean Olin on 12/5/12 concerning departments that we identified as our aspirational peers: Attachment 1D--Memo to Dean re Aspirational Peers 12-5-12

2. **Assessment Reports**

Upload as separate Attachments 2, 3, etc., your most-recent WEAVE “Detailed Assessment Reports” (DAR) for each undergraduate and graduate degree program.
Attachment 2A is our 2011-2012 English Department Assessment Plan.

Attachment 2B is our WEAVE DAR report for 2012-2013.

Attachment 3A is our Undergraduate Student Satisfaction Survey provided by the Graduate School.

Attachment 3B is our Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey provided by the Graduate School.

Attachments 3C-D relate to assessment specifically in relation to our First-year Writing Program.Attachments 3C and D are the SOI summaries for fall and spring of the most recent full academic year. These include the aggregate data for the whole program, as well as some data broken out by course. They also include grade distribution data from OIRA. We provide this to all of our teacher after each semester so that they can compare the results of their SOI to the program results. We also provide a blank self-assessment matrix for each FWP course so that teachers can assess their success (or need for improvement) in teaching each of the FWP course learning outcomes.

Attachments 3E and F are some orientation materials provided to us by McGraw Hill related to our use of the Connect Personalized Learning Plan program for online support of sentence-level writing issues (grammar, mechanics, usage, sentence structure, etc.). We are piloting the use of this program in two online EN 101 courses and several on-campus courses this fall, and we will expand the pilot to include all EN 102 courses taught by the EN 534 GTAs in the spring.

3. Assessment Evaluation

Upload as your next numbered attachment the most-recent critique of your department’s assessment activities provided to you by the Assistant to the Provost for Assessment.

Attachment 4A is the critique based on an examination of the 2012-2013 Department Assessment Plans and the results of the assessment activities that were executed and reported in the 2012-13 English Annual Assessment Reports.

4. Tenure and Promotion Criteria

Upload a numbered final attachment with your department’s tenure and promotion criteria.
Attachment 5 is our current T&P document, most recently revised in 2012.

Since the last review we have created a Governance Document. It is still a work-in-progress, but it has provided a very useful framework for conducting departmental business in an accessible and transparent way. We are constantly updating it as needed, most recently at our retreat on 8/27/13 when we needed to revise our tenure-track search procedures. This is Attachment 6.

Our commitment to transparency whenever possible is also reflected in our S: drive folder for English (to which you will have access as reviewers), and in our new website at http://english.ua.edu. You will have access as guests to the private part of the website through “myEnglish”.

5. Faculty Assignment by Rank

Faculty Assignment by rank for most recent fall semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer Track (CLTF)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Faculty</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Graduate Faculty

- Full: 23
- Associate: 12
- Temporary: 10

Faculty CVs are to be made available to the committee and consultant. Please let John Schmitt and OIRA know if they are already available online, will be posted publicly or privately, will be available as PDF files, etc.
Dean Wolfe has assured us that there will be a portal created in the FAR system for the consultants.

6. Faculty Publications in Last 5 Years

List the number of faculty publications in refereed scholarly journals over the last 5 years and compute the ratio of publications to faculty. (Note: This section may be modified department’s tenure and promotion guidelines).

The number of “faculty” here includes only the TT, because they are the only ones whose job includes research/creative activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
<th>Number of Publications</th>
<th>Ratio (Publications/Faculty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Years Ago</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Years Ago</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years Ago</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years Ago</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Years Ago</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.34 (note: I think that this represents an off-year for a couple of our typically very productive CW faculty)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: We are a diverse department with literature scholars, composition/rhetoric specialists, linguists, and creative writers. For this count in the table above, to articles in refereed scholarly journals we are adding books, book chapters, essays, short stories, and poems. The books and book chapters are also set out separately in the table below.

Additional Publications. (Note: This section also may be modified, as noted above, to refl

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Book Chapters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Years Ago</td>
<td>3 + 4 edited = 7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Years Ago | 3 + 2 edited = 5 | 13 (8 from 1 person)  
3 Years Ago | 2 + 1 edited = 3 | 16 (11 from 1 person)  
2 Years Ago | 4 + 1 edited = 5 | 9 (6 from 1 person)  
1 Years Ago | 1 (2 have appeared since) | 4

7. Citation Data

Upload below #7 a table showing each faculty member’s publication citation data over the last 5 years, in a way that is typical for your discipline. (Note. If citation indices are not

In our discipline it is not usual to produce citation data as part of our evaluation. We look at quality of placement of articles and books, and we rely heavily on external reviewers (a minimum of 4 for each candidate) as part of our tenure and promotion process.

8. Teaching Loads and Advisement

Briefly describe the undergraduate and graduate teaching loads and advising responsibilities of faculty for the past academic year.

The typical teaching load for the tenure-track faculty is two courses/semester, according to the formula of 40% teaching/40% research/20% service, with more undergraduate than graduate assignments, depending on program needs. Lecturers and instructors have a teaching load of four courses per semester (80% teaching/20% service). Advising is handled by the tenure-track faculty, with each professor working with a group of students consistently over the students’ undergraduate careers. Graduate advising is handled by the Director of Graduate Studies and the graduate program directors. The use of the DegreeWorks program has simplified things considerably by empowering students and faculty with easily accessible information about requirements and progress.
GENERAL INFORMATION

ATTACHMENTS

1. Attachment 1A, Progress on English Department 2005 Action Plan Updated 2008-2013
2. Attachment 1B, English Department Strategic Five Year Plan 2012
3. Attachment 1C, Strategic Research Areas from Retreat 10-18-12
4. Attachment 1D, Memo to Dean Olin RE: Aspirational Peers
5. Attachment 2A, English 2011-12 Assessment Plan
6. Attachment 2B, WEAVE DAR 2012-2013
7. Attachment 3A, Report 2012-13 UG EH
8. Attachment 3B, Report 2012-13 GR EH
9. Attachment 3C, FWP Student Opinion Survey Summary FA 12
10. Attachment 3D, FWP Student Opinion Survey Summary SP 13
11. Attachment 3E, Student Get Started Guide with Personal Learning Connect 2.0 UA
12. Attachment 3F, How to read the PLP reports
15. Attachment 5, TP Guidelines Approved 3-09 revised 2012
16. Attachment 6, English Department Governance Document as of August 27, 2013
Background.

As of 2000, each department completing a full review formulates an Action Plan. Prior to the review’s final meeting, the dean to whom the department reports approves the Plan. For each recommendation in the report by the program review committee, the Action Plan states (1) what actions(s) will be taken, (2) who is responsible for the actions(s), and (3) what the timeline is for completion. The Action Plan’s recommendations are a major focus of the review’s final meeting.

Beginning with reviews completed in the spring of 2003, a three-year follow-up report became required for each recommendation resulting from a full review. The department’s follow-up report is due May 15, three years following the review’s final meeting, and it is an integral component of the University Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) efforts. The report is also instrumental in demonstrating the University’s compliance with the SACS Principles of Accreditation.

Department Information.

Department: ENGLISH
Date of this Follow-Up Report: March 18, 2008
Date of Update: May 2010, by Catherine Davies, chair
Date of Update: May 2011, by Catherine Davies, chair
Date of Update: May 2012, by Catherine Davies, chair
Date of Update: May 2013, by Catherine Davies, chair

NO-COST RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION (2005): The department needs to create a clear plan for replacing retiring faculty.

RESPONSE (2005): In 2003/04, the English Department worked with facilitator John Dew to create a hiring plan. However, given the loss of 1/3 of the tenure-line faculty from 2003-2005 and recent decisions regarding the Applied Linguistics program, it is clear that the 2003/04 plan is not adequate to our needs.

ACTION (2005): A new hiring plan will be created during fall 2005, as part of the new Department 5-Year Plan.

PROGRESS (2008): Even since 2005, position needs have changed as a result of graduate curricular reform, the increased undergraduate enrollments campus-wide, and the Department’s commitment to large lecture sections of the 200-level literature surveys. Faculty position needs are impacted further by the success or failure of attempts to hire FTTIs with specific teaching competencies (Linguistics, for example) and by the secondary specializations of new faculty hired—by the ability of a newly hired specialist in Romanticism, for instance, to also teach critical theory. As a result of these factors, the Department’s most pressing hiring needs at this moment are not those projected by the 5-Year Plan of 2005.

PROGRESS (2010): The environment continues to change with retirements and resignations. We have not been successful this year in attracting instructors who can teach both literature or creative writing and technical writing or linguistics. The position request which is attached to this 2010 annual report provides our current rationale and priorities for hiring. In light of the success of our CRES Ph.D. graduates this year (all 3 on the job market were hired in assistant professor positions), and the success of the Writing Center, it seems wise to hire another CRES faculty member, possibly at the associate level as requested by the CRES faculty, as soon as possible in relation to our literature needs.
PROGRESS (2011): This year we were successful in attracting instructors who are qualified to teach technical writing and other composition specialties, and also linguistics.

PROGRESS (2012): We finalized a new Five-Year Plan this year (see section of main document), which gives priorities for the different areas of the department in terms of hires. We also did some work on “packages” to propose to the university that would combine a reduction in FTTI lines with an increase in TT lines in various areas and GTA lines for the graduate program (with a recognition of the need for more CRES faculty if we were to increase the size of the graduate program). We also came up with a way of calculating the appropriate number of TT lines for our department (as part of our response to the draft of the Clinical/Lecturer Faculty Track proposal:

If we wanted TT faculty (i.e., active researchers) to teach all of our graduate courses and upper division undergraduate courses (600, 500, 400, 300), and 200 English Department Honors Program sections [please note that these are not Honors College courses, but rather part of our own departmental honors program] and large lectures at the 200-level, we would need 47 TT faculty teaching.

Academic Year 2010-2011: Number of courses by category

- 600 = 41/4 = 10 TT faculty
- 500 = 15/4 = 4
- 400 = 33/4 = 8
- 300 = 72/4 = 18
- 200 Eng Dept Honors Courses = 27/4 = 7
- All other 200 = 206
- 104 = 3
- 103 = 41
- 102 = 168
- 101 = 154

Note: 50% of First-year Writing Program courses are taught by GTAs.

PROGRESS (2013): The problem with creating a plan for replacing faculty is that the circumstances keep changing. We had made a plan with priority for literature faculty and a CRES hire, and we had been authorized a Southern literature TT hire and our first CLTF hire (with expertise in teaching composition for the FWP) during 2012-2013. Literature and CRES were presumably to continue to have priority, but then two of the creative writing faculty left at the end of 2013, creating a crisis in that program. But of course the problem is that even if we create a plan, we have no control; the dean does. We are proud of the fact that our Large Lecture Initiative has eliminated the need for additional FTTI positions on soft money, but we have no confidence that our actions will result in the authorization of TT searches by the dean. The situation also creates a difficult situation in the department, with programs pitted against each other for scarce or nonexistent resources rather than thinking in terms of the good of the whole. An Ad Hoc Committee in the Search Process came up with some recommendations in the spring semester, and we will take them up during our August 2013 retreat, but that addresses only our process in the department.

RECOMMENDATION (2005): The Department should consider changing the policy for how long FTTI may work for the department

RESPONSE (2005): A longer contract period will enable the department to attract instructors from outside the immediate region; these instructors will help fill gaps in faculty expertise while our efforts to replace retired or lost faculty continue.
ACTION (2005): On March 16, the department voted to extend the FTTI contract period to three years.

PROGRESS (2008): Since the vote mentioned immediately above, the Department has also rehired FTTIs who have completed a three-year term to a second three-year term. This has been done in select cases where performance evaluations have been strongly positive. This year the Chair of the Department formed an Instructorship Committee and charged it with investigating the relative advantages and disadvantages of indefinitely renewable FTTIs. The Department mood seems to favor such positions: most faculty seem convinced that it makes little sense to fire good people who wish to stay. We hope to establish a limited number of indefinitely renewable FTTI positions by next year.

PROGRESS (2010): Since the update in 2008, the department has voted to go forward with the indefinitely renewable FTTIs, with the understanding that a systematic evaluation process would be in place. FTTIs about to enter upon their third year were notified in the spring of 2009 about the evaluation process by the chair of the committee. Materials were gathered and the committee made recommendations in the late fall of 2009, judging the FTTIs in terms of three categories: “exceeds expectations,” “meets expectations,” and “does not meet expectations.” One person was liaison from the Instructor Review Committee, serving also on the Instructor Hiring Committee (Karen Gardiner). The Instructor Hiring Committee found the review reports and evaluations extremely helpful. Three FTTIs were not renewed after receiving a “does not meet expectations” rating. TT faculty will serve in rotation on the Instructor Review Committee.

PROGRESS (2011): This continues to work well. We will begin to include the FAR in the evaluation process more systematically. The college has formalized the arrangement that instructors who have taught for three years and been reviewed and offered reappointment will be given an automatic raise. This is only after the first three-year term.

PROGRESS (2012): The review process is very valuable for the Instructor Hiring Committee, although the instructors are nervous about the importance placed on student opinions. We will try to incorporate information on grade distribution to give instructors more confidence in grading rigorously. The Instructor Review Committee is also using a category labeled “meets expectations with reservations,” and the Instructor Hiring Committee used that category this year to decide not to reappoint two of the FTTIs. The chair discovered the hard way that the instructors being reviewed had assumed that “meets expectations with reservations” would mean reappointment. The chair will make sure that the instructors being reviewed in the fall of 2012 realize that anything below “exceeds expectations” as a rating would suggest that they should go on the job market just to be safe.

Two further developments this year were (1) that we were given four 1-year FTTI lines; and (2) the dean asked us to provide feedback on a draft proposal for a Clinical/Lecturer Track for faculty, which would potentially change the whole faculty configuration.

PROGRESS (2013): The Instructor Review Committee reviewed their charge and backed off of any more nuanced rating other than “meets expectations” or “does not meet expectations.” They were also completely resistant to using grade distributions in the evaluation. The process seems to work well, with the result that all of the instructors up for review are given “meets expectations” and have been rehired. The advantage is that we know the quality of their teaching; the disadvantage is that we have less new blood, especially if we are reducing the number of FTTIs that we hire. It is up to the Instructor Hiring Committee to make decisions about the mix of our graduates, our instructors up for reappointment, and new people from the outside.

PROGRESS (2013):

RECOMMENDATION (2005): The Department should be given control over a set number of Graduate Council and Dean’s Merit Fellowships.

RESPONSE (2005): The department will not pursue this recommendation; these fellowships are not the property of individual departments.
**ACTION (2005):** Action: The department and college will continue to pursue external funding such as the new Truman Capote Scholarship.

**PROGRESS (2008):** The English Department continues to pursue external funding.

**PROGRESS (2010):** Two of our junior faculty (Ainsworth and Nelson) participated in the Bauer Grant Writing Workshop during 2009-2010, and we anticipate that they will write grants that will include some graduate student funding. The Strode Program wrote a proposal for the Post-Doc Fellows opportunity within the university, but were unable to compete because of our lack of external funding history. The chair met with Larry O’Neal very early in the fall semester, and we are in discussion about possibilities.

Progress (2011): The Creative Writing Program has succeeded in getting a commitment of 5 Graduate Council Fellowships for truly outstanding incoming MFA students.

**PROGRESS (2012):** No further developments.

**RECOMMENDATION (2005):** Formal procedures for mentoring junior and mid-level faculty need to be developed.

**RESPONSE (2005):** Junior faculty are currently mentored during annual Retention Committee and department chair FAR meetings. They also have access to university Teaching Fellows and to informal advice from colleagues. A lack of senior level faculty may make formal procedures impractical at this time.

**ACTION (2005):** Action: A discussion of mentoring procedures will take place during the development of the 2005 Department 5-Year Plan.

**PROGRESS (2008):** No action taken. The annual Retention Reviews, which are conducted in a deliberately supportive and helpful spirit, make the tenure process unusually transparent in the Department of English, and informal mentoring by the Chair and senior colleagues occurs often. No junior faculty members have mentioned the need for additional formal mentoring at anytime during the current Chair’s (one-year) tenure.

**PROGRESS (2010):** The Retention Review Committee and the chair continue to provide mentoring for junior faculty.

**PROGRESS (2012):** The Retention Review Committee and the chair continue to provide mentoring for junior faculty. In addition, we are very pleased that the dean has initiated seminars for first-year faculty (extended to second and third-year faculty) to provide additional mentoring. The English Department took advantage of the Publisher in Residence opportunity this year and plans to continue.

**PROGRESS (2013):** When we thought that Guy Bailey was going to be president during the fall semester of 2012, we were asked to identify our “aspirational peer institutions” and review our T&P guidelines accordingly. We did that, and decided that we would wait for our own 6-year cycle to review our T&P guidelines; we considered the request of junior faculty to get more guidance on the expectations for 4th year review and took that up by individual program with a view to the next T&P guidelines revision (in 2015).

**RECOMMENDATION (2005):** Staff positions should be redefined to create a realistic workload for the various staff within the department.

**RESPONSE (2005):** One of our staff positions became vacant at the end of February, while our need for a new staff position has not yet been addressed.

**ACTION (2005):** A review of staff responsibilities is currently underway, with possible redistribution of duties to take place in summer 2005; cross-training of staff will also begin in summer 2005.
PROGRESS (2008): Current staff members have been cross-trained and are good at their jobs. Redistribution of staff duties was accomplished, in particular the creation of a single administrative track for the graduate programs (ie. both graduate staff positions now serve both the CW and literature program directors.) As noted in “Response (2005),” the departmental receptionist continues to function as secretary to the Director of Undergraduate Studies.

PROGRESS (2010): The chair has initiated monthly staff meetings, and plans to discuss current job descriptions with staff during the summer. As technology changes (e.g., Student Opinions Online) we will keep up with the implications for the various staff jobs.

PROGRESS (2011): The job descriptions have been rewritten but not yet put into the governance document. We believe that we need another staff position for a department of our size.

PROGRESS (2012): The monthly staff meetings are valuable to the staff and the dean has agreed to have them count as part of the hours for the STAR program that was initiated this year. We continue to refine the revised job descriptions. One staff member left and a current member moved into her slot and is learning that job. We conducted a search and hired another Office Assistant for the Main Office to replace the member who moved. We also shifted responsibility for P-cards to the individual TT faculty who have been appropriately trained.

PROGRESS (2013): The Administrative Specialist left abruptly and it became clear that there was no documentation, let alone cross-training, for her job. We hired a new person, who is figuring out the job from scratch and documenting as she goes. There is a lot of pressure from the staff (with support from the chair) to get an additional staff person to handle the main office work (especially related to the functions of the Administrative Specialist). There is a morale problem because of heavy workload and the perception that the university is unwilling to pay higher salaries for office staff.

RECOMMENDATION (2005): The department needs to make a decision about the linguistics program.

RESPONSE (2005): With the loss of 2/3 of our linguistics faculty, the department was forced to consider the future of its offerings.

ACTION (2005): On March 2, the department voted to place the PhD in English-Applied Linguistics on inactive status, and to maintain the current MATESOL program.

PROGRESS (2008): The situation since 2005 has changed. Although we have not reactivated the Applied Linguistics PhD program, we need additional Linguistics faculty: the one regular faculty member in the area is on a reduced load as Director of Graduate Studies and we lost one of our two Instructors who could teach Linguistics. We need additional faculty here to offer the Linguistics courses required by our EN and SELA majors.

PROGRESS (2010): Since 2008 we have hired a new faculty member in linguistics (Robert Nelson). With the debut of the new arrangement with Ocean University of China, where there may be interest in an applied linguistics Ph.D., the Graduate Studies Committee voted to activate the Applied Linguistics Ph.D. for such students with support. The linguistics faculty will experiment with large lectures for EN 320 starting in the spring of 2011. Davies has gone from a reduced load as Director of Graduate Studies to the same reduced load as chair. If Davies continues as chair eventually we will need another linguist if we want all of the 300-level linguistics classes to be taught by tenure-track faculty.

PROGRESS (2012): We now have an FTTI with a linguistics background who can help with the UG linguistics courses. The possible connection with Saudi Arabia might yield a self-supporting Ph.D. student.

PROGRESS (2013): We succeeded in getting an additional GTA line for 2013-2014 for the Applied Linguistics program because of the influx of Chinese undergraduate students. The Department linguists are working with other linguistics colleagues across the university (particularly in Anthropology and Modern Languages and Classics) to develop an interdisciplinary minor in linguistics that we would jointly administer. We hope to have a proposal ready for the fall of 2013 to go through the bureaucratic process.
RECOMMENDATION (2005): The department needs to work toward decreasing unnecessary internal hierarchies.

RESPONSE (2005): A new governance system for the department is under construction. The new Policy and Planning Committee offers elected representation to tenure-line faculty including at least one pre-tenure member. The new Writing Program Committee offers elected representation to instructors and GTAs. The new Literature Steering Committee offers literature faculty a new voice in department affairs. In addition, both the Undergraduate Studies Committee and the Graduate Studies Committee are newly-constituted, with broad representation and clearly-defined responsibilities.

ACTION (2005): The new governance system discourages the formation of power blocs and provides transparency in decision-making.

PROGRESS (2008): This recommendation followed from a vision of the Department divided by in-group and out-group factionalism. This problem has largely disappeared due to retirements, relocations, and the hiring of outside Chairs (Professors Crowley and White) whose tenures leveled the playing field and created fresh starts for all concerned. It is the opinion of the current Chair that there are no “unnecessary internal hierarchies” in Morgan Hall at this time.

PROGRESS (2010): The Department is operating according to our Governance Document (see appendix). It is the opinion of the current Chair that there are no “unnecessary internal hierarchies” in Morgan Hall at this time. The current chair is working on reconfiguring 301 Morgan, with the help of the Interior Design Unit, so that it can function as an informal faculty lounge when it is not being used as a classroom or meeting room. We currently have no place where faculty can sit comfortably and interact informally with each other.

PROGRESS (2011): Apparently still no “unnecessary internal hierarchies.” Not much progress on redefining 301 Morgan as an informal faculty lounge.

PROGRESS (2012): Still no “unnecessary internal hierarchies” unless they show up in the anonymous feedback to the chair. We strive for transparency with all of our documents up on the S: drive, and a new website.

PROGRESS (2013): Still no “unnecessary internal hierarchies” unless they show up in the anonymous feedback to the chair. We continue to strive for transparency in our departmental operations.

RECOMMENDATION (2005): Further development efforts should be encouraged.

RESPONSE (2005): All areas of the department are concerned with development, and are working in various ways to secure funds.

ACTION (2005): A development plan with specific benchmarks will be included in the 2005 Department 5-Year Plan.

PROGRESS (2008): The Department of English continues to pursue development opportunities in collaboration with College of Arts & Sciences development personnel. We also nurture current relationships through letters of appreciation to donors and have recently reviewed the MOA of English Department bequests in an effort to use available funds to best purpose.

PROGRESS (2010): The current chair met with Larry O’Neal shortly after he became our development officer, and has worked with him on the establishment of the Robert Milton Young Memorial Lecture Fund. The department will compile a list of needs for Larry, so that he can have them in mind when establishing relationships with potential donors.

PROGRESS (2011): Michael Martone and Deborah Weiss volunteered to be on a departmental Development Committee to advise the chair. We met once with Larry O’Neal and formulated a departmental “wish list” for him. No results so far.
PROGRESS (2012): Michael Martone and Catherine Davies met with Kathy Yarbrough as new development person and gave her our wish list. No results so far. This is very frustrating for us because we assume that it would be a natural thing for wealthy Alabamians to want to fund a chair in Southern literature or Southern language.

PROGRESS (2012): Still nothing from the “Development” people We now have an electronic newsletter and an email list of graduates. We will begin to send it out.

**RECOMMENDATION (2005): The department needs space**

**RESPONSE (2005):** The department has been given a significant amount of office and seminar room space in the basement of Rowand-Johnson, with two classroom spaces that might hold 22 to 25 students each (although the department lost the use of two classrooms in the deal). However, the president’s enrollment initiative will only increase pressure on our classroom and office space needs. In response, the department will:

**ACTION (2005):** Action: (a) offer specially designed sections of 101/102 to departments and colleges for living-learning clusters, on the condition that classroom space is provided. We have already agreed to provide 5 sections of 101/102 to the College of Business for Fall 2005; these will be taught in Bidgood classrooms. We are also responding to a call from the Womens Studies living-learning initiative for a similar program and hope to have an agreement in place for 005/06. (b) offer more on-line and evening sections of 101/102 and literature surveys, beginning Spring 2006. (c) develop a limited number of large-enrollment courses. While these will require larger classrooms, they will lower the number of individual rooms needed. The first offering of these new large-enrollment courses will be in 2005/06.

**PROGRESS (2008):** With the advent of ASTRA, the Department has limited but nonetheless helpful access to classrooms across the entire campus. On a related front, the Provost has allocated $250,000 to refurbish Rowand-Johnson Hall for English Department needs. As a result of renovations underway this year, RJ will house four additional faculty offices, the department web operation and the editorial office of The Fairy Tale Review, and also accommodate the majority of FTII offices. We continue to offer greater numbers of evening classes. We also offered four large lectures classes in spring ’08 and will offer eight such sections in fall ’08.

**PROGRESS (2010):** The refurbishing of Rowand-Johnson Hall will be completed by the end of the fiscal year. We now have four faculty offices there, rooms where GTAs can meet with students, offices for instructors, and a kitchenette converted from the little bathroom that the instructors appreciate very much. We are at the limit of space for our faculty and instructors. We also have inadequate storage space for equipment that is checked out and used in classrooms. We have had trouble finding rooms the right size for the large lectures that we are trying to offer for our literature surveys.

**PROGRESS (2011):** We worked with eTech on figuring out how to put the TV monitors safely in some classrooms on a permanent basis. We are at the limit of space for offices. We will explore possibilities for rearrangement during the summer. We have asked the dean for the Morgan 202 space back.

**PROGRESS (2012):** We converted the copier room on the second floor of Morgan into an office for Jessica Kidd and moved the copier down into the grad lounge outside the main office. **We are at the limit of our space for offices.** We need the Morgan 202 space back (where Myron Tuman’s office was—now occupied by eTech). We are also not sure that the usage in MR 238 justifies its continued use for computers, but eTech would be the best judge of that. We are cleaning out unnecessary stuff in our “storage room” but that is not suitable for anything other than storage.

**PROGRESS (2013):** The dean offered and we accepted some space in the old Biology Building, for which we will cost-share. We have drawn up a plan with input from eTech (they have promised 30 refurbished computers for the space) and the plan is in the system. We want to have input into the carrells that will divide up the space. Depending on when it is available, we will make the option available to certain constituencies (probably primarily FTIIIs) in the department and accomplish the shifts during the fall semester. This will free up space in Rowand Johnson for future professor offices.
RECOMMENDATION: The equipment within the department needs to be updated.

RESPONSE: The department needs a copier able to handle the increased traffic that will be caused by increased enrollment; it also needs a copier and fax machine for the administrative offices on the second floor. The department also needs new telephone equipment (for instance, there is only one speaker-phone in the entire department).

ACTION: The department will request year-end funds for the copier(s) and fax machine, and pay for minor phone equipment out of operating funds.

PROGRESS: The Department of English has acquired a copy machine for the administrative office on the second floor. We continue to experience difficulties in this area, however. We are charged what seems an exorbitant amount both for our telecommunications technology and for copying maintenance.

PROGRESS 2010: Even with the increasing use of digital copies of readings, etc., that can be placed within eLearning, we are extremely concerned at the exorbitant amount that we have to pay for the “copier contract.” See the appendix for the memo that our Administrative Specialist wrote on this topic for the Technology Committee to be sent to Dean Burkhalter. Our impression is that we are not alone within the College in objecting to the cost of this arrangement. We bought a speaker phone for Morgan 106 when we realized that everybody was huddling in the chair’s office to participate in conference call meetings.

PROGRESS 2011: We never heard a word about the copier contract situation. The current 2 copiers/scanners seem to be working well. We may consider moving the copier from 207 down to the main office.

PROGRESS 2012: We still haven’t heard anything about the copier contract situation. We moved the copier from 207 down into the grad lounge and everybody seems to appreciate the access. We just heard from Ruth Pionke that we will have two classrooms in Morgan converted to media rooms this next academic year, and two in the subsequent year (with some cost-sharing from us). I am also exploring whether we can use the Strickland Account to work with eTech to get better computers for the instructor offices. One of the TT faculty has agreed to serve on the College committee concerning iPad use.

PROGRESS (2013): We finally figured out that we could get in contact with the UA person in charge of the copiers and ask for what we actually need. Based on our traffic we got three new copiers and replaced the copier in the Grad Lounge, replaced the one in the Main Office in a letter location in the copy room, and installed one in 209 Rowand Johnson for easier access for the GTAs, FTTIs, PTTIs, and professors based over there. At the end of the fiscal year we will be in a position to evaluate how much this is costing us (compared to the past). In terms of computers, eTech has been able to provide the FTTIs with refurbished machines. We are exploring whether we could save money on Telecom by eliminating some of the office phones (for the people who basically only use their cell phones anyway).

RECOMMENDATION: (3) The air conditioning and heating system needs to be repaired.

RESPONSE: The temperature control in the building is indeed uneven and no doubt in need of upgrade or repair. However, there are more immediate concerns.

ACTION: The department requests that leaks in the roof be repaired and doors placed on restrooms (which are in highly traveled, very public areas).

PROGRESS: The roof was repaired and all restrooms in Morgan Hall have doors. The Department received a new chiller and new air conditioning units in 2006-2007.

PROGRESS 2010: We are still having leaks (two on the second floor within the past month), and this is included in our list of “needs.” We had a problem getting the heat turned on this past year when the temperature dropped.
PROGRESS 2011: The roof of Morgan was “sealed,” and I have not become aware of any leaks since. Joel Brouwer can monitor the humidity in his office for us as another measure.

PROGRESS 2012: We continue to have problems with when the AC or in particular the heat gets turned on (i.e., we freeze in the building until some algorithm in relation to the outside temperature is achieved).

PROGRESS (2013): The system has been replaced within the building, but it still operates on a thermostat in relation to the outside temperature. The windows have just been repaired.

**RECOMMENDATION:** A new staff position is needed to reduce the work of the department’s receptionist.

**RESPONSE:** Currently, one person serves both as receptionist and as assistant to the Director of Undergraduate Studies. In a department serving graduate and undergraduate students, graduate teaching assistants, instructors, and tenure-line faculty with information requests, book orders, message-handling, copy and duplicator services, and mail-handling, the position of receptionist is indeed a full time job. Likewise, in a department serving some 500 majors and minors as well as approximately 120 education language arts majors, with an active honors program and honorary society and an undergraduate literary publication, with ongoing curriculum review and advising, and new outreach and enrichment activities, the position of assistant to the Director of Undergraduate Studies is also a full-time job.

**ACTION:** The department will make a proposal that savings in other areas be funneled into the cost of a new, low-level staff position.

**PROGRESS:** No new staff position has been created. The additional work has been handled through the establishment of an Advising Coordinator position, which is filled part-time by one of our FTTI, and by the use of first-year RAs as office assistants. This latter practice is problematic both because the work assigned is clerical rather than research in nature, and because from now on the first-year RAs will be assigned to the large lecture sections and will therefore be unavailable for office assignment. We occasionally have difficulties finding undergraduate work-study assistance.

**PROGRESS 2010:** The Advising Coordinator position seems to be working well. In response to the needs of the receptionist/assistant to the DUS, we have determined with Interior Design that the modular receptionist’s desk can be reconfigured at almost no cost to allow her workspace to be more efficient, and to open up the space in the office so that people can get to their mailboxes without crowding.

**PROGRESS 2011:** The desk in the main office was reconfigured and that is working well. We are making the case for another office staff person.

**PROGRESS 2012:** We have a new person in the Office Assistant II position in the front office. We will continue to explore the appropriate configuration of duties and whether we need another staff person to handle technology in relation to the department.

**PROGRESS (2013):** See comments above about needing an additional office staff person. It is not clear, given the Assistant Director of Undergraduate Studies position, that the rationale still holds.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Class sizes in lower level courses need to be lowered.

**RESPONSE:** Although the English Department agrees with this recommendation, given the president’s enrollment initiative it is unrealistic to expect that the administration will support it in the near future.

**ACTION:** The department notes that disciplinary guidelines about class-size and best-practice teaching suggest that FYE courses should be capped at or below 20.

**PROGRESS:** We have done the very opposite of this recommendation, with class sizes either remaining the same or, in the case of our newly introduced lecture classes, more than tripling in size. The capacities of FYE courses have not been reduced. The Department of English continues to believe that small classes remain the better teaching venues for English as an intellectual discipline. At the same time, we support President’s Witt’s
enrollment initiatives and concede the necessity of increasing class capacities to help accommodate larger numbers of students.

**PROGRESS 2010:** The Department of English continues to believe that small classes remain the better teaching venues for English as an intellectual discipline. The department notes that disciplinary guidelines about class-size and best-practice teaching suggest that FYE courses should be capped at or below 20.

We have also learned this year from Lorne Kuffel of OIRA that 19 is the desirable number for undergraduate classes in terms of creating good statistics for the ratings in US News & World Report.

**PROGRESS 2011:** DITTO.

**PROGRESS 2012:** DITTO.

**PROGRESS 2013:** I believe that the 101 and 102 classes are currently at 23, but many other UG classes are smaller (103, 104, CRES undergraduate courses, CW courses, honors sections of lit courses). This is a course of friction among the programs.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The GTA stipends need to be increased to aid the department in recruiting graduate students.

**RESPONSE:** Our graduate stipends are not competitive, especially since we ask students to teach two courses (once they are eligible to teach).

**ACTION:** The department requests an increase (over two years) in GTA stipends to $11,000.

**PROGRESS:** Progress has been made on this issue: stipends were increased and GTAs provided with health insurance. As gratifying as these improvements are, assistantships in the English Department continue to require too much teaching and pay too little money. We deem this issue to be of the first importance: our assistantship offers directly impact our efforts to recruit the best graduate students available, and graduate student quality directly impacts both graduate program quality and the quality of teaching in our 100- and 200-level Core Curriculum classes—classes which remain a staple of the first-year UA experience of thousands of students. We remain especially frustrated by the unavoidable comparisons with Auburn: in 2007-2008, GTAs in English at Auburn University have 2/1 loads as the standard assignment and are paid $11,728; GTAs in English at Alabama are on standard 2/2 teaching loads and are paid 10,908.

**PROGRESS 2010:** According to data from the Association of Departments of English of the MLA, most programs are now offering health insurance. We continue to be frustrated by the comparisons with Auburn.

**PROGRESS 2011:** Our stipends have been increased, and we are able to offer more money (matched by the Graduate School) for graduate student research and travel.

**PROGRESS 2012:** We are pleased that we are receiving more matching money from the Graduate School for graduate student travel, and that the College has also joined in on this effort. We are frustrated because students turn us down for programs with higher stipends and lower teaching loads.

**PROGRESS 2013:** It appears that our stipends are competitive, but the administrative has been adamant that it will not reduce the teaching load to allow us to compete with schools like LSU.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Faculty salaries need to be increased.

**RESPONSE:** We are offering $5,000 to $10,000 below market price for entering assistant professors. This year, in two out of three searches, our top candidates took offers at similar institutions for over $10,000 more than our best offer. It will be impossible to attract faculty to raise the profile of our graduate programs in literature and composition/rhetoric with salaries at current levels. Further, it is likely that retention of those faculty we are able to hire will be an issue.
ACTION: The department requests an increase in base salary for entering assistant professors to $47,000, with funds made available to address the consequent salary-compression inequities.

PROGRESS: Salaries have improved at the University of Alabama recently, and faculty members in English are grateful for their raises. But salaries plainly must go higher. With respect to faculty recruitment, we are still losing much-desired candidates because our starting salaries are, in one case from this year, as much as 25% lower than competitive offers. At the same time, it must be granted, first, that the College of Arts & Sciences has authorized higher entry level salaries in English for each of the last several years (48,000 this year); and, second, that the depressed job market for new PhDs in English has allowed the Department to hire very successfully.

PROGRESS 2010: With our current $48,000 assistant professor salary, we were able to hire our first choices in all searches, with some additional inducements from the College and Department. We are hopeful that the Board of Trustees will vote for raises in June.

PROGRESS 2011: We are still at $48,000. We hired two new faculty.

PROGRESS 2012: We have received raises during the last two years, and we expect to receive another raise this year. We were not given permission to hire any new TT faculty this year.

PROGRESS 2013: We are still low compared to other assistant professor or CLTF salaries, and we have to rely on our charm and our circumstances to attract faculty. We were successful this year in both of our searches.

RECOMMENDATION: The department needs new faculty lines, some of which should be at the associate professor level.

RESPONSE: The 2005 Action Plan included no response per se to this recommendation, but it was certainly one with which the Department of English agreed.

ACTION: This will be addressed in our new hiring plan, along with the possibility of recapturing lines lost to full-time administration in the Honors and Blount programs.

PROGRESS: While the faculty lines lost to Honors and BUI perhaps qualify as ancient history at this point, the Department of English certainly needs additional lines, all the more so given Dr. Witt’s commitment to growing the UA student population. And graduate program needs as well as our commitment to undergraduate teaching justify additional specific position requests. Hires at the associate professor level seem less necessary, although one associate was hired last year. Hiring an associate professor in Renaissance drama, book in hand, would enhance the profile of the Hudson Strode Program in Renaissance Studies.

PROGRESS 2010: We appreciate the four new hires this past year, but at the same time we lost one faculty member to retirement, another to death, and a third to another university. As noted previously, we lost Bob Halli to the Honors College, Hank Lazer to Creative Campus, and Joe Hornsby to Blount. Our current position request is attached for literature hires, after which we will want a CRES hire, ideally at the associate professor level.

PROGRESS 2011: DITTO.

PROGRESS 2012: DITTO. Also see our formulation (also included above) of how to determine how many TT lines we need:

If we wanted TT faculty (i.e., active researchers) to teach all of our graduate courses and upper division undergraduate courses (600, 500, 400, 300), and 200 English Department Honors Program sections [please note that these are not Honors College courses, but rather part of our own departmental honors program] and large lectures at the 200-level, we would need 47 TT faculty teaching.
Academic Year 2010-2011: Number of courses by category

- 600 = 41/4 = 10 TT faculty
- 500 = 15/4 = 4
- 400 = 33/4 = 8
- 300 = 72/4 = 18
- 200 Eng Dept Honors Courses = 27/4 = 7

- All other 200 = 206
- 104 = 3
- 103 = 41
- 102 = 168
- 101 = 154

Note: 50% of First-year Writing Program courses are taught by GTAs.

PROGRESS (2013): The dean made it possible for Trudier Harris to be brought into the department at the Professor level. We also expect Guy Bailey to join us in the fall at the Professor level.

RECOMMENDATION: New FTTI lines will be needed as undergraduate enrollments increase.

RESPONSE: The pool of available PTTIs is not of sufficient size or quality to accommodate the projected increases; our GTAs cannot take on overload teaching without impeding their progress toward degree.

ACTION: The department requests one additional FTTI per 150 additional students.

PROGRESS: Although our establishment of large lectures should reduce our dependence on FTTIs, current enrollment increases create a continuing need for additional FTTI lines. The need is all the greater because we have seemingly exhausted the local supply of PTTIs. In Fall '07, for instance, we succeeded in assigning a teacher to our final unassigned section only when the Administration approved a 6th course overload for one of our current FTTIs.

PROGRESS 2010: We are coping at the present time with the current number of FTTIs and PTTIs. As we develop our large lectures at the 200 level taught by TT faculty, we will work toward converting FTTI lines to GTA lines to decrease the number of FTTIs and increase the size of the graduate program.

PROGRESS 2011: We ended up with 4 additional FTTI lines, but at a lower salary and for one year. The Hiring Committee was not happy with this development. It’s unclear to me how we can possibly “convert” any of the lines to GTA lines without a decrease in enrollment.

PROGRESS 2012: Again, we were given 4 one-year positions, but we discovered that the one-year positions from last year were actually helpful in vetting people to see if we wanted to consider them for a multi-year position. We discovered (through some data that one of our Instructor Liaisons found) that we are one of just a handful of universities who offer renewable contracts and benefits for FTTIs (let alone travel money and other support). This confirmed our impression that we take good care of our FTTIs.

PROGRESS (2013): Because of the success of our Large Lecture Initiative at the 200 level for lit, taught by TT faculty, we were able to actually stabilize or reduce the need for additional FTTI lines.

RECOMMENDATION: The department needs an increase in operating budget.
RESPONSE: The department operating budget of $38,000 has not been increased in living memory. Almost all of our endowed funds are restricted to specific uses that do not permit them to be used for such mundane things as copier paper and monthly telephone expenses. Currently, the department supplements its operating budget with funds paid to us for our teaching in the Honors and Blount programs; but as enrollment pressures increase, we will be less and less able to afford this service to Honors and BUI. Further, as enrollment increases, monthly operating expenses will only increase.

ACTION: The department requests an increase (over three years) in operating expenses to $50,000.

PROGRESS: We have made dramatic progress on this front due to the impact of the course fees.

PROGRESS 2010: We are very pleased to receive the course fee money, and have put it to good use. A brief report is included in the budget section of the 2010 annual report.

PROGRESS 2011: Same.

PROGRESS 2012: Same.

PROGRESS (2013): Same. The course fee money allows us to supplement the travel allocation in the MOB for pedagogy-related activity at conferences for professors. It also allows us to fund some pedagogy-related conference travel for FTTIs.
GOALS

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

FIVE YEAR PLAN

Finalized during the academic year 2011-2012; updates added below

Department Mission Statement: The Department of English at the University of Alabama respects the power of the English language; we cultivate its study by fostering the arts of reading, writing, and speech. We encourage the creation and interpretation of imaginative works of literature, and a mastery of composition, linguistics, literary theory, and other modes of critical engagement. Students educated in the English Department will be well-prepared, with core liberal arts skills, to take on productive roles in society. These skills include the ability to read with understanding and insight, to think critically about texts in their broader sociopolitical contexts, and to articulate sophisticated thoughts in polished speech and writing appropriate to particular disciplinary audiences.

Since the formulation of the last five-year plan we have created a Department Assessment Plan that articulates outcomes both at the level of the department, and also at the level of degree programs in terms of student learning. In the interests of transparency and accountability in government, which is Department-level Outcome 1, our current governance document, department assessment plan, and 5-year plan will all be available to all faculty and staff of the English Department in the English folder on the UA share drive. As part of our 5-year plan the Department will examine our progress at the end of each academic year in terms of the department-level expected outcomes and also in terms of student learning in degree programs.

The five-year plan as formulated in 2011 is framed in terms of a vision for each program and what we perceive to be the needs associated with achieving that vision. The plan concludes with some more general departmental issues, including office staff support for UA’s increasing enrollment.

(1) The First-year Writing Program and the Writing Center

The English Department sees the FWP and WC as developing in our students basic skills on which academic success at the University depends, both for English majors and for all other students. (See Department-level Outcome 2.) These skills include the ability to read with understanding and insight, to think critically about texts in their broader sociopolitical contexts, and to articulate sophisticated thoughts in polished speech and writing appropriate to particular disciplinary audiences. The increase of the university population to 35,000 students over the next 5 years will be felt first in the First-year Writing Program. The Department believes that the increase in enrollment should not be accommodated mainly by the hiring of contingent faculty, but rather by the hiring of a significant number of TT faculty so that more TT faculty can have contact with students at the UG level.

FIRST-YEAR WRITING PROGRAM
The First-year Writing Program’s goals for the next five years involve both looking within and reaching outward. We want to continue our efforts to analyze our program—particularly our course goals and how we measure student learning. At the same time, we will continue to participate in outreach efforts like learning communities and themed EN 102s, while also creating a new Writing-across-the-Curriculum-based writing handbook developed with University-wide input to better assess and meet writing needs across the campus.

2011-12: Develop and implement new approach for teaching basic writing (EN 100) [This was not approved by the University]

2012-13: Refine course goals and learning outcomes for First-year Writing courses, including online courses [See Appendix for Report on the First-Year Writing Program.]

2013-14: Refine SOI instrument to better assess student learning, including online courses

2014-15: Work with College toward more plagiarism prevention and remediation

2015-16: Develop custom writing handbook with Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing in the Disciplines (WAC/WID) focus

NEEDS:

- A permanent staff position at the level of Associate Director of the First-year Writing Program to assist in (1) conducting assessment, (2) training and supervising both the graduate students and the instructors who teach writing in the FWP, (3) serving as a resource for faculty teaching in the undergraduate program generally, and (4) guiding teachers with specialized help in incorporating technology effectively into teaching. [We understand that a version of this need has been approved. Also, we have hired our first CLTF with specialization in the teaching of composition.]

THE WRITING CENTER

The dual goals of the Writing Center for the next five years are (1) to continue to serve the Department by cycling in a number of first-year graduate students each year, and (2) to better serve the University by retaining a core of dedicated staff for more than one year.

1. At the Department level, the Writing Center will evolve from a pre-service training site for first-year GTAs (in which all receive training and supervised experience in teaching writing in a one-on-one tutoring context) to a destination assignment, one with as much cachet as a classroom teaching post. GTAs and instructors will compete for a limited number of available positions on the Writing Center staff each year, with priority given to CRES students and instructors. This move will augment staff professionalism and expertise and assist CRES in recruiting. The Department will also benefit, as more GTAs will be available for discussion groups for large-lecture sections and other assignments.
2. At the University level, the Writing Center will become a destination site for all students interested in pursuing a concentration in Writing Center studies. A small (2-3 course) core of Writing Center-related coursework will be developed, and students completing these courses will have the opportunity to compete for positions on the Writing Center staff. These students will have every opportunity to participate in the full life of the Writing Center, including tutoring, research, and service initiatives. These initiatives will include additional satellite sites and online services.

2011-2012: Begin WC coursework; WC students begin joining staff; negotiations with deans, provost for additional funding for hires outside the Dept; work with Dept to discuss GTA reassignments [We began to realize that the Large Lectures would compete with the WC for the first-year literature graduate students.]

2012-2013: Develop coursework and outside hiring; develop additional satellite and/or additional online services; continue discussing GTA reassignments with Dept; # of English GTAs on staff reduced [Courses were approved. GTA assignments are an issue because of the demands of the Large Lectures, which need incoming literature graduate students. The deans are aware of this issue.]

2013-2014: Coursework and outside hiring continues; # of English GTAs on staff reduced

2014-2015: Coursework and outside hiring continues; # of English GTAs on staff reduced

2015-2016: WC positioned as alternate and/or additional teaching site for limited number of English GTAs; no more than half of the staff will be comprised of English GTAs

NEEDS:

- Additional funding from Provost for GTA hires outside the Department

(2) Undergraduate Programs at the 200-400 Level

Student Learning:

See our Degree Program Student Learning Outcomes for the English Major. We will monitor our progress at the end of each academic year. The Department believes that the increase in enrollment should not be accommodated mainly by the hiring of contingent faculty, but rather by the hiring of a significant number of TT faculty so that more TT faculty can have contact with students at the UG level.

2011-2015:

- Encourage everyone teaching undergraduates to (1) participate in opportunities to learn about how to incorporate practices associated with active and collaborative learning, and (2) explore using technology effectively to enhance learning [Our instructors have created a resource shell in Blackboard Learn, i.e., FITe Club “Fantastic Instructors Teaching English”; our instructors have organized a monthly “Lit Salon” where professors and instructors share pedagogical insights.]
Track use of technology in teaching

2016/17: Complete department-wide adoption of course outcomes assessment

NEEDS:

- more TT faculty lines so that UG students can have more contact with active researchers during their progress toward a BA degree [One new TT hire in 2012-2013.]
- additional media equipment in the classrooms that we control [The College is converting rooms in Morgan Hall to media rooms.]

Undergraduate Research:

Our revised Departmental Honors Program offers more opportunities for undergraduate students to work closely with professors in writing a long paper in the form of a thesis. Our award-winning chapter of the English Honor Society Sigma Tau Delta offers the possibility for our undergraduates to present their work at the annual conference, and also to publish their work in our new undergraduate literary magazine, DewPoint. The University of Alabama fosters undergraduate research by organizing an annual Undergraduate Research Conference in which our students participate. Our faculty are exploring joint authorship of scholarly papers with undergraduates.

2011-2016:

- Track the number of honors theses written, Sigma Tau Delta presentations, publication in DewPoint, participation in the UA UG Research Conference, and joint publication with professors [We have incorporated most of this information in the Annual Reports.]
- Explore ways to encourage more UG research participation

NEEDS:

- clear recognition in University evaluation processes for professors of the amount of teaching effort that goes into supervising an honors thesis or co-authoring an article with an undergraduate
- more TT faculty so that more undergraduate students can have the opportunity to work with a professor on an honors thesis

Retention\Graduation:

We have instituted important changes in our advising procedures, making excellent use of technology. We will continue to incorporate new ways of advising, mentoring, and tracking our students, both as UG majors and also as graduates of the program. Another focus for us will be gathering good information on the range of employment possibilities open to English majors, and displaying it in appropriate ways using social media.

2011/16:
• Continue to refine advising procedures [DegreeWorks is very helpful in this regard, and re are using group advising as well.]

• Explore appropriate use of social media in communicating both with current majors and minors and also with graduates [We have compiled an email list of graduates who are willing to be contacted in that way.]

• Gather information on career trajectories for English majors

• Collaborate with Career Services to create a sequence of experiences during the major that make students aware of possible careers for English majors and equip them to enter the job market

**International/Interdisciplinary:**

Faculty from the department regularly participate in UA’s Oxford Program. Other plans that would expand our involvement in international programs are in the works. There are courses cross-listed or jointly developed with Modern Languages & Classics, Gender and Race Studies, and New College. The linguistics faculty will continue to coordinate with the College of Education concerning our introductory linguistics course for prospective English teachers (EN 321), and will explore the possibility of an interdisciplinary minor in linguistics, based in English but with collaboration from Modern Languages & Classics and Anthropology. The Americanist Workshop is organized in English but draws in faculty from other departments and colleges. A number of English Department faculty from across our programs are founding and continuing members of the Digital Humanities Initiative on campus.

**Progress from 2012-2013:** We are working with linguist colleagues on the interdisciplinary minor in linguistics and have it almost to the stage where it can be presented to the various departments; two professors collaborated in starting an interim course in Cuba that we hope will become a continuing project; we have initiated a new international program, Alabama in Ireland, to begin in summer of 2013.

2013/14: Gather new baseline data on student participation; begin to establish funding to support student participation in international study; begin to establish funding to support faculty participation in international study

2014/15: Develop plan to further expand student participation

2015/16: Increase student participation in international study by 5%

2016/17: Increase student participation in interdisciplinary study by 5%

**NEEDS:**

• funding (in the form of scholarships) to support student participation in international study

• funding to support faculty participation in international study
• FTTIs and eventually another TT faculty member who can teach UG linguistics courses as we develop the interdisciplinary minor [We have one FTTI currently who is qualified to teach introductory linguistics.]

(3) Graduate Programs

Enrollment:

Our current graduate enrollment is proportionately appropriate in relation to our undergraduate program. Because our GTA stipends and teaching loads are not competitive we lose excellent prospective students to other universities. Experiments with the admission of self-supporting students have not been successful. The Applied Linguistics Ph.D. concentration has received permission to admit students, ideally in connection with funded students from our partnership with Ocean University of China, but the faculty intend to be highly selective. The linguistics faculty will also explore funding for Ph.D. lines through external grant support. Our goal for 2016 is to have a viable Applied Linguistics Concentration Ph.D. cohort.

2011-2016:

• Gather data on GTA stipends and teaching loads at comparable institutions [The DGS has been working on this.]
• Explore external funding that would support RAs/GTAs

NEEDS:

• higher GTA stipends
• more GTA lines [We have received another GTA for applied linguistics for 2013-2014 because of the influx of Chinese undergraduate students.]

Curriculum and Assessment:

See our Graduate Degree Program student learning outcomes in the Department Assessment Plan. The graduate program has already simplified curriculum requirements, encouraged research-directed learning, and implemented assessment procedures. During 2009-2011 we instituted new MA comprehensive exams guidelines and procedures, eliminated graduate course redundancies between the 500 and 600 levels, administered and began tracking results of MA comprehensive exams, formulated graduate assessment guidelines, and began systematic tracking of graduate placement. Over the next five years, we will reshape our graduate program around the jobs our students actually get. We will initially focus on systematic collection and analysis of placement data, then modify our program based upon the results.

Formulate guidelines for recommending thesis vs. non-thesis option to students based on their career goals.

Consider the comparative size of Master’s and PhD students in the literature program; based on placement record, formulate target enrollment percentages for each entering class.

International Recruiting:

Our greatest success in international recruiting at the present time is in our MA-TESOL program. We do, however, also recruit international students to our MA/PhD and MFA programs. In particular the MA/PhD program has begun a fruitful exchange with Ocean University in China; at present we have two PhD candidates from that university in our program.

Perhaps because of a change of leadership in the Ocean University department, we have not had any follow-up from them. One student that we admitted into our Ph.D. program continues to do well. After Professor Beidler taught in Tsingtao during the summer of 2010 we have not had any interest in our faculty in doing it again. We have not heard further from Saudi Arabia.

Placement and Continuing Contact with Graduates:

We have records of our Ph.D. graduates, but it is much more difficult to track our MA and MFA graduates. We are exploring ways of developing a stronger sense of collective identity and maintaining contact with our graduates through the use of social media.

- Devise ways of tracking our graduates [We are working on this.]
- Explore ways of enhancing a sense of collective identity
- Develop social media to maintain communication with our graduates [The Graduate Program has established a Facebook group.]

NEEDS:

- support for Webpage and social media construction and Public Relations/Development within the Department [Now that we have our new website up and running, we should be able to devote some attention to this through our Technology Committee.]

(4) Research and Creative Activity

Department Level Outcome 3: Faculty will engage in scholarly activities, including research, publication, conference presentations, and creative endeavors.
2011-2016:

- Track scholarly activities through the FAR [This is done by the chair.]
- Encourage productivity in scholarly activities (through our retention review process and annual FAR evaluations) [We are also doing this through discussions of “strategic research areas” and aspirational peers.]
- Encourage participation in the new Digital Humanities Initiative [The chair does this at every opportunity. When the post-doc rotates to English it should help a lot.]
- Encourage faculty participation in activities designed to create academic community in relation to scholarly activities, both within the department (e.g., the proposed Emerging Scholars Series for FTTIs and graduate and undergraduate students), and across departments (the ongoing Americanist Workshop based in the English Department)

NEEDS

- an increase in the English Operating Budget for travel for presentations at conferences and for other appropriate scholarly activities

(5) Diversity:

The Department of English has created its own Diversity Committee that works closely with the College Diversity Committee. The graduate program has consistent representation by international students (typically in the MA-TESOL Program), and we have recently admitted a number of McNair Scholars.

2011/16: Coordinate with OIRA to track our “diversity” and develop a plan

(6) Service:

Department-level expected outcome 4: The department will enrich the intellectual and cultural life of our campus, community, and state.

2011-2016:

- Track the number of public events that we organize, as well as the community outreach and service learning projects we initiate and participate in [We have begun to do this.]
- Explore ways of assessing the impact of our service activities

(7) Recycling and Sustainability: Gradually cut down on paper and energy use; increase recycling.

2011-2016: invite UA Recycling Director to present progress report on English Department annually as part of meeting of Departmental Space and Facilities Committee [This was done last year, but the
Director didn’t seem to have a progress report that related specifically to us. We will try again and be clear. We also periodically encourage faculty to save paper by using technology whenever possible.

(8) Technology: Review how we’re increasingly using technology in teaching, administration, research, service and try to plan intelligently.

2011-2016: Coordinate with eTech to explore ways to track progress in this area [We find UG advising with DegreeWorks to be very helpful; it is now expanding to advising at the graduate level.]

(9) Responding to Enrollment Increases

(a) In terms of faculty:

We currently have almost the same number of TT faculty that we had ten years ago (34 in 2001; 32 in 2011—given that two of our faculty don’t teach for us because they are in administrative roles elsewhere in the university: Joe Hornsby and Hank Lazer). This same period has seen a fifty-eight percent increase in enrollment (from Fall 2001 at 19,171 to Fall 2010 at 30,232 for an increase of 58%), with 35,000 as the projected enrollment target. This increase puts tremendous pressure on the First-year Writing Program. In addition, our numbers of English majors and of Secondary English Language Arts students from the College of Education have increased dramatically. We graduated 78 majors in 2003-4 and 116 majors in 2010-11.

The enrollment increase has been accommodated by hiring FTTIs and PTTIs, a national trend that is not helpful in terms of contact of TT faculty with undergraduate students. We have responded to this dilemma at the Departmental level by experimenting with large lectures at the 200 level taught by TT faculty (with discussion groups led by incoming literature GTAs as part of their professionalization process), and large lectures in introductory linguistics at the 300 level. We can, however, do only so much of this because (1) the students, if given a choice, register for the 35-student classes rather than the large lectures, and (2) the large-lecture model is not appropriate for other courses because of our focus on writing.

We currently have more FTTIs (43) than we have TT faculty teaching for us (35). Since the last 5-year plan we have created a rigorous review process for FTTIs as a condition of creating a renewable contract situation. This allows us to retain excellent teachers, but the problem remains that our TT faculty, because they are the only faculty who can teach in our graduate program, are represented less than the FTTIs and GTAs in undergraduate teaching. We believe that this imbalance is unhealthy for our program, especially if the university is interested in fostering undergraduate research. We have calculated that we need 47 TT faculty to guarantee that all courses at the 300-level and above are taught by TT faculty (as well as our 200-level large lectures). Even if the Lecturer Track is initiated, this does not put active researchers in contact with our English majors.

2011-2016:
• Increase the number of TT positions in the Department to 47 (see hiring priorities for TT positions below) [We hired 1 TT faculty member in 2012-2013 but two will be leaving, so we’re actually down one as we start 2013-2014.]
• Add Lecturers in the new Faculty Track (ideally 10 focussing on the FWP) [We were allowed to hire 1 CLTF specializing in the teaching of composition, who will start in 2013-2014.]
• Reduce the number of FTTIs in the Department. [The success of our Large Lecture initiative has allowed us to avoid asking for an increase in FTTI lines for 2013-2014.]
• As appropriate, increase the number of GTAs in the Department [We received 1 GTA for applied linguistics in light of the increase in the number of Chinese undergraduates in our EN 120/121 classes.]

**NEEDS**

• supplementary funding for converting FTTI positions into GTA lines
• additional TT lines in the English Department

**TT hiring priorities for 2013-2014: [position request due in early July]**

(a) TT lines: We lost two creative writers (a poet and a creative non-fiction writer). Replacing these will be the top priority, followed by two literature positions.

(b) Office Staff: With the massive increase in enrollment, the increase in employees (dramatic increase over the past 5 years or so in FTTIs), the shifting of responsibility for various things to the department level (e.g., P-cards, PA forms for Continuing Studies, etc.), and the increasing demand for technological training and expertise to manage various systems, we need an additional office staff person.

**Immediate Priorities for 2013-2014**

(1) Conduct the required Program Review successfully.
(2) Incorporate the new space in the old Biology Building appropriately into the operations of the English Department.
(3) Prepare the incoming chair to take over seamlessly in 2014-2015.
(4) Successfully conduct whatever searches are authorized for us.
Needs ("Wish List" that we created for Larry O'Neal and then also gave to Kathy Yarbrough]

A wish list from the English Department

for our Development person to have in hand when meeting with potential donors

(revised in spring of 2012, with updates in spring of 2013)

(1) A new building for the English Department constructed according to our specifications, or failing that, more office space for additional TT faculty and instructors. [Note: The dean has offered us and we have accepted some space in the old Biology Building and we have submitted the work request for that project.]

(2) Media equipment in all classrooms that we use. [This is happening as fast as the College can do it.]

(3) Additional rooms for large lectures on campus so that we can work in this way to increase our CHP for TT faculty.

(4) Supplementation to our completely inadequate funding for travel/research for faculty: This funding allows professors to afford to present their research at professional conferences, which creates visibility for their work and for the Department and the University. We suggest a named fund for this purpose. The fund would receive recognition both at conference presentations and also in ensuing publications. Alternatively, anything that could supplement our travel budget in the general fund of the department would be appreciated.

(5) Better seating for students in the halls of Morgan: We have been using pews acquired second-hand 25 years ago. This year we have begun to gradually replace them with lovely long benches (with backs) built by the UA carpentry shop. We could certainly use at least 7 more of those. I’m sure that we could get a small plaque installed in each with the donor’s name if that would be appropriate.

(6) Scholarship support for the Alabama at Oxford Program would be welcome, especially for students who can’t afford this opportunity without financial aid. Students would of course write thank-you notes to donors.

(7) Support for the annual convention for our very successful Sigma Tau Delta chapter (the English Honor Society for undergraduates): Students from this group routinely have their work accepted (both creative and critical) for presentation at the annual conference of the association, and come home with awards. Funding that could be used to pay their expenses each year would be welcome. Students would write thank-you notes to donors.

(8) Technology funding: We have a fund, the Strickland Fund, that can be used for technology. We would welcome any supplement to this fund, as technology becomes increasingly important.
(9) Full funding of the Robert Milton Young Memorial Lecture is a goal, so that we can pay for the annual lecture with earnings from the fund.

(10) Completely endowed professorships (i.e., endowed with enough money to generate an appropriate salary from interest): It seems to us that this idea would be attractive to donors, in that their name would be on it, and possibly even a specialization if they so chose.

(11) Endowed graduate assistantships would help us to grow our graduate program.

(12) An endowed fund for outside lectures would allow us to bring in outside speakers more easily, enriching the University experience for all of us.

(13) Support for our new undergraduate literary magazine, Dewpoint, would serve as a vote of confidence for our English majors. The magazine was launched in the spring of 2011 and a second volume appeared in spring of 2012. It contains both creative and critical work.

(14) Endowed and named teaching “post-docs” would allow us to attract excellent candidates from among recent Ph.D. recipients to teach in the department as they launch themselves on their academic careers.
Strategic Research Areas from Retreat in August of 2012

Note: The use of Digital Humanities methods should underwrite description of all areas to allow us to compete for research funding

(1) Creative Writing: This program is already recognized as our greatest departmental strength by the College and University.

(2) Early Modern Studies: The Strode Program in Renaissance Studies is also recognized by the College and University as a strength for us.

(3) The “Deeper South” aka “American Tropics”: The idea here would be to find our own niche that doesn’t try to compete with established programs in other Southern universities yet draws on our Southern location and resources. The two sub-categories (6) “The Cuba Initiative” and (7) “Language and Literature in the South” here could be combined under the broader area.

(a) The Cuba Initiative: We already have scholars in the department doing research in this area (Phil, Nikhil, Emily, Joel, Hank…) and other who would be interested in participating (Albert, Catherine, Fred…). The interdisciplinary nature of the program has created natural links for us to other departments if we choose to pursue them.

The Cuba Initiative could perhaps be the basis for a wider strategic research area that would incorporate studies of:

* The literature of the Gulf of Mexico as a region (many interactions and relationships between Louisiana, Alabama, Mexico, Florida, the Caribbean). Cassie Smith's work on Cabeza de Vaca and Estevan, for example, with its attendant relationship to Hernando de Soto, forms a part of this larger American Literature as I see it.
* Pan American literature
* Multilingual U.S. literatures (many canonical Cuban texts were written and published in New York and New Orleans)
* Postcolonial literatures
* Eco-critical studies (E.O. Wilson, Alexander Von Humboldt, Louis Agassiz, among others all did work in Cuba and have seen recent resurgence of critical interest. Even Christopher Columbus seems most interesting now for his descriptions of the flora and fauna of Cuba)
* Diasporic studies (the African Diaspora in Cuba, the Jewish Diaspora in Cuba, the Chinese Diaspora in Cuba (nineteenth century and renewed, which some of our exchange students might take an interest in), and the Cuban Diaspora),
* Tourist studies
* Translations studies
* Studies of Radicalism: (e.g., in relation to the Centro Memorial Martin Luther King Jr., and something related to Paula Freire’s work—which might be of particular interest to CRES faculty).
* Pedagogy (Karen Gardiner's work with the pilot 101 will, I think, lead to some good research on comparative teaching, teaching exchanges, and other projects involving ideology and pedagogy could benefit from Cuban research)

(b) Language and Literature in the South: A focus that could bring together literature, linguistics, CW, and rhetoric (or some combination of potentially all of our programs). It would involve research into Southern English by the linguists (building on the work of Davies and now Bailey as our newest faculty member), Southern rhetoric by the rhetoricians, the representation of Southern English in the canon of Southern literature and its use in characterization by the literary critics, and possibly research into the actual writing practice of creative writers as they attempt to represent Southern English (or into the typical methods by which creative writers are taught how to represent different varieties of English in ways that will be accessible for their readers). The decision of the department to ask for a hire in contemporary American literature
(mentioning Faulkner and O’Connor as desired specializations) is a possible step in this
direction, building on Phil Beidler’s work on Southern writers. Both Harris and Davies are
already affiliated faculty with the Summersell Center for the Study of the South in the History
Department. We could collaborate with American Studies (e.g., with Jolene Hubbs’ courses on
Southern literature).

(4) **Translation Studies:** Our ongoing effort blessed by the Executive Committee last year for Emily
Wittman to explore a focus in Translation Studies in collaboration with the Department of Modern
Languages and Classics and others. Potentially interested faculty in English are: Bilwakesh,
Burke, Davies, Deutsch, Drouin, Liu, Martone, McNaughton, Nelson, Tedeshi, ....(and there may be
others). This would be in tune with an interest in the discipline (MLA) in fostering translation
studies as part of an English major, and in which Emily has already attracted attention to our
department.

(5) **Performance Studies**

(a) **Literature and Film:** We have some successful pedagogy going on in relation to film (Phil,
Sharon, Nikhil, Yolanda, Trudier, Fred). We have a tradition in the department of Phil Beidler
teaching a popular course on literature through film, and Sharon O’Dair has just taught a highly
successful interim course on YouTube Shakespeare. Bringing Shakespeare to new generations
means engaging with performance (both on stage and in film), and an exploration of adaptation.
Such a research focus could involve a collaboration with the Departments of Theatre and Dance
and Telecommunication and Film (and others?). This may not be so innovative, since many
English Departments have film scholars as part of their faculty (e.g., find examples), but maybe
we could find something unique.

(b) **The Visual Arts and Literature:** This would include Burke’s work on ekphrasis.
To: Dean Robert Olin  
From: Catherine Davies, Chair of the English Department  
RE: Review of RTP Guidelines

We have appreciated the opportunity to review and reflect on our current RTP guidelines, because we share the goal of increasing our standing in the discipline. As other chairs mentioned in the recent meeting, we found the exercise to be “affirming” of our current guidelines. We have also realized that we were ahead of the curve, in that we did a thorough revision and strengthening of our guidelines in 2009, according to the timeline laid out in our Governance Document. This revised and updated our guidelines from 2003.

“Aspirational Peers”
Comparison with the RTP guidelines of regional (Georgia, Florida, Tennessee) and national (Delaware, Maryland, Nebraska) “aspirational peers” (as determined by a combination of Carnegie Classification and USN&WR rankings), reveal us to be expecting comparable achievements for tenure. All of these institutions are in Carnegie Classification RU/VH, all are ranked higher than UA in the US News rankings for graduate programs in English, and all have tenure guidelines that resemble ours.

“List of Aspirational Peers Institutions within the Carnegie Classification RU/VH.” (USN&WR rankings in parentheses)

University of Tennessee (71)  
University of Florida (52)  
University of Georgia (58)  
U of Nebraska (63)  
U of Delaware (71)  
University of Maryland (35)  
University of Alabama (94)

Congruence of our Current Document
Our aspirational peers are also careful to note that subdisciplines within an English Department may have different profiles that are equivalent (i.e., literature, composition/rhetoric, creative writing, linguistics). You will notice in paragraph 3.1 of our guidelines (pasted in directly below) that we (1) emphasize excellence as well as “consistent and continuing publication;” (2) clearly state that different subdisciplines may have different standards; (3) specify, using the “book” as a benchmark, how that is to be understood with equivalences; (4) discuss peer-reviewed articles; (5) give very helpful detail about what a “pre-publication [book] prospectus” should include; and (6) provide for assessment of ongoing work.

Here is that paragraph 3.1, which we are not currently changing.

3.1. RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION

The standards for promotion to tenured rank are excellence of scholarly work and/or creative activity, and consistent and continuing publication. The tenured faculty assess the quality,
quantity, and significance of the candidate’s body of work, keeping in mind the standards appropriate to the candidate’s particular sub-discipline. It is generally expected that during the candidate's time at the University, he or she will have published a book with, or had a book manuscript accepted for publication by, a well-regarded press with appropriate standards of peer review. (In some cases the major published or performed project may be other than a book.) Alternatively, a candidate may demonstrate substantial progress toward the completion of a published book as evidenced by submission of a completed book manuscript to a well-regarded press, or by significant peer-reviewed journal publications and a pre-publication prospectus which includes 1) a project narrative describing the work's argument, its intended audience, its expected length, and its contribution to the field; 2) an annotated table of contents including the contents and completion status of each chapter, including whether or not a version of the chapter has already been published in article form; and 3) a complete draft of the proposed book project's critical introduction. The tenured faculty also assess the quality, quantity, and significance of the candidate’s ongoing work, and his or her potential for future achievement. The Department acknowledges that different publication profiles may be appropriate in different cases, and that no uniform set of guidelines is possible.

“Retention Review”
We are proud of our Retention Review process, apparently unique in the College, and we want to maintain its mentoring focus. This is not to say that it doesn’t have a judgmental function, in that there is a vote to recommend retention or not, but rather that its main function is to mentor the junior faculty in a careful and consistent way.

We decided that we wanted to add a paragraph to the description of the Retention Review Committee, appended within our RTP guidelines, to clarify its role and to add more language that will highlight for everyone the importance of consistent and continuing scholarly production as an indication of a promising scholarly trajectory beyond tenure. Here is that new paragraph:

The purpose of the Retention Review Committee in the English Department is to provide annual reviews of progress for untenured faculty members with the goal of mentoring the junior faculty in establishing a consistent and continuing research agenda indicating a promising scholarly trajectory beyond tenure, as well as guidance in developing excellence in teaching skills.

Continuing Departmental Conversations
In terms of “fourth-year review benchmarks,” it appears that our aspirational peers do not have these specified. Our departmental discussions over the last month did not yield a clear direction for us, so we have not included benchmarks at this time. We want to continue the conversation about our RTP guidelines, leading up to our next official revision according to our Governance Document in 2015. We are specifically interested in working in the following areas:

(1) It appears that some of the probationary faculty would appreciate more specific benchmarks. Given the diversity of our subdisciplines, we believe that it will be most useful to have each program work on a set of benchmarks, which could then be used by the Retention Review Committee and also the Chair.

(2) We are aware of the need to evaluate digital scholarship appropriately, and we look forward to hearing from the College Digital Humanities committee for their recommendations. The MLA has not been helpful in this regard.
Suggestions for University Support in Raising Status

Finally, in examining the RTP guidelines and situations of our aspirational peers, we have formulated a set of suggestions for how the University of Alabama could support our faculty in raising our status within the discipline. We offer these ideas for your consideration.

(1) Undertake an examination of exactly how the Carnegie Research University Classification could be raised at an institutional level: Is it a question of research funding, or number of PhDs graduated, or total number of faculty publications, or some complex calculus of all of the above?

(2) Increase the number of TT faculty in English to 50. We have 36 TT faculty. We know that you have been working hard on increasing the number of TT faculty. Our aspirational peer institutions, who are higher ranked than we, have the following numbers of TT faculty:

- Univ. Tenn—45
- Univ. FLA—46
- Univ. Georgia—43
- Univ. Nebraska—47
- Univ. Delaware—59
- Univ. Maryland—61

(3) Hire productive scholars at the Associate and Professor level. This is the quickest way to raise our research standing (if, in fact, Carnegie research standing is based on scholarly productivity).

(4) For new hires and assistant professors: Offer competitive salaries. Ours are up to $10K below even regional aspirational peers; give attractive start-up packages (travel, books, software, equipment, etc.) for at least three years.

(5) Expand the College’s excellent mentoring for untenured faculty: Your first-year faculty seminars, now expanded to second and third-year faculty seminars, need to be continued and expanded, along with the Publisher in Residence Program. Institutional support should be provided for “writing groups” for each cohort to provide support and encouragement; in the cohort of 2007 this happened spontaneously, but we can’t rely on that.

(6) Provide pre-tenure research leave: The University of Delaware offers a pre-tenure research leave in either the third or fifth year. We notice that the University of Michigan (a very high aspirational peer, admittedly), provides a pre-tenure sabbatical in the form of a “nurturance leave” in the fourth year. We heartily endorse this idea.

(7) Increase the number and value of summer research grants (with priority for probationary faculty, but available to all).

(8) Allow the use of “course fee money” for travel and research. Research productivity and visibility in the discipline are linked to presentations at scholarly conferences. Scholarly work informs teaching, and students are attracted to graduate programs because of the quality, productivity, and visibility of faculty.
(8) For graduate students: Number and quality of PhD students is important to the Carnegie rankings. In the MA/PhD program, increase the number of doctoral students; reduce the teaching load of all graduate students to 1-1; increase the stipend for their work for us.
Division of Academic Affairs
College of Arts and Sciences
2011-12 Academic Department Assessment Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Name:</th>
<th>College of Arts and Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Name:</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Department Mission Statement:

The Department of English at the University of Alabama respects the power of the English language; our faculty cultivate its study by fostering students in the arts of reading, writing, and speech. We encourage the creation and interpretation of imaginative works of literature, and a mastery of composition, linguistics, literary history, and other modes of critical engagement.

II. Department Expected Outcomes

Include Targets (if any) in Measure box.

Department Outcome 1. The department will provide general education services to the university population through the First Year Writing program and the Writing Center.

Department Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). Draw upon their successful models as we redesign our other introductory courses.

Measure 1.1 Summary of student performance on assigned writing tasks in First Year Writing Program, as evaluated by the Director of FYW.

Measure 1.2 Number of students served and success of accessibility and outreach programs, as determined by the Director of the Writing Center.

Measure 1.3 Completion of preliminary redesign of the introductory literature program along lines similar to First Year Writing.

Department Outcome 2. Faculty will engage in scholarly activities, including research, publication, conference presentations, and creative endeavors.

Department Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). Work with other assessment agencies over the next year to develop a better grounding for a revised research benchmark.

Measure 2.1 At least 30 faculty publications and presentations per year

Measure 2.2 At least 10 internal or external grants submitted per year

Measure 2.3 Open dialogue with at least two other assessment agencies to develop a broader benchmark for success.

Department Outcome 3. The department will enrich the intellectual and cultural life of our campus, community, and state.

Department Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). Provide a more rigorous structure for tracking event participation continuously across the entire year.

Measure 3.1 At least 3 public events with a total attendance of 400

Measure 3.2 At least 2 community outreach and service learning projects

Measure 3.3 Percentage of participation in event tracking.
**Department Outcome 4.** The department will maintain a transparent and accountable system of government.

**Department Outcome #n Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report).** Anecdotal assessment of the review process (Instructor Review and tenure-track retention) ought to be formalized.

| Measure 4.1 | The department reviews and updates the department governance handbook, maintaining standing committees and administrative assignments as mandated by the handbook. This information will be made available through the Share drive. |
| Measure 4.2 | The department establishes clear methods of hiring and retention, including appointed search committees, the Instructor Review process, and the tenure-track retention process. |
| Measure 4.3 | Departmental discussion of review process assessment should be completed; any changes will proceed as the department decides. |

### III. Undergraduate Degree Program(s)

**Program Name: English major**

**Program Outcomes**

**Program Outcome 1.** The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

| Measure 1.1 | 8-year program review strengths |
| Measure 1.2 | 8-year program review opportunities for improvement |

**Program Outcome 2.** The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completions.

| Measure 2.1 | Undergraduate semester credit hour production for the last three fall semesters |
| Measure 2.2 | Number of undergraduate courses and sections offered for the last three fall semesters |
| Measure 2.3 | Number of students in the undergraduate major for the last three fall semesters |
| Measure 2.4 | Number of degrees awarded in the undergraduate major for last three years |
| Measure 2.5 | ACHE viability standards |

**Program Outcome 3.** The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

| Measure 3.1 | Results from University-wide Graduating Senior Survey for senior department majors |
| Measure 3.2 | Results from most recent NSSE for department senior majors |
| Measure 3.3 | Results from exit survey for graduating majors and minors |
| Measure 3.4 | Results from informal faculty advising or discussion with students regarding future plans |
### Student Learning Outcomes

#### Student Learning Outcome 1
Students will recognize major literary works and authors, and distinguish between major literary periods and genres.

**Student Learning Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report).**
In conjunction with OIRA, the department will implement a course-embedded measure for content in EN 205 for Spring 2012, which will then be used to adjust the course accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1.1</th>
<th>Student performance on exams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1.2</td>
<td>Progressive improvement in student performance on the annual Disciplinary Knowledge survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1.3</td>
<td>Implementation of the new course-embedded measure on a pilot basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student Learning Outcome 2
Students will demonstrate writing skills appropriate to the discipline.

**Student Learning Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 2.1</th>
<th>Student performance on a variety of assigned writing tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2.2</td>
<td>Student performance in departmental Honors theses collected as part of the capstone experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student Learning Outcome 3
Students will demonstrate critical thinking skills and imaginative strategies in their written work and presentations.

**Student Learning Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report).**
Develop a tracking mechanism to measure student use of critical thinking and imaginative strategies as a part of their course experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 3.1</th>
<th>Rubric-based evaluation of student written work and presentations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 3.2</td>
<td>Recognition of student work through awards, publication, participation in conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 3.3</td>
<td>Completion of preliminary departmental discussion; pilot proposal stage for potential tracking mechanism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student Learning Outcome 4
Students will participate in a variety of learning experiences to advance their understanding of how language relates to art and to culture.

**Student Learning Outcome #4 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report).**
Improve record keeping and coordinate more effectively with other programs to improve tracking of student participation in a range of programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 4.1</th>
<th>At least 20 students participating in internships and/or service learning projects; students summarize their learning experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 4.2</td>
<td>At least 50 students engaged in international programs, departmental honors, and programs such as BUI and New College; students summarize their learning experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 4.3</td>
<td>Initial implementation of activity tracking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student Learning Outcome 5
Students will engage in the English studies discourse community to demonstrate their ability to assess and participate in a discourse community.

**Student Learning Outcome #5 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 5.1</th>
<th>Satisfactory completion of an introductory course in literary theory, linguistics, advanced composition, or creative writing as assessed by course embedded items on final exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 5.2</td>
<td>At least 50 students involved in discipline-specific activities; students summarize their learning experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Curriculum Maps #1 (In which courses are Student Learning Outcomes Addressed)

Use “Introduce” when outcome is first address; “Reinforce” when outcome is reinforced; and “Master” when outcome is expected to be mastered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix/Number</th>
<th>Historical Development</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Critical thinking</th>
<th>Variety of learning experiences</th>
<th>Membership in discourse community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN 205</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-level theory/ling/writing</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-level early literature</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-level 18/19 century literature</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-level senior seminars</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W course requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Curriculum Maps #2 (What assessment measures will be employed in which courses for each SLO)

Indicate which measure is being obtained in which course by typing “Measure n.n” in the appropriate cell. If you’d rather use a description of the measure, that is fine. Also, indicate the year/semester in which the measure will be obtained (e.g., Fall 2011). Student learning outcomes must be assessed at least once within a 2-year period. Note that a measure does not need to be obtained from every course in which an outcome is covered (see Map #1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix/Number</th>
<th>Historical development</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Critical thinking</th>
<th>Variety of learning experiences</th>
<th>Membership in discourse community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN 205</td>
<td>Measure 1.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 2.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-level theory/ling/writing</td>
<td>Measure 2.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 3.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Evidenced by syllabus</td>
<td>Measure 5.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-level early literature</td>
<td>Measure 2.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 3.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-level 18/19 century literature</td>
<td>Measure 2.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 3.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-level senior seminars</td>
<td>Measure 2.1, Fall and Spring Measure 2.2, Spring</td>
<td>Measure 3.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 2.2, Spring</td>
<td>Measure 5.2, Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transcript reports, Fall and Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W course requirement</td>
<td>Measure 2.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 3.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Optional Additional Narrative:  Use this space to provide any additional detail concerning the 2011-12 Department Assessment Plan: Measure 4 primarily involves items outside of the classroom setting; within that setting, our assessment concentrates on diversity of content and emphasis upon language and theories of language. The English program depends heavily upon individually tailored avenues of study; much of the important work of the major takes place within elective courses not currently modeled by the curriculum map.

IV. Graduate Degree Program(s)
Include Targets (if any) in Measure box.

Program Name: MA - Literature

Program Outcomes

Program Outcome 1. The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Measure 1.1 8-year program review strengths.
Measure 1.2 8-year program improvement recommendations.

Program Outcome 2. The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Measure 2.1 Number of applications and percentage of admissions over three year period.
Measure 2.2 Number of graduates over three year period.
Measure 2.3 ACHE Viability standards.

Program Outcome 3. The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Measure 3.1 Results from alumni surveys
Measure 3.2 Employment data

Student Learning Outcomes

Student Learning Outcome 1. Students will recognize major literary works and authors, and distinguish between major literary periods and genres

Student Learning Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). Design and pilot a graduate-level equivalent to the DKAS.

Measure 1.1 Student performance on seminar papers, assessing knowledge of major literary works
Measure 1.2 Student performance on seminar papers, assessing ability to distinguish between major literary periods and genres
Measure 1.3 Completion of pilot MA DKAS.

**Student Learning Outcome 2** Students will demonstrate writing skills appropriate to the discipline.

Measure 2.1 Student performance on seminar papers and other assigned writing tasks
Measure 2.2 For those selecting MA-Thesis Option, successful completion of the thesis

**Student Learning Outcome 3** Students will demonstrate a level of professionalization sufficient for further graduate study and employment

Student Learning Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). Institute formal tracking system.

Measure 3.1 # of admissions to PhD programs
Measure 3.2 percent of graduates employed within 1 year
Measure 3.3 faculty observations of teaching
Measure 3.4 At least 50% response rate to formal tracking system

**Student Learning Outcome 4** Students will demonstrate theoretical and practical expertise in teaching

Measure 4.1 Successful completion of pedagogy course(s)
Measure 4.2 Construction of course syllabi prior to teaching
Measure 4.3 Undergraduate student course evaluation results

**Curriculum Maps #1** (In which courses or in what activities or assignments are Student Learning Outcomes Addressed)

Use “Introduce” when outcome is first address; “Reinforce” when outcome is reinforced; and “Master” when outcome is expected to be mastered. Note that you do not need to obtain a measure from every course in which an outcome is addressed (see Map #2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1 distribution</th>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcome 1</strong> knowledge of literary history</th>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcome 2</strong> writing skills</th>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcome 3</strong> professionalization</th>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcome 4</strong> teaching</th>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcome 5</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 2 <strong>535/536/635</strong></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3 <strong>537</strong></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Experience <strong>533/534</strong></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Experience teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Curriculum Map II  (What assessment measures will be employed in which courses/activities/assignments for each Student learning Outcome)
Indicate which measure is being obtained in which course by typing “Measure n.n” in the appropriate cell. If you’d rather use a description of the measure, that is fine. Also, indicate the year/semester in which the measure will be obtained (e.g., Fall 2011). Student learning outcomes must be assessed at least once within a 2 ½ year period. Note that a measure does not need to be obtained from every course in which an outcome is covered (see Map #1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 4</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>distribution</td>
<td>knowledge of literary history</td>
<td>writing skills</td>
<td>professionalization</td>
<td>teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>Measure 1.1 and 1.2, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 2.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535/536/635</td>
<td>Measure 1.1 and 1.2, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 2.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>Measure 2.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure 3.3, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 4.2, Fall and Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>Measure 2.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 3.3, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 4.3, Fall and Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Experience</td>
<td>533/534</td>
<td>Measure 2.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 3.3, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 4.2, Fall and Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Experience</td>
<td>teaching</td>
<td>Measure 2.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 3.3, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 4.3, Fall and Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Name: MFA in Creative Writing

Program Outcomes

Program Outcome 1. The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Measure 1.1 8-year program review strengths.

Measure 1.2 8-year program improvement recommendations.

Program Outcome 2. The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Measure 2.1 Number of applications and percentage of admissions over three year period.

Measure 2.2 Number of graduates over three year period.

Measure 2.3 ACHE Viability standards.

Program Outcome 3. The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Measure 3.1 Results from alumni surveys

Measure 3.2 Employment data

Student Learning Outcomes
**Student Learning Outcome 1.** Students will demonstrate historical and theoretical understanding of the field of imaginative writing

| Measure 1.1 | Participation in and variation within established imaginative forms as exhibited in student portfolios that are evaluated by faculty |
| Measure 1.2 | Successful completion of course requirements; understanding evaluated by course-embedded assessments |

**Student Learning Outcome 2** Students will write skillfully and imaginatively

**Student Learning Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report).** Develop a formal reporting process for publications.

| Measure 2.1 | Faculty evaluation of student portfolios |
| Measure 2.2 | Publications of student work |
| Measure 2.3 | 50% of students responding to reporting request. |

**Student Learning Outcome 3** Students will demonstrate theoretical and practical understanding of how to teach imaginative writing

| Measure 3.1 | Completion of pedagogy course(s); percent of students who completed them successfully |
| Measure 3.2 | Faculty observations of student teaching |
| Measure 3.3 | Student course evaluation results |

**Student Learning Outcome 4** Students will display a level of professionalization sufficient for employment and/or further study

**Student Learning Outcome #4 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report).** Changed measure 4.2 from employment in the discipline (difficult to define for creative writers) to participation in readings and other public events.

| Measure 4.1 | # of admissions to PhD programs |
| Measure 4.2 | Participation in readings and other public events |
| Measure 4.3 | Successful oral defense of thesis |

**Curriculum Maps #1** (In which courses or in what activities or assignments are Student Learning Outcomes Addressed)

Use “Introduce” when outcome is first address; “Reinforce” when outcome is reinforced; and “Master” when outcome is expected to be mastered. Note that you do not need to obtain a measure from every course in which an outcome is addressed (see Map #2)

<p>| Course 1 | Course 2 | Course 3 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genres distribution</th>
<th>Forms distribution</th>
<th>CW pedagogy courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcome 1</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome 2</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical and theoretical understanding</td>
<td>writing</td>
<td>teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintroduce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 4</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genres distribution</td>
<td>Historical and theoretical understanding</td>
<td>writing</td>
<td>teaching</td>
<td>professionalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 2.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 2</th>
<th>Genres distribution</th>
<th>Form distribution</th>
<th>CW pedagogy courses</th>
<th>Required Experience</th>
<th>Common Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 1.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 2.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 3.2, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 3.2, Fall and Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 3</th>
<th>Genres distribution</th>
<th>Form distribution</th>
<th>CW pedagogy courses</th>
<th>Required Experience</th>
<th>Common Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 1.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 2.1, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 3.2, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 3.2, Fall and Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Name:** MA in Teaching English as a Second Language

**Program Outcomes**

**Program Outcome 1.** The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

- Measure 1.1 8-year program review strengths.
- Measure 1.2 8-year program improvement recommendations.
Program Outcome 2. The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

- Measure 2.1 Number of applications and percentage of admissions over three year period.
- Measure 2.2 Number of graduates over three year period.
- Measure 2.3 ACHE Viability standards.

Program Outcome 3. The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

- Measure 3.1 Results from alumni surveys
- Measure 3.2 Employment data

Student Learning Outcomes

Student Learning Outcome 1. students will demonstrate mastery of the principles of TESOL

- Measure 1.1 course-embedded direct assessment through papers and tests
- Measure 1.2 comprehensive exam

Student Learning Outcome 2 students will demonstrate theoretical and practical expertise in teaching composition

- Measure 2.1 completion of pedagogy course
- Measure 2.2 faculty observations of student teaching
- Measure 2.3 student course evaluation results

Student Learning Outcome 3 students will demonstrate the ability to teach English language skills in an Intensive English program

- Measure 3.1 faculty observations of student teaching
- Measure 3.2 student course evaluation results

Student Learning Outcome 4 students will display a level of professionalization sufficient for further graduate studies and employment

Student Learning Outcome #4 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). Formalize reporting of employment and publications.

- Measure 4.1 presentation of student work at national and international professional conferences
- Measure 4.2 # of admissions to PhD programs
- Measure 4.3 employment in the discipline
- Measure 4.4 At least 50% reporting response rate.

Curriculum Maps #1 (In which courses or in what activities or assignments are Student Learning Outcomes Addressed)

Use “Introduce” when outcome is first address; “Reinforce” when outcome is reinforced; and “Master” when outcome is expected to be mastered. Note that you do not need to obtain a measure from every course in which an outcome is addressed (see Map #2)
### Curriculum Map II

(What assessment measures will be employed in which courses/activities/assignments for each Student learning Outcome)

Indicate which measure is being obtained in which course by typing “Measure n.n” in the appropriate cell. If you’d rather use a description of the measure, that is fine. Also, indicate the year/semester in which the measure will be obtained (e.g., Fall 2011). Student learning outcomes must be assessed at least once within a 2 ½ year period. Note that a measure does not need to be obtained from every course in which an outcome is covered (see Map #1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 4</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Experience</td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Experience</td>
<td>teaching</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Task</td>
<td>Comprehensive exam</td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Assignment</td>
<td>Activity 1</td>
<td>Conference presentations</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Outcomes

Program Outcome 1. The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Measure 1.1 8-year program review strengths.
Measure 1.2 8-year program improvement recommendations.

Program Outcome 2. The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Measure 2.1 Number of applications and percentage of admissions over three year period.
Measure 2.2 Number of graduates over three year period.
Measure 2.3 ACHE Viability standards.

Program Outcome 3. The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Measure 3.1 Results from alumni surveys
Measure 3.2 Employment data

Student Learning Outcomes

Student Learning Outcome 1. Ph.D. students will demonstrate comprehensive mastery of one sub-discipline of English studies

Measure 1.1 comprehensive written exam
Measure 1.2 faculty evaluation of seminar papers
Measure 1.3 oral defense of dissertation

Student Learning Outcome 2 Ph.D. students will demonstrate the writing, interpretive, and analytical skills required of a publishing scholar

Student Learning Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report).
Formalize reporting of presentations and publications.

Measure 2.1 oral defense of dissertation
Measure 2.2 presentation and/or publication of student work
Measure 2.3 seminar papers
Measure 2.4 At least 50% reporting rate.

Student Learning Outcome 3 Ph.D. students will gain theoretical and practical expertise in the teaching of literature

Measure 3.1 completion of pedagogy course(s)
Measure 3.2 faculty observation of teaching
Measure 3.3 undergraduate student course evaluation results

Student Learning Outcome 4 students will achieve a level of professionalization sufficient for employment in higher education
Formalize reporting procedures.

**Measure 4.1** student employment placement rates

**Measure 4.2** presentation and/or publication of student work

**Measure 4.3** oral defense of dissertation

**Measure 4.4** Track at least 50% of students.

**Curriculum Maps #1** (In which courses or in what activities or assignments are Student Learning Outcomes Addressed)

Use “Introduce” when outcome is first address; “Reinforce” when outcome is reinforced; and “Master” when outcome is expected to be mastered. Note that you do not need to obtain a measure from every course in which an outcome is addressed (see Map #2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 4</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600-level courses</td>
<td>Mastery of sub-discipline</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Professionalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Experience</td>
<td>533/534</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td>Introduce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Experience</td>
<td>Prelim exams</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Task</td>
<td>dissertation</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1</td>
<td>teaching</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Curriculum Map II** (What assessment measures will be employed in which courses/activities/assignments for each Student learning Outcome)

Indicate which measure is being obtained in which course by typing “Measure n.n” in the appropriate cell. If you’d rather use a description of the measure, that is fine. Also, indicate the year/semester in which the measure will be obtained (e.g., Fall 2011). Student learning outcomes must be assessed at least once within a 2 ½ year period. Note that a measure does not need to be obtained from every course in which an outcome is covered (see Map #1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 4</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600-level courses</td>
<td>Mastery of sub-discipline</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Professionalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>Measure 1.2, Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Measure 2.3, Fall and Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Experience</th>
<th>Measure 3.2, Fall and Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>533/534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prelim exams</td>
<td>Measure 1.1, Fall and Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Task</td>
<td>Measure 1.3, Fall and Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissertation</td>
<td>Measure 2.1, Fall and Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Assignment</td>
<td>Measure 4.3, Fall and Spring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 1</th>
<th>teaching</th>
<th>Measure 3.3, Fall and Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional Additional Narrative: Use this space to provide any additional detail concerning the 2011-12 Department Assessment Plan. Many of the department's improvement initiatives do not neatly fit into this form. Most particularly, the department has initiated an assessment and reorganization of the introductory literature program, aimed at duplicating the success of our First Year Writing program and strengthening both instruction and assessment at the introductory and foundational level. This redevelopment will also involve the institution of a pilot content knowledge assessment in these courses which can also be used to assess teaching. We are also taking steps to encourage voluntary reporting from our graduate students and graduates, who often go silent upon leaving school. And we are active in the beginning stages of a broader movement in the discipline to establish national standards and benchmarks for the study of English, a monumental task we expect will take many years to complete.
Mission / Purpose

The Department of English at the University of Alabama respects the power of the English language; our faculty cultivate its study by fostering students in the arts of reading, writing, and speech. We encourage the creation and interpretation of imaginative works of literature, and a mastery of composition, linguistics, literary history, and other modes of critical engagement.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Demonstrate understanding of imaginative writing

Students will demonstrate historical and theoretical understanding of the field of imaginative writing.

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map I-Creative Writing M.F.A.
Curriculum Map II-Creative Writing M.F.A.

Relevant Associations:
Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Fine Arts - SLO is related to a better understanding of the nature and validity of artistic expression through global and multi-cultural perspective, historical and cultural content, creative processes and/or aesthetics and critical thinking
7 Literature - SLO is related to major intellectual and aesthetic ideas covering multiple genres over a broad historical/literary period

Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.

Related Measures

M 1: Participation and variation within imaginative forms

Participation in and variation within established imaginative forms as exhibited in student portfolios that are evaluated by faculty.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
No defined disciplinary target exists. 100% would be the ideal.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All students met or exceeded expectations in all courses.

M 2: Completion of course requirement

Successful completion of course requirements; understanding evaluated by course-embedded assessments.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
No defined disciplinary target exists. 100% would be the ideal.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All students completed course requirements. This meets our expectations.

SLO 2: Writing ability

Students will write skillfully and imaginatively.

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map I-Creative Writing M.F.A.
Curriculum Map II-Creative Writing M.F.A.

Relevant Associations:
Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Fine Arts - SLO is related to a better understanding of the nature and validity of artistic expression through global and multi-cultural perspective, historical and cultural content, creative processes and/or aesthetics and critical thinking
11 Writing - SLO is related to building on students’ competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend
Strategic Plan Associations

University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.

Related Measures

M 3: Evaluation of Portfolio
faculty evaluation of student portfolios
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
No defined disciplinary target exists. 100% would be the ideal.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Similar finding to last year.

M 4: Publications
publications of student work
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
No specific numeric expectation exists.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Comments from 2011-2012 still apply.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Adjust outcome
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Change the outcome from assessing publications while enrolled in the program to tracking publications over a broader period.

SLO 3: Demonstrate understanding of teaching imaginative writing
students will demonstrate theoretical and practical understanding of how to teach imaginative writing

Related Documents
Curriculum Map I-Creative Writing M.F.A.
Curriculum Map II-Creative Writing M.F.A

Relevant Associations:

Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes
3.3.1.3 Educational support services

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
2 Fine Arts - SLO is related to a better understanding of the nature and validity of artistic expression through global and multi-cultural perspective, historical and cultural content, creative processes and/or aesthetics and critical thinking
11 Writing - SLO is related to building on students' competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend those skills

Strategic Plan Associations

University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.
3.3 Encourage and reward creative strategies for engaging students in learning and life-long learning.

Related Measures

M 5: Complete pedagogy courses
completion of pedagogy course(s); percent of students who completed them successfully
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
Ideally, all students will successfully complete the pedagogy courses.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All students completed the pedagogy courses successfully.

M 6: Observation by Faculty
faculty observations of student teaching
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
GTAs judged to be performing well based upon classroom observation.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Same finding and comments as 2011-2012.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
Gather existing observation reports
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Many faculty informally observe GTAs in the classroom as part of the process of writing them recommendation letters. The depart...

M 7: Student course evaluation
student course evaluation results
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
Monitor GTA evaluation results; assist those in need.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Same comment as 2011-2012.

SLO 4: Demonstrate professionalism
students will display a level of professionalism sufficient for employment and/or further study

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map I-Creative Writing M.F.A.
Curriculum Map II-Creative Writing M.F.A

Relevant Associations:
Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.
3.14 Provide career preparation and employment services that lead graduates to satisfying and productive careers and professions.

Related Measures
M 8: Admission rate
# of admissions to PhD programs
Source of Evidence: Graduate/professional school acceptance rate
Target:
No specific target exists. MFAs often do not need to attend a PhD program to find employment in the field.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Students self-report results; so far as we can tell, all students who applied to PhD programs were admitted. Given that this measure does not appear to be extremely useful, it might be better combined with employment after graduation and replaced with an alternate measure.

M 9: Employment rate
employment in the discipline
Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas
Target:
No specific target exists.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We are trying to compile this information in anticipation of our 8th-year Program Review in 2013-2014.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Develop ways to track our graduates
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Coordinate efforts with the graduate program as a whole to track our graduates and their performance.

M 10: Thesis Defense
successful oral defense of thesis
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project
Target:
No specific target exists.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All students defending did so successfully.

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 5: (N/A)Program Outcome: High Level of Recognized Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Related Measures
M 19: (N/A)8-year program review strengths
8-year program review strengths
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
M 20: (N/A)8-year program improvement recommendations
8-year program improvement recommendations.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 6: (N/A)Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Related Measures

M 21: (N/A)Number of applications and percentage of admissions over three year period
Number of applications and percentage of admissions over three year period.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 22: (N/A)Number of graduates over three year period
Number of graduates over three year period
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 23: (N/A)ACHE Viability standards
ACHE Viability standards.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 7: (N/A)Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Program Graduates
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Related Measures

M 24: (N/A)Results from alumni surveys
Results from alumni surveys
Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

M 25: (N/A)Employment data
Employment data
Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

OthOtcm 8: DELETE
The department will maintain a transparent and accountable system of government.

Related Measures

M 11: DELETE
The department reviews and updates the department governance handbook, maintaining standing committees and administrative assignments as mandated by the handbook.
Source of Evidence: Government standards

M 12: DELETE
The department establishes clear methods of hiring and retention, including appointed search committees, the Instructor Review process, and the tenure-track retention process.
Source of Evidence: Government standards

OthOtcm 9: DELETE
The department will provide general education services to the university population through the First Year Writing program and the Writing Center.

Related Measures

M 13: DELETE
Summary of student performance on assigned writing tasks in First Year Writing Program, as evaluated by the Director of FYW.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 14: DELETE
Number of student served and success of accessibility and outreach programs, as determined by the Director of the Writing Center.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 10: DELETE
Faculty will engage in scholarly activities, including research, publication, conference presentations, and creative endeavors.

Related Measures

M 15: DELETE
At least 30 faculty publications and presentations per year
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 16: DELETE
At least 10 internal or external grants submitted per year
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 11: DELETE
The department will enrich the intellectual and cultural life of our campus, community, and state.
Related Measures

M 17: DELETE
At least 3 public events with a total attendance of 400
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 18: DELETE
At least 2 community outreach and service learning projects
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Adjust outcome
Change the outcome from assessing publications while enrolled in the program to tracking publications over a broader period.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Publications | Outcome/Objective: Writing ability

Develop ways to track our graduates
Coordinate efforts with the graduate program as a whole to track our graduates and their performance.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Employment rate | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate professionalization

Gather existing observation reports
Many faculty informally observe GTAs in the classroom as part of the process of writing them recommendation letters. The department should collect these observation results when possible.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Observation by Faculty | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate understanding of teaching imaginative writing

Mission / Purpose
The Department of English at the University of Alabama respects the power of the English language; our faculty cultivate its study by fostering students in the arts of reading, writing, and speech. We encourage the creation and interpretation of imaginative works of literature, and a mastery of composition, linguistics, literary history, and other modes of critical engagement.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Recognize major literary works
Students will recognize major literary works and authors, and distinguish between major literary periods and genres.

Connected Documents
  Curriculum Map I-English B.A.
  Curriculum Map II-English B.A.

Relevant Associations:
Standard Associations
  SACS 3.3.1
    3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
  5 History - SLO is related to historical development and change over major periods of time and/or provides a survey of social, cultural, economic and political developments that have molded the modern world
  7 Literature - SLO is related to major intellectual and aesthetic ideas covering multiple genres over a broad historical/literary period

Strategic Plan Associations
  University of Alabama
    1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
    1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.
Related Measures

**M 1: Exam Performance**
student performance on exams
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target:**
No fixed numeric target.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met**
We continue to administer exams as usual, but we have not systematized what is meant by "recognize major literary works."

**M 2: Improve performance on annual Disciplinary Knowledge survey**
progressive improvement in student performance on the annual Disciplinary Knowledge survey
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
No specific numeric goal.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met**
2012-2013: We have continued to administer the Disciplinary Knowledge Survey to our majors, but I am informed that our Testing Services are now unable, for some reason that I don't quite understand, to collect the data from the surveys. We don't have the time or person power to handle this ourselves in the department, so we will continue to administer the surveys and trust that at some time in the future the University will be able to process the results for us.

**SLO 2: Demonstrate writing skills**
Students will demonstrate writing skills appropriate to the discipline.

**Connected Documents**
Curriculum Map I-English B.A.
Curriculum Map II-English B.A.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Standard Associations**

SACS 3.3.1

3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3  Freshman Composition - SLO is related to writing instruction, citation formatting, conventions of academic writing, audience awareness, varied rhetorical strategies, collaboration, and/or revision with attention to purpose, development, style, grammar, punctuation and spelling

7  Literature - SLO is related to major intellectual and aesthetic ideas covering multiple genres over a broad historical/literary period

11  Writing - SLO is related to building on students' competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend those skills

**Strategic Plan Associations**

University of Alabama

1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.

1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.

Related Measures

**M 3: Performance on writing tasks**
student performance on a variety of assigned writing tasks
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
No specific numeric requirement.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met**
We have a number (33) of undergraduate scholarships and prizes that involve selection of excellent student writing from among our majors. Our Sigma Tau Delta chapter had the largest number of papers (academic and creative) accepted for the national conference of any chapter in the US. As with several other outcomes, no disciplinary standard exists to assess student writing. We will maintain high expectations for our majors’ writing while considering ways to register the characteristic range, flexibility and independence within guidelines intrinsic to the study of English.

**M 4: Evaluation of Portfolio**
evaluation of final portfolio as part of capstone course requirements
Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**
Our current evaluation structure concentrates upon assessing the skills of our best majors to confirm that our major operates at a high level of expectations and standards.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The number of honors theses written by our majors increased from 10 last year to 12 this year.

**SLO 3: Demonstrate critical thinking skills and imaginative strategies**
Students will demonstrate critical thinking skills and imaginative strategies in their written work and presentations

**Connected Documents**
Curriculum Map I-English B.A.
Curriculum Map II-English B.A.
Relevant Associations:

Standard Associations

SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

3 Freshman Composition - SLO is related to writing instruction, citation formatting, conventions of academic writing, audience awareness, varied rhetorical strategies, collaboration, and/or revision with attention to purpose, development, style, grammar, punctuation and spelling
6 Humanities - SLO is related to students' ability to deal with questions of values, ethics, or aesthetics as they are represented in literature, philosophy, religion and the arts
7 Literature - SLO is related to major intellectual and aesthetic ideas covering multiple genres over a broad historical/literary period
11 Writing - SLO is related to building on students' competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend those skills

Strategic Plan Associations

University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.
3.14 Provide career preparation and employment services that lead graduates to satisfying and productive careers and professions.

Related Measures

M 5: Evaluation of written work and presentations
rubric-based evaluation of student written work and presentations
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
No specific numeric target exists.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
There was a similar performance to last year in terms of our majors' performance at adequate or better levels in their written work and presentations. In the absence of disciplinary standards, we believe this number to meet or exceed reasonable expectation. Documentation of critical thinking and imaginative strategies is difficult at best; the department should consider innovative approaches to assess our best students, in addition to the current data gathered from courses at the 200, 300 and 400 levels.

M 6: Recognition of work
recognition of work through awards, publication, participation in conferences
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
No recognized benchmark for recognition of student work exists in our discipline.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
A large number of our majors (33) won awards, prizes, and scholarships. Eighteen presented their work at the annual Sigma Tau Delta English honorary society conference (an increase over last year). We had 26 students in the English Honors Program, and 12 wrote honors theses. Our Sigma Tau Delta chapter published their third issue of the journal that they founded, DewPoint. In the absence of a disciplinary benchmark, we believe these numbers reflect well upon our majors, and will continue to encourage our students to submit work for awards, attend and present at conferences, and pursue Honors in English.

SLO 4: Understanding of language relationships
Students will participate in a variety of learning experiences to advance their understanding of how language relates to art and to culture.

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map I-English B.A.
Curriculum Map II-English B.A.

Relevant Associations:

Standard Associations

SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

6 Humanities - SLO is related to students' ability to deal with questions of values, ethics, or aesthetics as they are represented in literature, philosophy, religion and the arts
7 Literature - SLO is related to major intellectual and aesthetic ideas covering multiple genres over a broad historical/literary period

Strategic Plan Associations

University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.

Related Measures

M 7: Participation in internships and service learning projects
at least 20 students participating in internships and/or service learning projects; students summarize their learning experiences
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: 20 students or more.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
We piloted a new internship in collaboration with the Literacy Council of West Alabama, READ Alabama, Literacy is the Edge (LITE), and the Adult Education Program at Shelton State Community College. The internship is entitled, "Literals Old and New."

M 8: Participation in various programs
at least 50 students engaged in international programs, departmental honors, and programs such as BUI and New College; students summarize their learning experiences

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
At least 50 students.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Twenty-six students participated in the English Honors Program. At least 40 were members of Sigma Tau Delta. Students participated in both the Alabama at Oxford Program during the summer and also our new Alabama in Ireland program.

SLO 5: Demonstrate ability to participate in discourse community
Students will engage in the English studies discourse community to demonstrate their ability to assess and participate in a discourse community.

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map I-English B.A.
Curriculum Map II-English B.A.

Relevant Associations:
Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Freshman Composition - SLO is related to writing instruction, citation formatting, conventions of academic writing, audience awareness, varied rhetorical strategies, collaboration, and/or revision with attention to purpose, development, style, grammar, punctuation and spelling
6 Humanities - SLO is related to students' ability to deal with questions of values, ethics, or aesthetics as they are represented in literature, philosophy, religion and the arts
7 Literature - SLO is related to major intellectual and aesthetic ideas covering multiple genres over a broad historical/literary period
11 Writing - SLO is related to building on students' competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend those skills

Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.
3.2 Expand the development of living/learning communities.
3.4 Increase involvement of undergraduate students in research and scholarly activities.

Related Measures
M 9: Satisfactory completion of an introductory course
satisfactory completion of an introductory course in literary theory, linguistics, advanced composition, or creative writing as assessed by course embedded items on final exam

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
No specific numeric target exists.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
90% of students satisfactorily completed an introductory course in the discipline. All students who complete the major must successfully complete one of these courses.

M 10: Involvement in discipline-specific activities
at least 50 students involved in discipline-specific activities; students summarize their learning experiences

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
At least 50 students.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Student participation is extremely difficult to formally track, as anything from poetry writing outside of class to blog posting to public performance might qualify. Student participation in our English honor society (Sigma Tau Delta) tends to track student involvement fairly well, however. Well over 50 students are members of Sigma Tau Delta. Factoring in student participation in internships and other creative activities, the department considerably exceeds the target of 50 students.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Tracking student activities
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
A more formal procedure to register and promote the wide variety of ways in which our majors participate within the discipline w...
Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 6: (N/A) Program Outcome: High Level of Recognized Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Related Measures

- M 19: (N/A) 8-year program review strengths
  8-year program review strengths
  Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

- M 20: (N/A) 8-year program improvement recommendations
  8-year program review opportunities for improvement
  Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 7: (N/A) Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completions.

Related Measures

- M 21: (N/A) Undergraduate semester credit hour production for the last three fall semesters
  Undergraduate semester credit hour production for the last three fall semesters
  Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

- M 22: (N/A) Number of undergraduate courses and sections offered for the last three fall semesters
  Number of undergraduate courses and sections offered for the last three fall semesters
  Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

- M 23: (N/A) Number of students in the undergraduate major for the last three fall semesters
  Number of students in the undergraduate major for the last three fall semesters
  Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

- M 24: (N/A) Number of degrees awarded in the undergraduate major for last three years
  Number of degrees awarded in the undergraduate major for last three years
  Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

- M 25: (N/A) ACHE Viability standards
  ACHE viability standards
  Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 8: (N/A) Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Program Graduates
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Related Measures

- M 26: (N/A) Results from University-wide Graduating Senior Survey for senior department majors
  Results from University-wide Graduating Senior Survey for senior department majors
  Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

- M 27: (N/A) Results from most recent NSSE for department senior majors
  Results from most recent NSSE for department senior majors
  Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

- M 28: (N/A) Results from exit survey for graduating majors and minors
  Results from exit survey for graduating majors and minors
  Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

- M 29: (N/A) Results from informal faculty advising or discussion with students regarding future plans
  Results from informal faculty advising or discussion with students regarding future plans
  Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 9: DELETE
The department will maintain a transparent and accountable system of government.

Related Measures

- M 11: DELETE
  The department reviews and updates the department governance handbook, maintaining standing committees and administrative assignments as mandated by the handbook.
  Source of Evidence: Government standards

- M 12: DELETE
  The department establishes clear methods of hiring and retention, including appointed search committees, the Instructor Review process, and the tenure-track retention process.
  Source of Evidence: Government standards

OthOtcm 10: DELETE
The department will provide general education services to the university population through the First Year Writing program and the Writing Center.

Related Measures
Summary of student performance on assigned writing tasks in First Year Writing Program, as evaluated by the Director of FYW.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Number of student served and success of accessibility and outreach programs, as determined by the Director of the Writing Center.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Faculty will engage in scholarly activities, including research, publication, conference presentations, and creative endeavors.

Related Measures

At least 30 faculty publications and presentations per year

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

At least 10 internal or external grants submitted per year

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

The department will enrich the intellectual and cultural life of our campus, community, and state.

Related Measures

At least 3 public events with a total attendance of 400

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

At least 2 community outreach and service learning projects

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Tracking student activities

A more formal procedure to register and promote the wide variety of ways in which our majors participate within the discipline would assist the assessment process, help the students themselves to document formally activities which reflect well upon them, and augment material already available through the department website and newsletter. We already register some exciting events, like the recent founding of a new literary journal by Sigma Tau Delta, but for the most part these represent collective accomplishments. As the department works to track graduate student achievement in the discipline, it should also consider ways in which these tracking mechanisms can be adapted to apply to our undergraduates as well.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Involvement in discipline-specific activities | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate ability to participate in discourse community

Mission / Purpose

The Department of English at the University of Alabama respects the power of the English language; our faculty cultivate its study by fostering students in the arts of reading, writing, and speech. We encourage the creation and interpretation of imaginative works of literature, and a mastery of composition, linguistics, literary history, and other modes of critical engagement.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Recognize major literary works

Students will recognize major literary works and authors, and distinguish between major literary periods and genres

Connected Documents
Curriculum Maps II-Literature M.A.
Curriculum Maps I-Literature M.A.

Relevant Associations:
Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
7 Literature - SLO is related to major intellectual and aesthetic ideas covering multiple genres over a broad historical/literary period

Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.

Related Measures

M 1: Student performance on seminar papers
Student performance on seminar papers, assessing knowledge of major literary works
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target:
No numeric target exists.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Same finding as last year.

M 2: Seminar papers assess ability to distinguish between major literary periods and genres
Student performance on seminar papers, assessing ability to distinguish between major literary periods and genres
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
No recognized disciplinary target exists.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
97% of assignments were assessed at a good performance level or better. Even in the absence of disciplinary standards, we believe this performance level to constitute success.

M 3: Completion of pilot MA DKAS
Completion of pilot MA DKAS.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
Complete a pilot version of the Disciplinary Knowledge Assessment Survey for the MA program.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
Our new M.A. exam allows us to evaluate disciplinary knowledge.

SLO 2: Demonstrate writing skills
Students will demonstrate writing skills appropriate to the discipline.

Connected Documents
Curriculum Maps II-Literature M.A.
Curriculum Maps I-Literature M.A.

Relevant Associations:
Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
11 Writing - SLO is related to building on students' competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend those skills

Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.

Related Measures

M 4: Student performance on seminar papers and other writing tasks
Student performance on seminar papers and other assigned writing tasks
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
No disciplinary target exists.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
97% of assignments were assessed at a good performance level or better. Even in the absence of disciplinary standards, we believe this performance level to constitute success.

M 5: Successful completion of the thesis
For those selecting MA-Thesis Option, successful completion of the thesis
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project
Target:
Ideally, all students taking the exam will be able to pass.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All students taking the exam passed.

**SLO 3: Demonstrate professionalization**

students will demonstrate a level of professionalization sufficient for further graduate study and employment

**Connected Documents**
- Curriculum Maps II-Literature M.A.
- Curriculum Maps I-Literature M.A.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Standard Associations**
- SACS 3.3.1
  - 3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**
- 7 Literature - SLO is related to major intellectual and aesthetic ideas covering multiple genres over a broad historical/literary period
- 11 Writing - SLO is related to building on students’ competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend those skills

**Strategic Plan Associations**

University of Alabama
- 1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
- 1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.

**Related Measures**

**M 6: # of admissions to PhD programs**

# of admissions to PhD programs

Source of Evidence: Graduate/professional school acceptance rate

**Target:**

No clear desirable target exists. Student application to PhD programs need not directly relate to the success of the MA program; graduates may instead teach high school English, for example.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Findings from 2011-2012 still apply.

**M 7: percent of graduates employed**

percent of graduates employed within 1 year

Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

**Target:**

In the current job market, it is difficult to determine what percentage of employment represents success. We would obviously prefer a number as close to 100% as the desires of our graduates allow.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Comments from 2011-2012 still apply.

**M 8: Faculty observations of teaching**

faculty observations of teaching

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**

All MAs who will teach should be observed as a part of their training process.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

All students were observed. Any found to need guidance were provided with it by the faculty.

**M 9: Response rate to formal tracking system**

At least 50% response rate to formal tracking system

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target:**

At least 50% response rate to formal tracking system.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**

We are currently trying very hard to track our graduates as part of the report for the 8th-year Program Review in 2013-2014. Often this involves a networking effort, because professors may know, or fellow students, when we don’t hear directly from the graduate. We have also established an email list of our graduates for our new Newsletter; we hope that this will encourage them to let us know what they are doing.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Develop ways to track our graduates**

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012

The new Facebook page, coupled with the department’s new website, may offer the graduate program new tools to track students aft...

**SLO 4: Demonstrate expertise in teaching**

students will demonstrate theoretical and practical expertise in teaching

**Connected Documents**
- Curriculum Maps II-Literature M.A.
- Curriculum Maps I-Literature M.A.

**Relevant Associations:**
Standard Associations

SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1  Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

Strategic Plan Associations

University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.
3.3 Encourage and reward creative strategies for engaging students in learning and life-long learning.

Related Measures

M 10: Completion of pedagogy courses
Successful completion of pedagogy course(s)
Source of Evidence:  Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
Completion of the courses is required of all teachers.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All students completed the courses. We see no reason to change this requirement.

M 11: Construction of course syllabi
Construction of course syllabi prior to teaching
Source of Evidence:  Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
All students must construct an adequate course syllabus as part of their training.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All students completed adequate or better course syllabi. We see no reason to change this requirement. The First-year Writing Program provides model syllabi and significant guidance in syllabus creation. The new OSM system is also very helpful.

M 12: Course evaluation results
Undergraduate student course evaluation results
Source of Evidence:  Student course evaluations on learning gains made
Target:
Monitor GTA evaluation results; assist those in need.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Similar findings to 2011-2012.

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 5: (N/A) Program Outcome: High Level of Recognized Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Related Measures

M 13: (N/A) 8-year program review strengths
8-year program review strengths
Source of Evidence:  Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 14: (N/A) 8-year program improvement recommendations
8-year program improvement recommendations.
Source of Evidence:  Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 6: (N/A) Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Related Measures

M 15: (N/A) Number of applications and percentage of admissions over three year period
Number of applications and percentage of admissions over three year period.
Source of Evidence:  Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 16: (N/A) Number of graduates over three year period
Number of graduates over three year period.
Source of Evidence:  Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 17: (N/A)ACHE Viability standards
ACHE Viability standards.
Source of Evidence:  Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcm 7: (N/A) Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Program Graduates
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The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

**Related Measures**

**M 18:** (N/A) Results from alumni surveys
Results from alumni surveys
Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**M 19:** (N/A) Employment data
Employment data
Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

**OthOtcm 8:** DELETE

The department will provide general education services to the university population through the First Year Writing program and the Writing Center. Department Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). Draw upon their successful models as we redesign our other introductory courses.

**Related Measures**

**M 20:** DELETE
Summary of student performance on assigned writing tasks in First Year Writing Program, as evaluated by the Director of FYW.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 21:** DELETE
Number of students served and success of accessibility and outreach programs, as determined by the Director of the Writing Center.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 22:** DELETE
Completion of preliminary redesign of the introductory literature program along lines similar to First Year Writing.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**OthOtcm 9:** DELETE

Faculty will engage in scholarly activities, including research, publication, conference presentations, and creative endeavors. Department Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). Work with other assessment agencies over the next year to develop a better grounding for a revised research benchmark.

**Related Measures**

**M 23:** DELETE
At least 30 faculty publications and presentations per year
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 24:** DELETE
At least 10 internal or external grants submitted per year
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 25:** DELETE
Open dialogue with at least two other assessment agencies to develop a broader benchmark for success.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**OthOtcm 10:** DELETE

The department will enrich the intellectual and cultural life of our campus, community, and state. Department Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). Provide a more rigorous structure for tracking event participation continuously across the entire year.

**Related Measures**

**M 26:** DELETE
At least 3 public events with a total attendance of 400
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 27:** DELETE
At least 2 community outreach and service learning projects
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 28:** DELETE
Percentage of participation in event tracking.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**OthOtcm 11:** DELETE

The department will maintain a transparent and accountable system of government. Department Outcome #n Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). Anecdotal assessment of the review process (Instructor Review and tenure-track retention) ought to be formalized.

**Related Measures**

**M 29:** DELETE
The department reviews and updates the department governance handbook, maintaining standing committees and administrative assignments as mandated by the handbook. This information will be made available through the Share drive.
M 30: DELETE
The department establishes clear methods of hiring and retention, including appointed search committees, the Instructor Review process, and the tenure-track retention process.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 31: DELETE
Departmental discussion of review process assessment should be completed; any changes will proceed as the department decides.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Develop ways to track our graduates
The new Facebook page, coupled with the department’s new website, may offer the graduate program new tools to track students after they graduate. Facebook, in particular, can provide information about graduate location and employment, so long as they report it there. That said, the department needs to undertake a determined and persistent approach to gathering information on its graduates. In addition to coordinating efforts with the Graduate School and, perhaps, with the Alumni Association, the department should send a regular e-mail to its graduates, when possible, in an attempt to gather information about how they are doing. Providing an incentive for less successful graduates to respond will remain a challenge for the foreseeable future.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Response rate to formal tracking system | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate professionalization

Introductory Literature program development
Over the next few years, the department will develop an Introductory Literature program administration to perform tasks similar to those in First Year Writing, including examination of GTA evaluations.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Course evaluation results | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate expertise in teaching

Detailed Assessment Report
2012-2013 English Ph.D.
As of: 9/03/2013 08:29 PM C EN T R AL
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of English at the University of Alabama respects the power of the English language; our faculty cultivate its study by fostering students in the arts of reading, writing, and speech. We encourage the creation and interpretation of imaginative works of literature, and a mastery of composition, linguistics, literary history, and other modes of critical engagement.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Comprehensive mastery of one sub-discipline of English studies
Ph.D. students will demonstrate comprehensive mastery of one sub-discipline of English studies

Connected Documents
Additional Details-Literature Ph.D.
Curriculum Maps II-Literature Ph.D.
Curriculum Maps I-Literature Ph.D.

Relevant Associations:
Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5 History - SLO is related to historical development and change over major periods of time and/or provides a survey of social, cultural, economic and political developments that have molded the modern world
6 Humanities - SLO is related to students' ability to deal with questions of values, ethics, or aesthetics as they are represented in literature, philosophy, religion and the arts
11 Writing - SLO is related to building on students’ competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend those skills

Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.
Related Measures

M 1: comprehensive written exam
comprehensive written exam
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level
Target:
All students must pass the exam to proceed in the program.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All students passed. The new system seems to be working well, with good cooperation from faculty as part of the MA Exam Committee.

M 2: faculty evaluation of seminar papers
faculty evaluation of seminar papers
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
No specific numeric target exists.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All students completing work were judged to have met or exceeded expectations.

M 3: oral defense of dissertation
oral defense of dissertation
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project
Target:
All students must successfully pass the defense to earn the degree.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All students who defended their dissertations passed.

SLO 2: Demonstrate writing, interpretive, and analytical skills
Ph.D. students will demonstrate the writing, interpretive, and analytical skills required of a publishing scholar

Connected Documents
Additional Details-Literature Ph.D.
Curriculum Maps II-Literature Ph.D.
Curriculum Maps I-Literature Ph.D.

Relevant Associations:

Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
6 Humanities - SLO is related to students' ability to deal with questions of values, ethics, or aesthetics as they are represented in literature, philosophy, religion and the arts
7 Literature - SLO is related to major intellectual and aesthetic ideas covering multiple genres over a broad historical/literary period
11 Writing - SLO is related to building on students' competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend those skills

Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.

Related Measures

M 3: oral defense of dissertation
oral defense of dissertation
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project
Target:
Student dissertation writing must meet our standards for a student to earn the degree.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All dissertations defended in 2012-13 met or exceeded our standards for writing, interpretation and analysis.

M 4: presentation and/or publication
presentation and/or publication of student work
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target:
No specific numeric target exists.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
At present, the department does not formally collect information on presentations or publications, and self-reporting remains an uncertain means of gathering good data. While the program should concentrate first upon gathering information about how our graduates perform after they leave us, we also need to do more to gather and make public the good news about the scholarly work our PhDs are doing and the recognition it receives.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
Develop ways to track our graduates  
*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*  
The new Facebook page, coupled with the department's new website, may offer the graduate program new tools to track students aft...

**M 5: seminar papers**

Seminar papers  
Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level  
**Target:**
No specific numeric target exists.  
*Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met*  
All students completing papers performed at or above expected skill levels.

**M 6: Reporting rate**

At least 50% reporting rate.  
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other  
**Target:**
Get at least 50% of our students to report publications and presentations formally.  
*Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met*  
Our comments from 2011-2012 still apply.

**SLO 3: Gain theoretical and practical expertise**

Ph.D. students will gain theoretical and practical expertise in the teaching of literature  

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**More data collection**

*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*  
Try to collect more information from faculty who informally visit GTA classrooms; consider a more formal observation structure o...
M 9: undergraduate student course evaluation results
undergraduate student course evaluation results
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
No specific numeric target exists.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
GTAs in the First Year Writing program are routinely evaluated and the program analyzes these evaluations.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Assess evaluations
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
As other teaching programs are revamped, put a structure into place to assess student evaluations, if practical.

SLO 4: Achieve a level of professionalization
students will achieve a level of professionalization sufficient for employment in higher education

Connected Documents
Additional Details-Literature Ph.D.
Curriculum Maps II-Literature Ph.D.
Curriculum Maps I-Literature Ph.D.

Relevant Associations:
Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.
3.14 Provide career preparation and employment services that lead graduates to satisfying and productive careers and professions.

Related Measures

M 3: oral defense of dissertation
oral defense of dissertation
Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target:
Students must demonstrate professionalization in their discipline during the defense.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All students who defended were found to have demonstrated the appropriate level of professionalization in their respective disciplines.

M 10: student employment placement rates
student employment placement rates
Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

Target:
No specific numeric target exists. Ideally, we would like 100% of our graduates who seek employment to find it.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
The comments from 2011-2013 still apply. I hear from the Association of Departments of English of the MLA that it is notoriously difficult to track M.A. graduates.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Develop ways to track our graduates
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
The new Facebook page, coupled with the department's new website, may offer the graduate program new tools to track students aft...

M 11: presentation/publication
presentation and/or publication of student work
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
No specific numeric target exists.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
At present, the department does not formally collect information on presentations or publications, and self-reporting remains an uncertain means of gathering good data. While the program should concentrate first upon gathering information about how our graduates perform after they leave us, we also need to do more to gather and make public the good news about the scholarly work our PhDs are doing and the recognition it receives. In addition, the department may wish to consider participation in professional organizations as an additional sign of professionalization. Naturally, we would still need to find out about such participation from our students.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Develop ways to track our graduates**  
*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*

The new Facebook page, coupled with the department's new website, may offer the graduate program new tools to track students aft...

**M 12: Track students**  
Track at least 50% of students.  
Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements  
**Target:**  
Track at least 50% of students.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met**  
Comments from 2011-2012 still apply.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Develop ways to track our graduates**  
*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*

The new Facebook page, coupled with the department's new website, may offer the graduate program new tools to track students aft...

---

**Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**OthOtcm 5: (N/A)Program Outcome: High Level of Recognized Quality**  
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

**Related Measures**

**M 13: (N/A)8-year program review strengths**  
8-year program review strengths  
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 14: (N/A)8-year program improvement recommendations**  
8-year program improvement recommendations.  
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**OthOtcm 6: (N/A)Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment**  
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

**Related Measures**

**M 15: (N/A)Number of applications and percentage of admissions over three year period**  
Number of applications and percentage of admissions over three year period.  
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 16: (N/A)Number of graduates over three year period**  
Number of graduates over three year period.  
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 17: (N/A)ACHE Viability standards**  
ACHE Viability standards  
Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

**OthOtcm 7: (N/A)Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Program Graduates**  
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

**Related Measures**

**M 18: (N/A)Results from alumni surveys**  
Results from alumni surveys  
Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**M 19: (N/A)Employment data**  
Employment data  
Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

**OthOtcm 8: DELETE**  
The department will provide general education services to the university population through the First Year Writing program and the Writing Center. Department Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). Draw upon their successful models as we redesign our other introductory courses.

**Related Measures**

**M 20: DELETE**  
Summary of student performance on assigned writing tasks in First Year Writing Program, as evaluated by the Director of FYW.  
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**M 21: DELETE**  
Number of students served and success of accessibility and outreach programs, as determined by the Director of the
Writing Center.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 22: DELETE**
Completion of preliminary redesign of the introductory literature program along lines similar to First Year Writing.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**OthOtcm 9: DELETE**
Faculty will engage in scholarly activities, including research, publication, conference presentations, and creative endeavors. Department Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). Work with other assessment agencies over the next year to develop a better grounding for a revised research benchmark.

**Related Measures**

**M 23: DELETE**
At least 30 faculty publications and presentations per year

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 24: DELETE**
At least 10 internal or external grants submitted per year

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 25: DELETE**
Open dialogue with at least two other assessment agencies to develop a broader benchmark for success.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**OthOtcm 10: DELETE**
The department will enrich the intellectual and cultural life of our campus, community, and state. Department Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). Provide a more rigorous structure for tracking event participation continuously across the entire year.

**Related Measures**

**M 26: DELETE**
At least 3 public events with a total attendance of 400

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 27: DELETE**
At least 2 community outreach and service learning projects

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 28: DELETE**
Percentage of participation in event tracking.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**OthOtcm 11: DELETE**
The department will maintain a transparent and accountable system of government. Department Outcome #n Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). Anecdotal assessment of the review process (Instructor Review and tenure-track retention) ought to be formalized.

**Related Measures**

**M 29: DELETE**
The department reviews and updates the department governance handbook, maintaining standing committees and administrative assignments as mandated by the handbook. This information will be made available through the Share drive.

Source of Evidence: Government standards

**M 30: DELETE**
The department establishes clear methods of hiring and retention, including appointed search committees, the Instructor Review process, and the tenure-track retention process.

Source of Evidence: Government standards

**M 31: DELETE**
Departmental discussion of review process assessment should be completed; any changes will proceed as the department decides.

Source of Evidence: Government standards

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Assess evaluations**
As other teaching programs are revamped, put a structure into place to assess student evaluations, if practical.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** undergraduate student course evaluation results | **Outcome/Objective:** Gain theoretical and practical expertise

**Develop ways to track our graduates**
The new Facebook page, coupled with the department's new website, may offer the graduate program new tools to
track students after they graduate. Facebook, in particular, can provide information about graduate location and employment, so long as they report it there. That said, the department needs to undertake a determined and persistent approach to gathering information on its graduates. In addition to coordinating efforts with the Graduate School and, perhaps, with the Alumni Association, the department should send a regular e-mail to its graduates, when possible, in an attempt to gather information about how they are doing. Providing an incentive for less successful graduates to respond will remain a challenge for the foreseeable future.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: presentation and/or publication | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate writing, interpretive, and analytical skills
- Measure: presentation/publication | Outcome/Objective: Achieve a level of professionalization
- Measure: Reporting rate | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate writing, interpretive, and analytical skills
- Measure: student employment placement rates | Outcome/Objective: Achieve a level of professionalization
- Measure: Track students | Outcome/Objective: Achieve a level of professionalization

**More data collection**
Try to collect more information from faculty who informally visit GTA classrooms; consider a more formal observation structure once the Introductory Literature program has been retooled.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: faculty observation of teaching | Outcome/Objective: Gain theoretical and practical expertise

---

**Mission / Purpose**
The Department of English at the University of Alabama seeks to cultivate the arts of reading, writing, and speaking the English language. We encourage the creation and interpretation of imaginative works of literature; we strive for a mastery of composition, linguistics, literary history, and theory. We challenge our students to read, write, and think in a sophisticated and critical fashion; to understand the historical evolutions of American and English literatures; to participate in the development of knowledge through scholarly research, publication, and creative writing; and to provide meaningful service, to the state and nation, as teachers, writers, and scholars. Our commitment is to enrich the intellectual and cultural life of our campus, our community, and the individuals who compose them.

**Goals**

**G 1: What are goals?**
It's unclear to me how a "goal" is supposed to be formulated. Presumably it's at a lower level of abstraction than the "mission statement" but a higher level of abstraction than "objectives" (especially if the objectives are supposed to be formulated in that outdated notion of "behavioral" from the 1960s and ultimately from Robert MacNamara of the DOD).

**Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**SLO 1: General Education Services**
The department will provide general education services to the university population through the First Year Writing program and the Writing Center. Improvement Action from 2010-11: Draw upon their successful models as we redesign our other introductory courses.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Standard Associations**
- SACS 3.3.1
  - 3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes
  - 3.3.1.3 Educational support services

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

3 Freshman Composition - SLO is related to writing instruction, citation formatting, conventions of academic writing, audience awareness, varied rhetorical strategies, collaboration, and/or revision with attention to purpose, development, style, grammar, punctuation and spelling

6 Humanities - SLO is related to students' ability to deal with questions of values, ethics, or aesthetics as they are represented in literature, philosophy, religion and the arts

11 Writing - SLO is related to building on students' competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend those skills

**Strategic Plan Associations**

University of Alabama

3.2 Expand the development of living/learning communities.

3.9 Ensure user-friendly support services for students, faculty, and staff.

3.12 Increase the level of academic scholarship support.

3.14 Provide career preparation and employment services that lead graduates to satisfying and productive careers and professions.
**Related Measures**

**M 1: Writing Tasks in First Year Writing Program**
Summary of student performance on assigned writing tasks in First Year Writing Program, as evaluated by the Director of FYW.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
No single specific numeric target exists.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
87% of students completed the program. (Only students who perform at an adequate or better level may complete the First Year Writing Program.) While this number seems satisfactory, the program continues to evaluate and improve itself as indicated in its goals for next year.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**First Year Writing Plan**
*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*
*Program Goals:*
  1. Revisit EN 101/102 curriculum and adjust course goals and learning outcomes
  2. Implementation goal: spring 2013 ...

**M 2: Success of Accessibility and Outreach Programs**
Number of students served and success of accessibility and outreach programs, as determined by the Director of the Writing Center.

Source of Evidence: Activity volume

Target:
Targets indicated in attached report. For example, increase number of consultations to 6000.

**Connected Document**
*Writing Center Annual Report 2011-12*

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The Writing Center had 7230 student contacts in 2012-2013, as measured in terms of face-to-face and online consultations (6455) and in-class promotions and workshops (775).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Writing Center Plan**
*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*
See attached document for full plan. Goals include an increase in number of students served, workshops for students and faculty...

**M 3: Redesign of Introductory Literature Program**
Completion of preliminary redesign of the introductory literature program along lines similar to First Year Writing.

Source of Evidence: Curriculum/syllabus analysis of course to program

Target:
Preliminary assessment of program; development of potential redesign approaches; initial analysis of needed resources.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**
The discussion from 2011-2012 remains accurate.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Initial redesign steps**
*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*
2012-13 objectives include implementation of an assessment measure across most or all sections of the introductory literature pr...

**Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**OthOtm 2: Faculty Scholarly Activities**
Faculty will engage in scholarly activities, including research, publication, conference presentations, and creative endeavors. Action Plan from 2010-11: Work with other assessment agencies over the next year to develop a better grounding for a revised research benchmark.

**Relevant Associations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SACS 3.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.4  Research within its educational mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Alabama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Increase involvement of undergraduate students in research and scholarly activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Related Measures**

**M 4: Publications and Presentations**
At least 30 faculty publications and presentations per year.
Source of Evidence: Benchmarking

**Target:** At least 30 faculty publications and presentations per year.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Our faculty had 46 pieces of scholarly or creative writing accepted for publication (not counting in press and actual publication), gave 40 readings, and made 58 presentations at professional conferences.

---

**M 5: Grant Submissions**

At least 10 internal or external grants submitted per year.

Source of Evidence: Benchmarking

**Target:** At least 10 internal or external grant proposal submitted per year.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met**

Our junior faculty have participated in the Bauer Grantwriting Workshop.

---

**M 6: Dialog with Assessment Agencies**

Open dialogue with at least two other assessment agencies to develop a broader benchmark for success.

Source of Evidence: Discussions / Coffee Talk

**Target:** Discuss assessment with at least two external agencies in 2011-12.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

The department chair has continued to seek some kind of guidance on assessment, so far without success, from the Association of Departments of English of the Modern Languages Association. The English Department was part of a group headed by Dean Wilson of the Digital Humanities Initiative that worked on establishing guidelines of evaluation of digital humanities scholarship for tenure and promotion in the College.

---

OthOtcm 3: Intellectual and Cultural Life

The department will enrich the intellectual and cultural life of our campus, community, and state. Action Plan from 2010-11: Provide a more rigorous structure for tracking event participation continuously across the entire year.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Standard Associations**

- SACS 3.3.1
  - 3.3.1.4 Research within its educational mission
  - 3.3.1.5 Community/public service within its educational mission

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

1. Computer - SLO is related to building on prior computing knowledge or expanding existing knowledge through the development and analysis of computer applications within the discipline
6. Humanities - SLO is related to students’ ability to deal with questions of values, ethics, or aesthetics as they are represented in literature, philosophy, religion and the arts
7. Literature - SLO is related to major intellectual and aesthetic ideas covering multiple genres over a broad historical/literary period
11. Writing - SLO is related to building on students’ competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend those skills

**Strategic Plan Associations**

University of Alabama

1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.2 Increase the recognition of the University's service priorities that enhance the quality of life for all Alabamians.
3.2 Expand the development of living/learning communities.
3.3 Encourage and reward creative strategies for engaging students in learning and life-long learning.
3.4 Increase involvement of undergraduate students in research and scholarly activities.
4.3 Produce scholars who will become academic and civic leaders in their disciplines.

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Public Events and Attendance**

At least 3 public events with a total attendance of 400.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

**Target:** At least 3 events with total attendance of at least 400.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

We had a similar situation in 2012-2013.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

**Tracking mechanism**

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012

The present attempt to track attendance is simply too unwieldy to work. We will explore other options. The ideal would be an a...

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**M 8: Outreach and Service Learning Projects**

At least 2 community outreach and service learning projects.

Source of Evidence: Benchmarking

**Target:** At least 2 community outreach and service learning projects.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
We engaged in all of the same activities as last year, and initiated an undergraduate internship with community literacy advocates, "Literacies Old and New." Some of our faculty are very much involved in community outreach individually.

**M 9: Participation in Event Tracking**
Percentage of participation in event tracking.
Source of Evidence: Activity volume

**Target:**
Establishment of event tracking; 20% plus initial participation.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**
The comments from last year still apply. We don't have a good system for this.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

**Tracking mechanism**
*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*
The present attempt to track attendance is simply too unwieldy to work. We will explore other options. The ideal would be an a...

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**OthOtcm 4: Transparent and Accountable System of Governance**
The department will maintain a transparent and accountable system of government. Action Plan from 2010-11: Anecdotal assessment of the review process (Instructor Review and tenure-track retention) ought to be formalized.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Standard Associations**
- SACS 3.3.1
  - 3.3.1.2 Administrative support services
  - 3.3.1.3 Educational support services

**Strategic Plan Associations**
- University of Alabama
  - 1.6 Streamline administrative functions and improve their effectiveness.
  - 2.5 Improve communication among all constituent groups in campus decision-making processes.

**Related Measures**

**M 10: Review and Update Dept. Governance Handbook**
The department reviews and updates the department governance handbook, maintaining standing committees and administrative assignments as mandated by the handbook. This information will be made available through the Share drive.

Source of Evidence: Document Analysis

**Target:**
 Maintain updated governance handbook, available through the department's share drive.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The handbook is maintained on the share drive and is up to date. The updating is done by the department chair.

**M 11: Clear Methods of Hiring and Retention**
The department establishes clear methods of hiring and retention, including appointed search committees, the Instructor Review process, and the tenure-track retention process.

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

**Target:**
 Hiring and retention process remains clear and accountable.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The department developed a set of guidelines for hiring and retention of the CLTF faculty. It also completely revised its tenure-track search procedures. It engaged in a discussion of feedback to faculty during fourth-year review, in conjunction with identification of our "aspirational peer" institutions and their practices.

**M 12: Discussion of Review Process Assessment**
Departmental discussion of review process assessment should be completed; any changes will proceed as the department decides.

Source of Evidence: Discussions / Coffee Talk

**Target:**
Department discussion of a review procedure.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**
We have not formally discussed assessment, but we will do so in 2013-2014 because we are undergoing an 8-year Program Review.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

**Discuss review procedures for hiring/retention processes**
*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*
Attaching this conversation to larger hiring and retention matters seen as more important within the department may win it some ...

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**OthOtcm 5: Mistaken Addition**
This was mistakenly added but I can't figure out how to delete it. It duplicates the first entry.
Discuss review procedures for hiring/retention processes
Attaching this conversation to larger hiring and retention matters seen as more important within the department may
with it some consideration. The department has, however, dedicated considerable energy in the recent past to the
retention process, implementing a time-intensive and rigorous retention procedure for our many instructors, so many
of these processes have been subjected to close scrutiny in the past three years. Improving our procedure here
should be secondary to improvements in practice and procedure both in other areas.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of Review Process Assessment</td>
<td>Transparent and Accountable System of Governance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First Year Writing Plan
Program Goals:
1. Revisit EN 101/102 curriculum and adjust course goals and learning outcomes •implementation goal: spring 2013 • implementation progress: Composition subcommittee created common syllabi for EN 533/534 GTAs; will need to adjust course goals and learning outcomes accordingly. 2. Continue collaborative initiative with faculties at University of San Geromino and University of Havana in Cuba •implementation goal for interim course: interim 2013 •Implementation progress: Proposal approved by A & S and UF, San Geromino. Working on budget and student recruitment for May 2013. 3. Develop and implement online training modules on Dealing with Academic Misconduct and the First-year Writing Program Attendance Policy •implementation goal: summer 2013 •implementation progress: met with Deans Wolfe and Burkhalter in fall 2008; filmed Dean Roskos-Ewoldsen in summer 2009; currently in discussion with Faculty Resource Center for project development. 4. Custom campus-wide writing handbook: •Develop and implement plans for collaborative revision of custom edition of A Writer’s Reference to include materials about writing in a variety of disciplines at UA; consider selection of eBook rather than print book – present proposal to A & S and Provost’s offices, within next 3-5 years. 5. Guest Speakers and Faculty Workshops: •Bring Stephen Wilhoit (U Dayton) to campus for workshop with EN 533 GTAs (September 2012) •Offer more workshops for Turnitin.com •Offer workshops for teaching with Blackboard LEARN. 6. Continue EN 103 collaboration with Honors College for special themed EN 103 sections •appointed new coordinators for fall 2012 (Bonnie Whitener and Brian Morrison) •Fall 2012 theme: “Monsters: Natural and Unnatural” 7. Continue working with Blount Undergraduate Initiative to offer BUI EN 104 8. Continue with A & S Dean’s office on FLLCs (Parker Adams and Arts) and FLCs: •creation of Nursing and Business LLCs for fall 2012 9. Continue sponsoring annual Writing Fair. 10. Continue offering regular online EN 101 and 102 courses, fall I/spring II EN 101 and EN 102 courses, eArmy EN 101 and 102 courses, and Early College EN 101 and 102 courses, as needed 11. Resume research on program assessment, possibly seeking grant support as available •implementation goal: next 3-5 years •implementation progress: currently looking at models at Duke U and U of Arizona/Arizona State U; director and staff attended portfolio assessment workshop at UAB in spring 2009; phase 1 (pre- and post-surveys) conducted fall 2008/spring 2009 was not successful; revisit program assessment question after implementation of new GTA training sequence and EN 101/102 curriculum redesign.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing Tasks in First Year Writing Program</td>
<td>General Education Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial redesign steps
2012-13 objectives include implementation of an assessment measure across most or all sections of the introductory literature program to sample student progress from start to end of the semester. One student per section will be asked to fill out a brief assessment instrument at the beginning and end of the semester and progress or improvement tracked. The main challenge will be in evaluating this instrument, as it will involve a poetic analysis and not a multiple-choice or right/wrong test. In addition, the department will continue to develop tools for teachers in the introductory literature program, including making sample assignments and syllabi available through the department’s Intranet.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redesign of Introductory Literature Program</td>
<td>General Education Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tracking mechanism
The present attempt to track attendance is simply too unwieldy to work. We will explore other options. The ideal would be an automated system which asks for and collects the information from the organizer of record following each event.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Event Tracking</td>
<td>Intellectual and Cultural Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Events and Attendance</td>
<td>Intellectual and Cultural Life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Writing Center Plan
See attached document for full plan. Goals include an increase in number of students served, workshops for students and faculty, expanded space for the Center and a Writing Fellows program.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success of Accessibility and Outreach Programs</td>
<td>General Education Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Luke Niiler, Director of the Writing Center
Mission / Purpose

The Department of English at the University of Alabama respects the power of the English language; our faculty cultivate its study by fostering students in the arts of reading, writing, and speech. We encourage the creation and interpretation of imaginative works of literature, and a mastery of composition, linguistics, literary history, and other modes of critical engagement.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Mastery of TESOL
students will demonstrate mastery of the principles of TESOL

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map I - Teaching English as a second language M.A.  
Curriculum Map II - Teaching English as a second language M.A.

Relevant Associations:
Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1  
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
4 Foreign Language - SLO is related to basic communication skills and knowledge of the culture where the specific language is spoken
11 Writing - SLO is related to building on students' competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend those skills

Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.

Related Measures

M 1: Assessment based on papers and tests
course-embedded direct assessment through papers and tests
Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target:
No set target; 100% would be ideal.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All students completing the course met or exceeded expectations. No changes required.

M 2: Comprehensive exam
comprehensive exam
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
No set target.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All students taking the exam passed.

SLO 2: Expertise in teaching composition
students will demonstrate theoretical and practical expertise in teaching composition

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map I - Teaching English as a second language M.A.  
Curriculum Map II - Teaching English as a second language M.A.

Relevant Associations:
Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1  
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
3 Freshman Composition - SLO is related to writing instruction, citation formatting, conventions of academic writing, audience awareness, varied rhetorical strategies, collaboration, and/or revision with attention to purpose, development, style, grammar, punctuation and spelling
11 Writing - SLO is related to building on students' competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend those skills

Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.
3.3 Encourage and reward creative strategies for engaging students in learning and life-long learning.

**Related Measures**

**M 3: Complete pedagogy courses**

completion of pedagogy course

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
No set target; 100% of students must complete the courses before teaching.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
All students successfully completed the courses.

**M 4: Faculty observation of student teaching**

faculty observations of student teaching

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
All students are observed as part of their training process.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
All students were observed and found to be acceptable or better.

**M 5: Course evaluation results**

student course evaluation results

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
No specific numeric target required.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The First Year Writing program and the MA-TESOL faculty examine and do an analysis of all evaluation results every year. Results from this year are judged to be favorable.

**SLO 3: Ability to teach in an Intensive English Program**

students will demonstrate the ability to teach English language skills in an Intensive English program

**Connected Documents**

Curriculum Map I - Teaching English as a second language M.A.
Curriculum Map II - Teaching English as a second language M.A.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Standard Associations**

SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

4 Foreign Language - SLO is related to basic communication skills and knowledge of the culture where the specific language is spoken
6 Humanities - SLO is related to students' ability to deal with questions of values, ethics, or aesthetics as they are represented in literature, philosophy, religion and the arts
11 Writing - SLO is related to building on students' competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend those skills

**Strategic Plan Associations**

University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.
3.3 Encourage and reward creative strategies for engaging students in learning and life-long learning.

**Related Measures**

**M 4: Faculty observation of student teaching**

faculty observations of student teaching

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
All students are observed as part of their training process.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Collect faculty observation details**

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Ask faculty who are already observing GTAs in order to write letters of recommendation for them to send observation details to...
apprenticeship in UA's intensive English Language Institute.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Assess evaluations**

*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*

Perform a brief examination and assessment of Intensive English course evaluations, if practical.

**SLO 4: Demonstrate professionalization**

Students will display a level of professionalization sufficient for further graduate studies and employment

**Connected Documents**

Curriculum Map I - Teaching English as a second language M.A.
Curriculum Map II - Teaching English as a second language M.A.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Standard Associations**

SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

**Strategic Plan Associations**

University of Alabama

1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
1.7 Sharpen assessment activities of all campus functions and link those to an enhanced planning process.
3.14 Provide career preparation and employment services that lead graduates to satisfying and productive careers and professions.

**Related Measures**

**M 6: Presentation at professional conferences**

Presentation of student work at national and international professional conferences

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**

No specific target exists.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

During 2012-2013 MA-TESOL students presented at national conferences with the mentorship of the MA-TESOL faculty.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Formalized data collection**

*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*

Formally gather information on TESOL conference participation and report it on the department website.

**M 7: Admission rate**

# of admissions to PhD programs

Source of Evidence: Graduate/professional school acceptance rate

**Target:**

No specific target exists; not all graduates will want or need to go on to a PhD program.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Some students go directly into a PhD program in Applied Linguistics. Others choose teaching as a career in intensive programs or other similar institutions. Some teach for a while and then apply for a PhD.

**M 8: Employment rate**

Employment in the discipline

Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

**Target:**

No specific target exists.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met**

The comments from 2011-2012 still apply. Anecdotally, the MA-TESOL Program is very successful in placing students in ESL teaching jobs.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Develop ways to track our graduates**

*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*

In conjunction with other graduate programs, develop and implement stronger tracking and reporting mechanisms to determine whether...

**Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**OthOtcm 5: (N/A) Program Outcome: High Level of Recognized Quality**

The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality

**Related Measures**

**M 17: (N/A) 8-year program review strengths**

8-year program review strengths.
M 18: (N/A) 8-year program improvement recommendations
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcn 6: (N/A) Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Related Measures
M 19: (N/A) Number of applications and percentage of admissions over three year period
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 20: (N/A) Number of graduates over three year period
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 21: (N/A) ACHE Viability standards
Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

OthOtcn 7: (N/A) Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Program Graduates
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Related Measures
M 22: (N/A) Results from alumni surveys
Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

M 23: (N/A) Employment data
Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

OthOtcn 8: DELETE

OthOtcn 9: DELETE
The department will provide general education services to the university population through the First Year Writing program and the Writing Center.

Related Measures
M 11: DELETE
Summary of student performance on assigned writing tasks in First Year Writing Program, as evaluated by the Director of FYW.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 12: DELETE
Number of student served and success of accessibility and outreach programs, as determined by the Director of the Writing Center.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcn 10: DELETE
Faculty will engage in scholarly activities, including research, publication, conference presentations, and creative endeavors.

Related Measures
M 13: DELETE
At least 30 faculty publications and presentations per year
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 14: DELETE
At least 10 internal or external grants submitted per year
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

OthOtcn 11: DELETE
The department will enrich the intellectual and cultural life of our campus, community, and state.

**Related Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (ID)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 15</strong>: DELETE</td>
<td>At least 3 public events with a total attendance of 400</td>
<td>Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M 16</strong>: DELETE</td>
<td>At least 2 community outreach and service learning projects</td>
<td>Academic indirect indicator of learning - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Established in Cycle</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Relationships (Measure</th>
<th>Outcome/Objective):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assess evaluations</strong></td>
<td>Perform a brief examination and assessment of Intensive English course evaluations, if practical.</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Measure: Course evaluation results</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Ability to teach in an Intensive English Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collect faculty observation details</strong></td>
<td>Ask faculty who are already observing GTAs in order to write letters of recommendation for them to send observation details to the department as well.</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Measure: Faculty observation of student teaching</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Ability to teach in an Intensive English Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop ways to track our graduates</strong></td>
<td>In conjunction with other graduate programs, develop and implement stronger tracking and reporting mechanisms to determine whether our graduates are able to find employment as well as to track what kinds of employment they find.</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Measure: Employment rate</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate professionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formalized data collection</strong></td>
<td>Formally gather information on TESOL conference participation and report it on the department website.</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Measure: Presentation at professional conferences</td>
<td>Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate professionalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondent Characteristics

Thirty-five graduating seniors from the Department of English completed the instrument during the 2012-13 academic year. Twelve respondents graduated during the Fall 2012 term and twenty-three during the spring 2013 term. Twenty-nine respondents were female and six were male.

Survey Results

Percentages of structured responses are reported in tables. Respondent open-ended comments are given an ID number and highlighted in *red italic text*. The ID number allows comparison and context among all open-ended questions. For example, all open-ended responses for each number are given by the same graduating senior.
**Question 2: General Knowledge, Skills, Personal Development**

To what extent do you think your education at UA contributed to your knowledge, skills, and/or personal development in each of the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening skills</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension skills</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(written information)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical skills</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific methods of inquiry</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic skills</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer skills</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public speaking skills</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information gathering skills</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function as part of a team</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate racial equality</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Appreciate racial equality was added in 3511-3512.
**Question 3: Department and Department Faculty**

Please assess your department and its faculty members for each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you conduct or assist in a research project in your major?</td>
<td>EH 34</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did at least one faculty member in your major express a special interest in your academic progress?</td>
<td>EH 34</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did at least one faculty member in your major express a special interest in your career development?</td>
<td>EH 35</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were you unable to enroll in a required course in your major because all sections were filled?</td>
<td>EH 35</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did faculty in your major encourage you to be an actively involved learner?</td>
<td>EH 34</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did faculty in your major give you prompt feedback?</td>
<td>EH 34</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did faculty in your major care about your academic success?</td>
<td>EH 34</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 4: Major Courses, Faculty, Instruction, Advising**

How would you evaluate the courses, faculty, instruction, and advising in your major?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction in 100 and 350 level courses in your major was</td>
<td>EH 35</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction in 300 level and above courses in your major was</td>
<td>EH 35</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction provided by departmental graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) in your major was</td>
<td>EH 34</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall quality of your major was</td>
<td>EH 35</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of courses as preparation for employment after graduation in your major was</td>
<td>EH 34</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of courses as preparation for graduate or professional school in your major was</td>
<td>EH 33</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising in your major was</td>
<td>EH 35</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 5: Department Facilities**

How would you evaluate your department's facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The classroom facilities in your department were</td>
<td>EH 35</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The non-computer laboratory facilities for courses in your major were</td>
<td>EH 34</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The departmental computer facilities for courses in your major were</td>
<td>EH 35</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 6: Core Courses, Faculty, Instruction

How would you evaluate the courses, faculty, and instruction in your core curriculum/general education classes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction provided by graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) in core courses was good.</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Took core Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Were you unable to enroll in a core course because all sections were filled?</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Took core Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did faculty in your core courses encourage you to be an actively involved learner?</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Took core Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did faculty in your core courses give you prompt feedback?</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Took core Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did faculty in your core courses care about your academic success?</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Took core Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments on the above core curriculum courses, faculty, and instruction.  N = 3

6  General education classes are generally so large that instructors don't have the time to invest in individual students. It is quite easy to get lost in the crowd or behind in a class, and many classes are proscribed as being “weed out” classes at the beginning of the semester. Overall, the environment in general education classes is not very encouraging and needs significant improvement.

19  It is absurd that an English major has to take four semesters of a foreign language, two different sciences, and two maths. It was a complete waste of my time when my time could have been used to strengthen my skills in my major. But, I get it, it’s just another way for this campus to get money out of us.

25  My studies in English Literature were useful and interesting. Faculty in English were so much more helpful, nice, and caring than faculty in my general Ed courses.
Question 7: Campus Offices, Services, Opportunities

How would you evaluate these offices, services, and opportunities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration process</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid services</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus food services</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply store services</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus health services</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus counseling (not career) services</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business services/cashier/student accounts</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Career Center</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus residence life programs for those in University-owned housing</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to participate in campus recreational activities</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to participate in other extra-curricular activities</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to participate in community service projects</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments on the offices, services, and opportunities. N = 2

6 Having lived on campus in University-owned housing for my entire undergraduate career, I have been very displeased with my experience. Because of increased enrollment, housing tends to focus on the requirements for incoming freshmen rather than the real needs of scholarship students and RAs. This often involves placing non-Honors students in Honors only dormitories. Options are severely limited for upperclassmen living on campus, and parking on campus is frankly a joke. This area is in need of serious improvement, but since the University foolishly stopped giving four year housing scholarships, perhaps they feel that they’ve solved the problem. Last year I was personally involved in a situation where a roommate got violent with an RA. This was conveniently swept under the rug as my RA roommate and I spent ten days in temporary housing while UA “resolved” the situation. As the child and sibling of UA alumni, I still would not recommend the on campus housing experience to others.

14 Bureaucracy: it is what it is. They functioned to the best of their ability, I suppose.
Question 8: Professional Growth from Field Experience

How would you evaluate your experience with a co-op, internship, practicum, student teaching, or other field experience in terms of its contribution to your personal and professional growth?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>MAJOR= EH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not participate in any of those activities</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 9: Person who made Most Significant Positive Contribution

Identify the person at UA who made the most significant positive contribution to your education: N = 28

1  Joyce Stallworth
2  Dr. Norvin Richards
3  Noel Engebretson
5  Dr. Andrew Drozd
6  Tricia McElroy
8  James McNaughton
9  David Ainsworth
10 Ralph Voss
11 Deborah Weiss
12 John Wingard
14 Fred Whiting
15 Philip Beidler
16 John Burke
17 Steffen Guenzel
18 Tricia McElroy
19 Dr. John Burke
20 Jen Drouin
21 Alexandra Cook
22 Ashley McWaters
24 Patti White
25 Dr. Yolanda Manora
26 Sherry Kirksey
27 Melissa Hull
28 Pionke
29 Tricia McElroy
30 Alexander Parks
32 Dr. Weiss
35 Kellie Wells
Question 10: Overall UA Intellectual Environment

All things considered, how would you characterize the intellectual environment at UA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR= EH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your reason(s) for your answer.  N = 16

1. Besides taking unnecessary courses, the education I received was great.
7. I enjoyed my education. Of course it could have been better, things can always improve.
8. The quality of education I have received was very challenging and extremely rewarding compared to my previous institution.
9. Professors were smart, qualified, and endlessly enthusiastic. As much as I put in, I got. There were always greater depths to plumb if I desired--always the professor was ready to help me going deeper.
10. Everybody is too obsessed with football.
12. I believe I could have learned more about myself Freshman year that could have been better suited for me in my future employment opportunities.
16. I had some great instructors and learned invaluable lessons that I will carry with me throughout the remainder of my life.
18. Every faculty member I have encountered (in the English department, at least) has been incredibly knowledgable and passionate about his/her field. This passion is contagious; I want to learn more and study harder just so I can hold an intelligent conversation with them.
19. I feel like I wasn't challenged enough, once I finally started to care about my grades, I could get an A without hardly trying. When you are on this campus, you really don't get that overwhelming feeling of everyone is brilliant here.
20. Our English and Art and Art History Departments have great faculty, but we could use more professors with specializations like postcolonial and gender studies (areas of interest to me).
21. My teachers expected the best from me, and made me strive to improve.
22. I was able to be a part of such organizations as Slash Pine Press, Sigma Tau Delta, and Dewpoint and become an integral part of the greater creative writing community.
25. The quality of faculty in the English department is outstanding but my fellow students are often just trying to get easy grades. UA as a whole could be a public Ivy League school if they used more discretion in admissions and encouraged active discussion and research.
30. I can’t speak for the other departments, but the English department is just fantastic. The faculty and quality of classes were so enriching.
33. I learned more than I ever thought I would and changed my opinions on a lot of things. The faculty was always so helpful and understanding.
35. The English Department, New College, and Blount Undergraduate Initiative all have vibrant intellectual communities, but outside of those programs I feel the university student body is fairly anti-intellectualist.
Question 11: Overall UA Education Received

All things considered, how would you evaluate the overall education that you received at UA?

Percent
MAJOR= EH
N = 35
Excellent 40.0
Good 51.4
Fair 8.6
Poor 0.0

Please explain your reason(s) for your answer. N = 18

5 SO EXPENSIVE. This university needs to take a look at its priorities. The athletic facilities are nice, but my tuition and other fees were not completely worth the time I spent here at UA. Focus more on academia and less on pleasing the greedy board of trustees.
7 I love UA.
8 UA was the best experience I have ever had so far.
9 I love this school. It means something more to me than just the experience I had here. Also, the professors were strongly qualified.
10 English professors are hit and miss. You get good ones, and then you get the ones who grade on whether you agree with them or not in your interpretation of a text.
12 Again, wish I could have known more about my field before being thrown into it.
16 I love this University.
17 Alabama was my first choice school without truly knowing what the education process would be, and now that I know how the experience has been I would definitely choose this school again.
18 I love UA. The only classes I have not enjoyed at this university have been online; and there’s only so much one can do to make those interesting.
20 As much as UA has meant to me, I think I would have benefitted from being in a more urban environment.
21 I am very happy with the education I received, but if it was bad I don’t know any better.
22 UA is small enough to foster community among students, yet large enough to attract national attention.
25 I would only choose UA because of their out of state merit scholarships. However, I may reconsider, now that I know how poor race relations are on the campus at large and how little the high levels of administration care about fixing these poor race relations. I have never felt more marginalized in my life as an African American woman than I have in the past four years at UA.
29 Again, I dont want to explain
30 I feel that my English major and creative writing minor significantly shaped my skills as a writer and my basis of experience as a teacher.
32 I'm assuming this is meant to be 10a...There were not enough options to explore outside of British and American literature.
33 I made amazing friendships and got a great education in a different environment.
35 My experience with the English department was excellent. The faculty is devoted to students and they are wonderful teachers.
Question 12: Attend UA Again

If you had to start over again, would you still choose to attend UA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR= EH</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your reason(s) for your answer.  N = 19

6 In my experience at UA, the increased enrollment made me feel like a number (CWID specifically) in a sea of students. It was difficult to become involved or close with teachers. Parking is terrible. The University seems solely concerned with maintaining their statistics and getting more and more money.

7 I adore both English and History, although I would rather it were History and English. If I could handle a third though, I would have added Classics.

8 Yes and no. It is very challenging writing papers for class but still rewarding to get great feedback.

9 I love my major, and have always dedicated myself to it. There's no wiggle room for me. I love what I love, and it's my major.

10 It was close to home and free.

12 A lot of fun, good balance of academics and social.

14 I didn't exactly choose to attend UA. It was the only school I applied to. I didn't have much drive or resolve to make my own decisions at the end of high school. Of course, if any high school graduate had his or her way, every major would be drinking beer and going out. The value of academic rigor and community involvement and understanding wasn't stressed to me before I entered college. I wouldn't have attended UA because I believe I could have been admitted to a more prestigious institution. Although, it's hard to say if I absolutely would have attended a different school. I didn't apply for scholarships to UA either; if I had obtained a full ride, I may have still chosen UA.

16 I would pick a major more employable.

18 Absolutely. The campus, faculty, and overall experience have surpassed my expectations.

20 Studying English and Art History have helped me find my voice. The things I have learned have changed the way I look at the world and have given me the vocabulary and the confidence to tell the world what I have to say.

21 I always wanted to go to UA and had a great college experience here.

22 English and creative writing suit me well, and the faculty and instructors (especially the instructors) are superb.

25 The English department has been a haven of acceptance, active discussion, learning, research, community, and support on this campus for me.

26 My major is very broad, it's not easy to find a specific career path. My answer has nothing to do with the university.

29 I'd choose a business major.

30 Three National Championships in four years.

32 I came here because it was marginally cheaper than my top choice and then prices skyrocketed each year here. Also parking and housing have shown me UA doesn't actually care about its enrolled students.

33 The English department is great and I love all of the faculty.
I received a great education for cheap with the PACT program. I would not choose another in-state university, and I would never pay out-of-state tuition, so I would choose UA again.
Question 13: Choose Major Again

If you had to start over again, would you still choose this major?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR=</td>
<td>EH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your reason(s) for your answer. N = 18

7 It won’t let me click more than one, but it was really a number of factors that led to me coming here; friends came here, and wanted me to live with them; location, I was not ready to really leave home behind just yet; and my last minute taking of the ACT yielded a 30.
8 I believe having the University of Alabama on your resume looks great to future employers.
9 UA provided the financial aid I needed to go to college.
10 English major is pretty much useless unless you plan to keep getting higher degrees in it.
12 I would want to go into engineering and make English my minor.
14 English isn’t directly marketable. I’m now interested in pursuing a PhD in clinical psychology. I might have to take more undergraduate courses in psychology before I can make that idea a reality.
16 My mother is an alumnuus.
18 I love English, but career options seem limited. I might chose a more specialized major if I had to start again.
20 UA offered me the best scholarship. That’s pretty much the only reason I came here.
21 I love my major and can’t imagine what else I would do.
22 My choice was based on the scholarship I received.
25 The scholarship package I received because of national merit is the only reason I chose UA and stayed here.
26 I have wanted to attend UA since I was a child.
29 It was close.
30 Already said it.
32 I chose my major because it makes me happy.
33 The other out of state schools that I applied to did not give me any kind of scholarship money.
35 I knew as an incoming freshman that I wanted to major in English. I don’t know what I want to do with it, but it was an obvious major choice for me.
**Question 14: Reason for Attending UA**

What is the primary reason you chose to attend UA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>Major/EH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>N =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>Academic Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Friends came here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>Major/Field of Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>Scholarship/Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Social Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Other: Please list (see comment below)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is the list of comments from the “Other” category. N = 2

14  Indecision
29  proximity
Question 15: Participation in Clubs and Organizations

Check all of the clubs or organizations that you participated in actively while in graduate school at UA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major = EH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent study/research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad or overseas program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social fraternity or sorority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious services/clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student newspaper/Corolla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Million Dollar Band</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you hold an office in any of the above organizations? Yes: N = 7

The following are the offices and remarks listed by the respondents.

1    Scholarship Chair
5    Recruitment Chair for Sigma Tau Delta International English Honor Society.
12   In my sorority, I held three different positions, two on the Executive Board.
22   I was the president of Sigma Tau Delta and Editor-in-chief of Dewpoint.
25   Social Chair in the English honors society.
32   I was the Coordinator for the Tuscaloosa Initiative for Language Education in the Alabama International Relations Club.
35   I was secretary for Sigma Tau Delta, the English honor society.

Question 16: Work Status Throughout College

Generally, what was your work status throughout college?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>On-Campus Full-Time</th>
<th>On-Campus Part-Time</th>
<th>Percent Off-Campus Full-Time</th>
<th>Off-Campus Part-Time</th>
<th>Did not work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 17: Plans Following Graduation.

Indicate the ONE best description of your plans following graduation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR= EH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know yet</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have accepted a job related to my field of study:</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company’s name? <em>(see below)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have accepted a job not related to my field of study:</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company’s name? <em>(see below)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to continue in my current position</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be going to a graduate or professional school full-time next year:</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What school? <em>(see below)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be going to a graduate or professional school part-time next year</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and working part-time:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What school? <em>(see below)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will take more undergraduate courses</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am still seeking employment</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not currently seeking employment</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and do not plan to attend school next year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am entering military service</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other <em>(see below)</em></td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is the list of comments from the above questions.

I have accepted a job related to my field of study:
Company’s name?

32 English First

I have accepted a job not related to my field of study:
Company’s name?

27 Blue Cross

I will be going to a graduate or professional school full-time next year:
What school?

5 UA
9 UA
28 Alabama
30 The University of Alabama
33 Medical school
I will be going to a graduate or professional school part-time next year and working part-time:
What school?

None listed

Other

11 I'm joining the Mississippi Teacher Corps and going to graduate school at the University of Mississippi.
12 Traveling and studying for law school
24 Missionary School in Mozambique and Israel with Iris Ministries
31 Taking a year off and going to Law School Fall 2014

Question 18: Additional Comments

Additional comments: Elaborate on anything covered or not covered in the survey. N = 6

6 Peace.
16 Roll Tide!
19 This place is a money-pit. “I can't wait to pay to go here for the rest of my life”...said NO ONE ever.
22 The creative writing department is superb (especially the instructors).
29 Yea. Your prices suck and parking is a pain in the ass. Also, I'm pretty sure all that money you spend to build fraternitites could go to something more important. UA is a pompous pain in the butt and I wouldn't have chosen here if I didn't live 30 minutes away.
33 Parking needs to be expanded.
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**Question 3:** What degree are you seeking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>PHD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 4:** What do you like best about your major program, i.e., what are its strengths?

1. Comradery—even between professors and grad students. I know of dysfunctional departments elsewhere whose professors don't get along at all, which causes all kinds of other rifts in other parts of the department. UA English really works as a team though. The professors all seem to get along and treat the grad students like the future colleagues we hope to be one day.
2. I like the size of my program...not too big and not too small. I also like how helpful all of my professors are. They went above and beyond to help me inside and outside of class and to prepare me for a career.
3. I love my advisor and my committee members. They've all been extremely helpful throughout this process.
4. Very supportive faculty, a variety of opportunities for teaching, research, and collaboration
5. The diversity of faculty.
6. I have really enjoyed the professors I have been able to work with, especially Tricia McElory, Heather White, Emily Wittman, and Deborah Weiss.
7. The CRES teachers here are dedicated to their craft. As CRES faculty, they know that teaching is important and often work to make class time valuable.
8. Helpful professional conferences, great chair of the department, highly qualified professors.
9. It is interdisciplinary and open to courses of study outside of literature.
10. The concern faculty show for helping students professionalize
11. One of the professors actually cares about the students. She's invaluable and, in my opinion, the only strength of the department.
12. My department has a particularly good graduate faculty who are not only well-researched and published in their field but also good teacher who invest in their students.
13. No tests, Discussions, Seminars, Smaller classes
14. I think the strengths of the CRES program is that it is small; there are not many students competing for the professors' attention so grad students can reach out to instructors as much as they want. Another strength of the CRES program is that Dr. Handa particularly is very career oriented. She is interested in the MA and PhD students finding jobs evidenced by frequent posts on the listserv for jobs in the field as well as the way she teaches her classes.
15. We have excellent, supportive faculty.
16. I know that my reward from going through the program will be a job. Otherwise, I wouldn't go through it. It's not a good program to have to endure.
17. The faculty and staff are extremely helpful and always willing to discuss professional and academic issues.
18. a number of strong faculty members and dedicated fellow graduate students
19. The faculty are, on the whole, quite friendly.
20. The faculty are awesome
21. Knowledgeable professors, genuine concern about our well-being, community, resources
Question 5: What do you like least about your major program, i.e., what are its weaknesses?

2 There were only a few professors in my area. So, the same few professors taught all of the classes. Also, there was not much faculty diversity/professors of different races and ethnicities. Diversity would help.
3 Lack of African-American Literature courses, or any literature. The department is heavily focused on Creative Classes and Composition/Rhetoric.
4 Small number of faculty limits the number and types of courses offered and makes it difficult to secure committee members for dissertation committee.
5 The inequality in funding between phds in different programs.
6 I think there should be more division between MFA students and students studying literature. While the cross-pollination is sometimes fruitful, I have had few literature classes where the focus has truly been the analysis and study of literature. I would like our literature program to be much stronger -- I think expectations should be higher and the course offerings more diverse.
7 The CRES program has too few faculty and I cannot enroll in the classes I would like to enroll in, specifically, EN 659: Writing Program Administration. Since the faculty number is so small, there is little discussion of different ideologies. It seems that the three faculty agree, and although they are very open-minded, our program is very directed towards a certain kind of pedagogy. This is a strength and a weakness; it allows for a better atmosphere between faculty, which is important to maintain for students, but also does not make for much conflict, which could teach students a lot.
8 The intro to graduate studies class was not helpful at all, at least not in my area of concentration which is composition and rhetoric.
9 Bureaucracy and lack of communication between advisors and students. Given that the program is so small, advising should be more of a personal experience. Currently, it seems more like a formality that they only do because they are required. Not a pleasant experience at all.
10 Those that aren't in a focused program of study like Strode or CRES are sometimes left to flounder.
11 We do not have enough content specialists in my area of study. As a consequence, the course offerings are not varied in terms of content nor are they fresh. The professors seem tired and are not focused on the professionalization of students. Certain students seem to receive attention. I'm sad to say this, but the students who receive the most attention are minority students. I certainly understand the philosophical concepts of affirmative action, but I wish the professors find a way to treat everyone equally.
12 My department is too large, making it difficult to make connections and making it likely that someone will be overlooked.
13 There are too few PhD opportunities. CRES took only one PhD candidate for next year. The selection committee specifically eliminated any UA MA students and any non-black candidates in order to get a black student from out of town, all in the name of diversity. Those of us committed to the UA community, the Tuscaloosa community, and the Alabama community were completely disregarded. And it will be the same next year, and next year, and next year because our professors are so disorganized that they can barely keep up with the basic work that they must do; thus, they do not want to take on the responsibilities associated with overseeing PhD candidates.
14 The CRES program's strength is also its weakness. The smallness of the program means that when two professors are on sabbatical, half of the professors are gone. Also, the lack of professors in CRES means that graduate students receive less of a variety of classes.
15 The small number of graduate classes offered each semester.
16 We have very few professors in the program (CRES specifically) and of those, few (maybe 1) are willing or able to help with projects or professionalization. They are not interested in your success unless you are a minority and seemed threatened by success if you aren't one of their "prize" students. This favoritism is discouraging at best, and I have felt like it is a constant battle to try to gain the professors' approval. I have actually given up on this approval and had to go outside the department to get the guidance I need to be successful (i.e. work on publications, professionalization, and teaching strategies). Note, these comments strictly apply to the CRES program. I have consistently sought help from literature professors (who the CRES professors openly hate), and they have gone above and beyond for me.
The work centered on professional development (research, publishing, committee work) could use more focus.

A few faculty are not approachable and not very helpful with research questions.

Not much in the way of advising or professionalization help.

There are not enough African American Literature faculty; the chair is overworked because no one else in that specialty can serve as chair.

Lack of organization
Question 6: Advising and Practical Experiences.

Please circle the response that corresponds to your opinion about each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The overall quality of your major is</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of practical experiences (Practicum, Laboratory, Internship, Clinical Experience, or Field Experience) in your major is</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of courses as preparation for employment after graduation in your major is</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of academic advising in your major is</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of career advising in your major is</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you attended the workshop, the quality of the university-wide workshop for new GTAs is</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you were/are a GTA, the quality of departmental efforts to help you develop and improve your teaching skills as a GTA is</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you were/are a graduate assistant, the quality of your experiences as a graduate assistant is</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please identify the nature of any of your concerns regarding instruction, courses, or advising. If you have any suggestions for improvement, please include them.

1. It's difficult to find courses to take and professors to work with in our department if you study the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. We have a ton of Renaissance/Medieval professors and a lot of 20th-century ones, but the same four people basically make up every committee for students doing anything between 1700 and 1900, regardless of whether they are interested in or know much about the actual subject matter.
2. More options for courses to take would be good.
3. English 102 and its structure needs a serious overhaul. Themed courses aren't working for the students or the instructors. It zaps any remnants of creativity from the lesson plan.
4. We need another faculty member in the CRES program. There are four teaching faculty but two also have heavy administrative responsibilities that limit their teaching loads. These professors also teach undergraduate courses. As a result, course offered in our program are very limited. Sometimes there are only two courses offered in a semester.
5. When I came in as a PhD student, I was told by my third year I would be teaching literature and I would have fulfilled my comp responsibilities. This is not the case. The department demonstrates little commitment to making sure PhD students have a reasonable (one prep) course load that helps us build competitive CVs.
6. The department needs to get rid of or revamp the intro to grade studies course and instead have the academic writing course last 2 semesters rather than 1. That was the most helpful and practical course.
7. En 537 is a waste of time. The readings do not relate to any of the work/papers for the class. And class discussions have nothing to do with either the readings or the papers. The
structure of the course seems as though it's designed as a weed-out class, which is fine, but those who stick with academia should not feel as if that was three, precious, valuable credit hours wasted.

12 It would be nice to actually pair students up with an adviser who does work in their field instead of sending everyone to the graduate director. Ideally, you would have just 2-5 students per faculty/adviser that way instead of 30ish something people per one grad director.

13 At the MA level, it would have been nice to become more focused on a specific area: composition instruction, rhetoric studies, book history, research in a certain area, technical writing, business writing, writing center theory. However, the MA curriculum is merely an extension of the undergraduate curriculum. The classes that I have taken do not build upon one another. They do not focus a student toward a particular study. Basically, it is two additional years of survey classes. Additionally, there are so few opportunities to do research. I have expressed a desire to do research to three of my professors. None of them had any advice for me. To those same professors, I expressed a desire to focus on a specific area of study. None of them had any advice for me. Two of them just chuckled and said, “I don’t know what to tell you.” It is ridiculous that professors have no interest in their students expressed concerns, expectations, and goals. If you want something specific, you have to research it from beginning to end for yourself.

14 I think the department, if possible, should hire another CRES professor; another professor is desperately needed.

16 The CRES program desperately needs more professors with a broader range of topics they are able to assist with. The extreme specialization of the professors limits students to the topics they are able to get support in. The courses therefore are also limited and lack freshness or, in many instances, relevance. Compared to other CRES programs, we severely lack both new and interesting classes in up-and-coming specializations as well as professionalization. Furthermore, the divide between the literature and CRES faculty is very discouraging. This divide is unhealthy and outdated. The amount of help I have received from senior faculty (Trudier Harris, Phil Beidler, Heather White, for instance) should be followed through by junior faculty. Instead, this junior faculty seems to lack professionalization themselves and are unable to advise appropriately. Finally, the “spread the wealth” mentality is absolutely unfair. The department gives funding and opportunities to less than adequate students simply because of favoritism (especially to minority students) within the department. Opportunities for successful non-minority students would be welcomed.

19 Could use more advising about which PhD programs are the best to apply to.

20 I'm glad that Whiting is the new Graduate Advisor. The previous one was not as knowledgeable or precise, which is why I gave the academic advising a low score.
Question 7: Personnel, Courses, and Instruction.

Please circle the response that corresponds to your opinion about each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Printed information (e.g., catalog, brochures) about your major program is useful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You have a professor in your major who serves as your "mentor."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty in the department feel that academic and/or professional interaction with other students is an important part of your program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The department offers about the right number of combined undergraduate/graduate courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sequencing of courses in your major program is appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Departmental faculty members are professionally competent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Courses in your major program are offered frequently enough so that you can complete your degree requirements as planned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You receive instruction in the current research methods used in your major field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You receive a sufficient amount of practical training for your major field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most staff members in your departmental office are helpful.

Please identify the nature of any of your concerns regarding personnel, courses, or instruction. If you have any suggestions for improvement, please include them.

3 need more diverse course offerings
4 See previous comment ... we need another faculty member
Additionally, the English department doesn't cater to undergraduate majors who are interested in writing and rhetoric rather than literature.
6 Department faculty frequently go above and beyond to work with graduate students. Carol Appling and Jennifer Fuqua are professional and extremely knowledgable. Michele Tunaitis needs to be more professional in her interactions with graduate students.
10 PhD students that come in with a master's aren't required to take a research & bib class, but they probably should be. I know it would've been helpful to me.
13 Carol Appling is great. She is way overworked. She takes care of us all, and she does it well.
14 The sequencing of courses has not been explained to me. And, I think for improvement, graduate students in the CRES program should be assigned a mentor for their second year.
16 The person who I consider my mentor is now at another university. Only because of this person do I know research methods in my field or know what it means to be professionalized. The volatile nature of the department necessitate this person's leave. I would have agreed to many of the above comments had this person been in the department, but as is, I can't agree. Again, note that these comments only apply to the CRES program.
20 More African American instructors/professors/courses needed, or cross list more with Gender/Race Studies. When we are forming committees of knowledgeable faculty, our base committees are the same.
**Question 8: Assistance, Involvement, and Research.**

Please circle the response that corresponds to your opinion about each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you conduct or assist in a research project in your major?</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you assist faculty or staff in your major in providing service to the community or state?</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often are professors in your program available to help you outside of class?</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often are you unable to enroll in a required course in your major because all sections are filled?</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often are you unable to consult with your program advisor when necessary?</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do faculty encourage graduate students to participate in professional organizations associated with your major program?</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often does at least one faculty member in your major express a special interest in your progress?</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please identify the nature of any of your concerns regarding assistance, involvement, and research. If you have any suggestions for improvement, please include them.

3. There needs to be more assistance for dissertating students. The two or three awards are so competitive. We don't make enough money to support ourselves on teaching alone. This leads to the majority of us seeking several outside jobs, which leads to less time for research and coursework.

6. More collaboration between graduate students and faculty members would be useful. Graduate students are hungry for the experience.

7. It would be nice to have some kind of summer support for the English graduate students, or at least a focused effort on gathering and giving resources to graduate students to tell them what they can do over the summer. Although faculty was very helpful in finding entry-level positions or summer jobs, none were related to my major, which I find problematic. UA needs a summer internship program, or summer camp (where graduate students can be TAs for teachers) or something for English graduate student support.

13. see above

14. I think I have not conducted or assisted in research projects because I am just finishing my first year. I know collaboration happens frequently in CRES.

16. The faculty don't seem to know a lot about professional organizations that would benefit specialties other than their own.
Question 9: Facilities

Please circle the response that corresponds to your opinion about each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>More than Adequate</th>
<th>Percent Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The non-computer laboratory facilities for courses in your major are</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The departmental computer facilities for courses in your major are</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library holdings for your major are</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please identify the nature of any of your concerns regarding facilities. If you have any suggestions for improvement, please include them.

1. More technology in the classrooms (media podiums/projectors) would be nice, of course!
2. Morgan Hall is an older building that should be updated or renovated.
4. Morgan Hall is disgusting! In the three years I've been at UA there's been issues with mold eradication twice. Classrooms are too small and technologically inadequate. Some rooms still have chalkboards and no computers. It's really a joke. How can you teach modern writing without technology? You cannot.
6. The library should open earlier in the morning. 6:00 would be nice so those of us who teach at 8:00 could have time to work at the library before teaching.
10. The computer labs in Morgan Hall are frequently booked up with classes, so they can be difficult to get into.
16. I never had allergy problems until I started working in Rowand-Johnson and Morgan Hall. I'm willing to bet it is a result of the moldy, mildewy atmosphere.
17. Centralizing classes in one building would be helpful.
18. Need for additional classrooms!
20. Elevator suck.
The following items pertain to faculty and enrollment.

Please select the response that corresponds to your opinion about each item.

**Question 10:** With how many faculty members in your department have you developed a close professional relationship, such that you could ask them for a letter of recommendation?  N = 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>Three or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 11:** What do you think about the size of the graduate classes in your department?  N = 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Many are too small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>Most are about right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>Many are too large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 12:** If you had to do it again, would you choose this major?  N = 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>Probably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Probably not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please identify the nature of any of your concerns regarding faculty and enrollment. If you have any suggestions for improvement, please include them.

6  As mentioned before, many MFA students complain about having to take literature classes, and the inclusion of MFA students in those classes makes it difficult to focus solely on literary analysis.
7  We need more faculty in the Composition and Rhetoric program. There are far too few and the classes I am most interested in taking are not being offered as a result.
10  My ambivalence about the major has nothing to do with my experience in the UA English Department.
13  see above
14  I think the CRES department needs to grow in students as well as faculty. It will one day be a great program!
16  The answers to question 13 is only because of the literature faculty, not the CRES faculty. I would choose this major only because it will allow me to get a job, not because of the quality of the major. I have worked very hard individually to achieve what I have. This achievement should not be a reflection of the CRES faculty.
20  Please hire more faculty (and promote those that are present--for committee chair purposes) based on the student’s specialties/interest.
The following items pertain to assistantships.

Please select the response that corresponds to your opinion about each item.

**Question 14:** How clear is the process for obtaining a graduate assistantship in your program?  N = 21

Percent
57.1  Clear
38.1  Somewhat confusing
  4.8  Very confusing
  0.0  I never tried to obtain an assistantship

**Question 15:** How many opportunities are there for obtaining graduate assistantships (teaching, research, other) in your program?  N = 21

Percent
61.9  Many
28.6  Some
  9.5  Few
  0.0  None
  0.0  I never tried to obtain one

**Question 16:** How would you rate the quality of the assistance available for obtaining graduate assistantships?  N = 20

Percent
40.0  Excellent
45.0  Good
  5.0  Fair
10.0  Poor
  0.0  No assistance is available
  0.0  I never tried to obtain one

**Question 17:** How clearly were your duties as a graduate teaching or research assistant explained to you in a letter of appointment?  N = 20

Percent
55.0  Very clearly
40.0  Fairly clearly, but I still had a number of questions
  5.0  The letter was vague in describing my duties
  0.0  I did not receive an appointment letter
  0.0  I have never had a graduate assistantship
Please identify the nature of any of your concerns regarding assistantships. If you have any suggestions for improvement, please include them.

2 I think it's A LOT to ask grad students to teach 2 courses each semester while trying to do their own work in order to graduate. That is why many students do not graduate on time. The GTA course load should be decreased.

3 They don't pay enough. Teaching two classes is one thing, but the amount of grading involved with 101 and 102 courses is entirely too much work on the part of the GTA. We spend more time grading papers and preparing lesson plans than most senior faculty. Also, we don't get paid enough. So, getting an outside job is necessary...which leaves even less time for coursework.

6 PhD students should be able to take a year off from funding without losing their funding line entirely.

13 The stipend is ridiculously low for the amount of work that is required. I know many students from many different universities across America, and their workload is much less than UA.

14 The process and ability to receive graduate assistantships have been excellent!

16 All of us are funded through assistantships, but we are consistently given worse opportunities as GTAs. I, for instance, have been given 2 separate preps for the last 5 semesters. For the amount of money I am paid and the work that I am here to do as a student, this is too much work. Graduate students should be given the best opportunity to succeed in their program while also providing a quality experience for the students they teach. I do not feel that I can provide my students with a quality classroom experience when I have to prep two classes on top of my own work. Often this tension actually made me get behind in my own research.
Student Opinion Survey Summary – fall 2012

You might use this summary to help gauge where your FWP Student Opinion Survey results fall in the spectrum of the total program results. To further self-assess your fall teaching, you might also consider completing the attached matrix for your FWP courses (EN 534 GTAs will complete the EN 101 matrix as part of a class activity this spring).

1. How much did you gain from your 100-level course? (N = 3,557 responses) (Program Mean = 3.22)
   (1) Not much = 2%
   (2) Some = 11%
   (3) A good bit = 47%
   (4) Gained much valuable information = 38%

2. How would you rate professor performance? (Program Mean = 3.51)
   (1) Poor = 1%
   (2) = 7%
   (3) = 32%
   (4) Outstanding = 59%

3. Instructor accessibility (Program Mean = 3.66)
   (1) Not accessible at all = 1%
   (2) = 4%
   (3) = 21%
   (4) Very accessible = 68%
   (5) Not Applicable = 5%

Response Means for Questions 1-3 by Course:
EN 101:  
1. 3.22  
2. 3.50  
3. 3.66

EN 102:  
1. 3.18  
2. 3.53  
3. 3.65

EN 103:  
1. 3.24  
2. 3.53  
3. 3.70

EN 104:  
1. 3.00  
2. 3.37  
3. 3.65

Actual Grade Distributions (from OIRA):

EN 101 (3,615 students; 103 withdrew = 3%)
   A = 1,326 (37%)   includes A + and A -, etc.
   B = 1,490 (41%)
   C = 448 (12%)  notice: 78% of all students in 101 made A or B
   NC = 248 (7%) : 90% pass; 7% NC; 3% W

EN 102 (833 students; 64 withdrew = 8%)
   A = 335 (40%)
   B = 244 (29%)  69% A or B
   C = 87 (11%)  80% pass; 14% NC; 8% W
   NC = 103 (12%)

EN 103 (Honors Comp; 552 students; 11 withdrew = 2%)
   A = 331 (60%)
   B = 167 (30%)  90% A or B
   C = 28 (5%)  95% pass; 2% NC; 3% W
   NC = 15 (3%)  EN 104 not included here

Response Rate for fall 2011:
OIRA reports 5,032 students in FWP courses in fall 2012; 3,557 total responses to FWP survey, or 71%
Instructor Strengths

Explains well = 73.3%
Writing instruction = 60.5%
Relates well to students = 72.4%
Available outside class = 64.8%
Fun/Enjoyable = 70.3%
Understanding / flexible / caring = 71.4%
Helpful = 74.7%
Encourages student participation = 64.4%
Knows material / intelligent = 73.7%
Enthusiastic / passionate = 60%
Personable / friendly / nice = 79.7%
Gives good feedback on papers = 71.4%
Approachable / easy to talk to = 77.2%
Well-prepared / organized = 61.3%
Clear expectations = 57.5%
Interesting / engaging = 57%

Areas of Personal Writing Improvement – Note that these answers include 101, 102, 103, and 104 students and are not divided out by individual course.

Thesis Statements = 55.3%
Writing a variety of essay types or genres = 59.2%
Introductions = 41.4%
Prewriting = 35.8%
Revising = 48.1%
Organization / Structure = 59.3%
Content / Development = 49.3%
Description / Using more detail = 33.9%
Transitions = 45.8%
Conclusions = 33.5%
Word choice / Vocabulary = 38.3%
Sentence structure = 44.2%
Grammar / syntax / usage / mechanics = 35.2%
Documentation / citation / using MLA / formatting = 43.3%
Quoting / Paraphrasing / Summarizing = 53.3%

What areas do you still feel unsure about? (ditto)

Thesis Statements = 14.9%
Writing a variety of essay types or genres = 10.6%
Introductions = 13.7%
Prewriting = 17.3%
Revising = 16.6%
Organization / Structure = 11.4%
Content / Development = 14.9%
Description / Using more detail = 12.7%
Transitions = 19.8%
Conclusions = 23.8%
Word choice / Vocabulary = 17.9%
Sentence structure = 14.3%
Grammar / syntax / usage / mechanics = 23.5%
Documentation / citation / using MLA / formatting = 18%
Quoting / Paraphrasing / Summarizing = 13.4%
Student Opinion Survey Summary – spring 2013

You can use this summary to help gauge where your FWP Student Opinion Survey results fall in the spectrum of the total FWP program results. To further self-assess your spring teaching, you might also consider completing the attached matrix for your FWP courses.

1. How much did you gain from your 100-level course? (N = 2,385 responses) (Program Mean = 3.22)
   (1) Not much = 3%
   (2) Some = 12%
   (3) A good bit = 44%
   (4) Gained much valuable information = 40%

2. How would you rate professor performance? (Program Mean = 3.50)
   (1) Poor = 1%
   (2) = 7%
   (3) = 33%
   (4) Outstanding = 59%

3. Instructor accessibility (Program Mean = 3.69)
   (1) Not accessible at all = 1%
   (2) = 4%
   (3) = 20%
   (4) Very accessible = 70%
   (5) Not Applicable = 4%

Response Means for Questions 1-3 by Course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EN 101:</th>
<th>EN 102:</th>
<th>EN 103:</th>
<th>EN 104:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 3.32</td>
<td>1. 3.21</td>
<td>1. 3.06</td>
<td>1. not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 3.63</td>
<td>2. 3.48</td>
<td>2. 3.56</td>
<td>2. taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 3.76</td>
<td>3. 3.70</td>
<td>3. 3.53</td>
<td>3. in spring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Grade Distributions (from OIRA):

EN 101 (482 students; 40 withdrew = 8%)
- A = 137 (28%) includes A + and A -, etc.
- B = 121 (25%)
- C = 62 (13%) notice: 53% of all students in 101 made A or B
- NC = 122 (25%) : 66% pass; 25% NC; 8% W

EN 102 (3,517 students; 151 withdrew = 4%)
- A = 1,354 (39%)
- B = 1,321 (38%) 77% A or B
- C = 411 (12%) 89% pass; 8% NC; 4% W
- NC = 275 (8%)

EN 103 (Honors Comp; 105 students; 6 withdrew = 6%)
- A = 73 (70%)
- B = 18 (17%) 87% A or B
- C = 2 (1%) 88% pass; 6% NC; 6% W
- NC = 6 (6%) 88% pass; 6% NC; 6% W

EN 104 not included here
Instructor Strengths

- Explains well = 72.2%
- Writing instruction = 57.7%
- Relates well to students = 68.1%
- Available outside class = 66.6%
- Fun/Enjoyable = 64.1%
- Understanding / flexible / caring = 69.4%
- Helpful = 73.7%
- Encourages student participation = 64.1%
- Knows material / intelligent = 70.8%
- Enthusiastic / passionate = 56.6%
- Personable / friendly / nice = 75.3%
- Gives good feedback on papers = 67.4%
- Approachable / easy to talk to = 72.2%
- Well-prepared / organized = 62.9%
- Clear expectations = 54.7%
- Interesting / engaging = 51.1%

Areas of Personal Writing Improvement – Note that these answers include 101, 102, and 103 students and are not divided out by individual course.

- Thesis Statements = 59.5%
- Writing a variety of essay types or genres = 53.9%
- Introductions = 42.4%
- Prewriting = 31.9%
- Revising = 42.2%
- Organization / Structure = 55.7%
- Content / Development = 47.5%
- Description / Using more detail = 28.6%
- Transitions = 43.7%
- Conclusions = 36%
- Word choice / Vocabulary = 36.9%
- Sentence structure = 39.4%
- Grammar / syntax / usage / mechanics = 31.5%
- Documentation / citation / using MLA / formatting = 45.5%
- Quoting / Paraphrasing / Summarizing = 50.6%

What areas do you still feel unsure about? (ditto)

- Thesis Statements = 11.8%
- Writing a variety of essay types or genres = 10.3%
- Introductions = 10.2%
- Prewriting = 18.1%
- Revising = 16.6%
- Organization / Structure = 10.2%
- Content / Development = 13.7%
- Description / Using more detail = 12.9%
- Transitions = 16.9%
- Conclusions = 18.4%
- Word choice / Vocabulary = 15.9%
- Sentence structure = 14.3%
- Grammar / syntax / usage / mechanics = 21.8%
- Documentation / citation / using MLA / formatting = 15.6%
- Quoting / Paraphrasing / Summarizing = 12.7%
How Students Can Get Started With Personal Learning:

> **Step 1: Locate and access your Personal Learning assignment**
After you have registered for Connect and have logged in to your account at https://ualearn.blackboard.com/

The Personal Learning assignment(s) that your instructor has assigned for you to complete will be available on the main home page.

**Full Personal Learning Plan:**

> **Step 2: Beginning Assessment in Personal Learning**
Once you have opened your Personal Learning assignment you will begin to interact with the Personal Learning coach. This coach will help direct you to what you should click on and what the next steps will be. The very first thing that Personal Learning will ask you to do is begin with an initial diagnostic test.
If you have been assigned the full Personal Learning Plan this test will be 50 questions and will only need to be taken once. If you have been assigned individual Personal Learning topics this test will be smaller, approximately 10 questions, and one will be given for every topic your instructor has assigned.

The questions that you receive from either of these beginning diagnostic tests will try to determine what course areas you know pretty well and what material you might need a little bit more help in. The Personal Learning program does this by asking you to select the correct answer choice and also by asking you to tell the program how confident you are in your answer choice.

While going through your initial diagnostic test it’s important that you take your time and answer each question as best you can. Make sure to respond to the confidence bar “I know it, Think So, Unsure, and No Idea” honestly. You will not be penalized for taking your time and the more accurate information you give the Personal Learning program the better it can tailor the learning plan to you. Be sure, though, to ask your instructor when they would like you to have finished your diagnostic test. If you need to log
out during the course of the diagnostic test that’s ok; the Personal Learning plan will save your work and return you to that spot when you log back in next time.

➢ **Step 3: Moving Through New Personal Learning Material**

If you have been assigned the full Personal Learning Plan and have completed your initial 50 question diagnostic test, the Personal Learning program will ask you to choose a personal study schedule. The study schedule is there to help keep you on track with your work for the semester.

The study schedule will present you with options to work two, three, or four days per week. Depending on how many days per week you select, the Personal Learning Plan will then be able to offer suggestions on how long you per day you should spend in your plan:

Choose the option that you feel will best work for your personal schedule. This is not set in stone, so if you need to go back later and adjust you will have the opportunity to do so.

If you are working on the individual topic Personal Plan or after selecting your preferred study schedule from the full Personal Plan, you will move on to the learning material chosen for you to work on based on your initial test results.
The material presented is divided into two sections: **New Learning** and **Review and Practice**. To begin, click on the blue highlighted item that says “Go”. This will take you in to your first assigned exercise. The material presented to you may include reading selections, videos, practice questions, and interactive activities. All of these materials are specifically presented to help you better understand the course material your instructor has assigned. Please take your time to read and understand the material presented to you and when asked by the program if you understand, please respond honestly. This will help the Personal Learning program adapt to better suit you.

As you continue to work through the material located in the New Learning category you will begin to see items checked off and the estimated time to complete (on the New Learning top right corner) counting down.
This is will help indicate to you what has been completed and show you the next item, highlighted with the blue Go button, you should move on to. The time estimator will give you a general indication of how much longer it should take you to finish all of the material located under the New Learning category. You will not be penalized for taking longer than the estimated time to complete. The Personal Learning Plan will also save your completed work if you need to log off and return to it later. Please make sure to keep track of when the entire assignment is due. This is available on the main home tab of Connect and will indicate when your instructor has required the entire Personal Plan or individual Personal Learning topic to be finished by.

**Step 4: Review & Practice**
Once you have completed all of the work in the New Learning category in your Personal Learning assignment the program will ask you to finish the Review and Practice section.
The Review and Practice area is there to help you practice some of the material you may still be uncertain about. If you are completing the full Personal Learning Plan this section might review material from previous lessons. If you are working on an individual Personal Learning topic the Review and Practice section will review material from that specific topic area.

**Understanding Student Personal Learning Scores:**

- **Report Options**
  There are two ways to track your progress in Personal Learning. The main progress report will appear every time you log in to your Personal Learning Plan after you have completed the initial diagnostic.
This report will give you an overall view of how much progress you have made in your Personal Learning, the amount of time passed until the assignment is due, your own personal profile, and a place to change your existing study schedule. If you have been assigned individual Personal Learning topics by your instructor this progress report will show your status on just that single topic, logging in to another topic will let you see the work completed on that topic.

The other way you can view your overall progress is by clicking the “Your Progress” bar located at the top right corner of your screen within your Personal Learning assignment. When you click on this progress bar you will be presented with a list of report types. The report option called “Topic Scores” will allow you to look in to individual units and topics and see what your current progress score is and how much time you’ve spent working on each topic.

What Does Progress Mean?
Within your Personal Learning assignments you will see your overall progress reported on the main progress report. If you have been assigned the full Personal Learning Plan by your instructor progress is measuring the number of items you have completed vs the number of total items your instructor has assigned to you. So for example, if your instructor has assigned 10 topics for you to understand and you’re seeing 50% progress that means you’ve completed approximately 5 out of the 10 topics.

If you are working through your Personal Learning assignment by individual topics the progress column will show how much work you’ve done and understood on that one individual topic.

Keep in mind that Personal Learning wants to make sure that you fully understand the topics your instructor has assigned to you so that you will receive better grades in this course. The program will continue to adapt and give you practice questions and material until it’s confident you understand the material. Personal Learning’s progress means you are not only done with that learning topic but you’ve shown that you understand it too.
How do the questions answered / questions attempted affect my Overall Progress?

In Personal Learning progress is the best indicator as to how much work you’ve completed and how well you understand that material. However, everyone is different and may move through their Personal Learning plan at different speeds. In your Personal Learning reports there are two columns called “Current Score Correct/Total” and “Current Score Percentage”. These two columns illustrate how many questions you’ve received and how many you’ve gotten correct. In order to increase your progress score you must demonstrate that you understand the material assigned in your Personal Learning assignment. The more questions you answer correctly and honestly with your confidence bar the more the Personal Plan begins to understand what you need to practice some more and what material you understand. The “Current Score Correct/Total” and “Current Score Percentage” are there to show you how much effort you’ve put behind learning the course material. The progress score will show you how much you’ve understood and how much more work you have left to complete.

What does the “time passed until due date” bar mean?

On your Progress Report you will notice a toolbar called “Time Passed Until Due Date” that sits above your “Overall Progress” toolbar.

These two toolbars are there to help ensure you finish your assignment on time. The “Time Passed Until Due Date” bar reflects the amount of time left until your Personal Learning assignment is due. The “Overall Progress” bar is showing how much of the assignment material you’ve completed and understood. You should always aim to have your progress score be even or higher than the time passed bar. This will help ensure that you finish your Personal Learning assignment on time and receive full credit from your instructor. If you fall behind a little bit with your overall progress we recommend either using the change my schedule button to add more time to your study schedule or logging in more frequently to complete your Personal Plan. This will help you catch up before the assignment is due.
Personalized Learning Reports-Instructor

1. Performance Summary and Details
2. Student Progress by Unit
3. Section Averages by Topic
4. Metacognitive Skills
5. Student Progress by Topic
The Performance Summary report lists each student in the section alongside his/her cumulative metrics for personalized learning assignments. This report provides the most benefit to those using the “full” PLP assignment, as opposed to assigning by topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Initial diagnostic</th>
<th>Post diagnostic</th>
<th>Time spent (hh:mm:ss)</th>
<th>Overall progress</th>
<th>Current score correct/total</th>
<th>Current score percentage</th>
<th>Unaware</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Last accessed</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zhukhanov, Aleksey</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>07:40:06</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>746/1211</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Jun 25, 2012</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright, Beth</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>00:00:58</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Jul 18, 2012</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffitt, Courtney</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, John</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>00:06:58</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>48/56</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Jul 18, 2012</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- “Overall progress” represents the # correct out of the total number of correct answers needed to demonstrate mastery and complete the PLP.
- This is a measure reflecting the student’s mastery of the PLP topics at a given point in time which accommodates for the adaptive learning technology. Because different students will need more or less practice to achieve mastery, simply comparing the number of questions answered correctly to the total number attempted does not account for the individualization that the PLP affords. The next column (Current Score) provides such a “raw score” for each student.

For “full” PLP assignments, this column represents the student response to the 50 question diagnostic at the beginning of the assignment.

For PLP assignments by topic, this column represents the cumulative score across the 10 question diagnostic tests at the beginning of each assignment.

“Current score” is the # correct out of the total number of questions attempted.

This is the cumulative time spent per student on personalized learning assignment(s).

This is the date the student last entered into a PLP assignment.

If assigned, the post diagnostic score will display here.

Click here for more individual student details.

This relates to the student’s self-assessment of his/her knowledge, specifically, the frequency that the student was unaware that he or she did not know the answer.
The Performance Details report lists individual student data broken down by unit and topic.

### Performance Details for: Yahr, Laura

- **UNIT 1: VOCABULARY SKILLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit/topic</th>
<th>Time Spent (hh:mm:ss)</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Current score correct/total</th>
<th>Current score percentage</th>
<th>Initial unaware</th>
<th>Current unaware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIT 1: VOCABULARY SKILLS</td>
<td>05:37:58</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>303/464</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOCABULARY: CONTEXT CLUES</td>
<td>03:33:32</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>180/248</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOCABULARY: WORD STRUCTURE CL</td>
<td>02:04:26</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>123/216</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- "Initial unaware" represents the frequency that the student was unaware that he or she did not know the answer during the initial diagnostic test.
- "Current unaware" represents the frequency that the student was unaware that he or she did not know the answer over the course of all their answers in the program to date.
- The top row is cumulative for that particular unit.
The Student Progress by Unit gives overall progress at the unit level, as well as “all units”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Time spent (hh:mm:ss)</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>UNIT 1: VOCABULARY SKILLS</th>
<th>UNIT 2: UNDERSTANDING</th>
<th>UNIT 3: INTERPRETING</th>
<th>UNIT 4: READING CRITICALLY</th>
<th>UNIT 5: STUDY TECHNIQUES</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brkhanov, Alesya</td>
<td>07:40:06</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>UNIT 1: VOCABULARY SKILLS</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stu7@mhhm.com">stu7@mhhm.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night, Beth</td>
<td>00:00:58</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>UNIT 2: UNDERSTANDING</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stu8@mhhm.com">stu8@mhhm.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psitt, Courtney</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>UNIT 3: INTERPRETING</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stu9@mhhm.com">stu9@mhhm.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, John</td>
<td>00:00:58</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>UNIT 4: READING CRITICALLY</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stu6@mhhm.com">stu6@mhhm.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This is the cumulative time spent per student on personalized learning assignment(s).
2. This represents the overall progress across all units (# correct out of the total number of correct answers needed in order to complete the PLP).
3. This represents the overall progress for a particular unit (# correct out of the total number of correct answers needed in order to complete the unit).
The Section Averages by Topic report provides class averages for time, correctness and progress, broken down by topic and learning objective. This report can help give an overview of class performance as well as provide a baseline to compare students.

**Section Averages by Topic for section: 54321**

**UNIT 1: VOCABULARY SKILLS**

- **Topic: VOCABULARY: CONTEXT CLUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic/Learning Objective</th>
<th>Average time spent (hh:mm:ss)</th>
<th>Average correct/total</th>
<th>Average progress to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOCABULARY: CONTEXT CLUES</td>
<td>01:46:46</td>
<td>90/124</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand how to use context clues</td>
<td>00:04:02</td>
<td>4/6</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize the limitations to context clues</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize six types of context clues</td>
<td>00:16:05</td>
<td>13/18</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize definition or synonym clues</td>
<td>00:02:47</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The *Metacognitive Skills* report displays how knowledgeable students are about their own learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Correct &amp; aware</th>
<th>Correct &amp; unaware</th>
<th>Incorrect &amp; aware</th>
<th>Incorrect &amp; unaware</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryukhanov,Aleksy</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alexey.bryukhanov@area9.dk">alexey.bryukhanov@area9.dk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith,John</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stu6@mhhm.com">stu6@mhhm.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight,Beth</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stu7@mhhm.com">stu7@mhhm.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proffitt,Courtney</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stu8@mhhm.com">stu8@mhhm.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. % of questions they answered correctly and thought they were right.
2. % of questions they answered correctly and did not think they were right.
3. % of questions they answered incorrectly and did not think they were right.
4. % of questions they answered incorrectly and thought they were right.
The Student Progress by Topic report lists each student in the section alongside his/her time spent and progress for each topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Time spent (hh:mm:ss)</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryukhanov, Aleksey</td>
<td>00:01:31</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alexey.brukhanov@area9.dk">alexey.brukhanov@area9.dk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, John</td>
<td>00:06:58</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stu6@mhhm.com">stu6@mhhm.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight, Beth</td>
<td>00:00:58</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stu7@mhhm.com">stu7@mhhm.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proffitt, Courtney</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stu8@mhhm.com">stu8@mhhm.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time spent and progress per student per topic.
Personalized Learning Reports - Student

1. Personalized Learning Assignment Main Page
2. Topic Scores
3. Most Challenging Learning Objectives
4. Missed Questions
5. Self-Assessment
The student PLP assignment landing page gives students an overview of their performance and progress to date.

“Overall progress” represents the # correct out of the total number of correct answers needed to complete the assignment.

This bar indicates how close the assignment due date is relative to when it was assigned.

This gives students an indication of how much work the student has done and a measure of basic performance.

The boxes in the Personal Learning Profile will “fill” as the student makes positive progress through the plan.

Students are able to adjust the amount of work they do per day here, so the program can adapt to their preferences.
The *Topic Scores* report shows time spent, correctness and progress broken down by unit and topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit/Topic</th>
<th>Avg. time spent (hh:mm:ss)</th>
<th>Current score Correct/total</th>
<th>Current score Percentage</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 1: VOCABULARY SKILLS</strong></td>
<td>00:01:58</td>
<td>88 / 96</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOCABULARY: CONTEXT CLUES</strong></td>
<td>00:01:35</td>
<td>42 / 44</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOCABULARY: WORD STRUCTURE CLUES</strong></td>
<td>00:00:23</td>
<td>46 / 52</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 2: UNDERSTANDING</strong></td>
<td>00:16:36</td>
<td>164 / 197</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 3: INTERPRETING</strong></td>
<td>00:00:02</td>
<td>0 / 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 4: READING CRITICALLY</strong></td>
<td>00:06:57</td>
<td>12 / 17</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT 5: STUDY TECHNIQUES</strong></td>
<td>00:02:41</td>
<td>47 / 68</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Most Challenging Learning Objectives report displays up to 5 learning objectives per unit that posed the most difficulty to the student.
The *Missed Questions* report displays up to 5 questions per unit that the student answered incorrectly.

Clicking a question brings up that question for the student to try again.
The **Self-Assessment** report shows students how aware they were of whether or not they knew the answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aware that you knew the answer:</th>
<th>81%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You were conscious of the fact that you knew the correct answer. If you have a high percent in this category, you are well on your way to mastering the subject. You should still practice once in a while to keep your new knowledge fresh – you don't want to get rusty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aware that you didn't know the answer:</th>
<th>16%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You knew that you didn't know the answer. That is OK! It takes time to learn new things. What is important is that you know which material you should study more. This is the first step towards improving. Just keep practicing and you will quickly learn this material!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unaware that you knew the answer:</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You thought you didn't know the answer, even though you actually did. When you are learning new material, it is easy to be uncertain about what you truly know and don't know. One way to gain confidence is to keep practicing. As you get more questions correct you will start to trust in your new knowledge!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unaware that you didn't know the answer:</th>
<th>3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You thought you knew the answer, but got the question wrong. If you have a high percent in this category, be careful! You may think you know the material better than you really do. You don't want to do poorly on a test by not preparing well enough. Practice more to make certain you have learned the material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are based on students' metacognitive responses to each question (“I know it”, “Think so”, “Unsure”, “No idea”).
Critique of Assessment Activities in the English Department
Bob Smallwood, Ph.D.
Assistant to the Provost for Assessment
November 3, 2013

Overview:

This critique is based on an examination of the 2012-13 Department Assessment Plans and the results of the assessment activities that were executed and reported in the 2012-13 English Annual Assessment Reports.

The focus of the critique is on identifying strengths of the assessment efforts in monitoring the achievement of student learning outcomes and my suggestions for potential improvements. It is also my intention to identify any areas where the departments’ assessment efforts may fall short of SACS institutional effectiveness expectations.

2012-13 English Department Assessment Plans

It is the University of Alabama’s policy and a SACS expectation that there be an assessment plan for all degree programs offered by the university. There are four degree programs offered in the Department of English at UA, including the following:

1. B.A. Degree
2. M.A. Degree
3. M.F.A. Creative Writing Degree
4. Ph.D. Degree

Critiques

BA Degree Program in English

Strengths:

1. The breadth of knowledge and skills expressed as student learning outcomes is excellent.

2. The Disciplinary Knowledge Survey is an excellent indirect measure of content mastery
Opportunities for Improvement:

1. The student learning outcomes (SLOs) address a number of excellent areas of learning within the discipline but are expressed more as objectives than as outcome. The SLO need to be expressed in more concise measurable terms such that one can readily identify what performance outcome will be observed that will affirm the achievement of the outcome.

2. The absence of disciplinary standards within the discipline appears to pose uncertainty yet assessment results would suggest excellence and success. You may want to consider exploring the merits of the “VALUE Rubrics” as standards of excellence in your writing exercises and assignments.

3. The absence of attention to the three common program outcomes puts the degree program out of compliance with both UA and SACS requirements.

MA Degree Program in English

Strengths:

1. It is noteworthy that the Department has included 4 student learning outcomes (UA minimum requirement is 2), the chosen four represent and broad set of discipline-related skills.

2. The new MA exam allows the department leadership to track disciplinary knowledge.

3. Again, it is noteworthy that the department has chosen to do more than the minimum in assessing achievement of the outcomes they’ve deemed important. Having 3 and even 4 assessment measures should strengthen the quality and empirical soundness of the inferences drawn concerning student learning.

Opportunities for Improvements:

1. Actual MA exam results need to be posted in the findings section of WEAVE

2. Even though there may be an absence of disciplinary standards, it seems reasonable for a set of departmental or program-level standards might be crafted. Could such an initiative be an assignment in one of your graduate classes such that it would be a student prompted metric?

3. The absence of attention to the three common program outcomes renders the degree program out of compliance with both UA and SACS requirements.
3. M.F.A. Creative Writing Degree

Strengths:

1. The four student learning outcomes (SLOs) seem to be quite appropriate for the MFA degree program. I think it is excellent that you have included teaching and professional conduct as part of your expectations.

2. Tracking publications after the MFA student graduates is a significant potential improvement.

Opportunities for Improvement:

1. As is the case on your other degree programs, these SLOs are expressed more as objectives than as outcome. The SLOs need to be expressed in more concise measurable terms such that one can readily identify what performance outcome will be observed that will affirm the achievement of the outcome. When you add this level of clarity is becomes more apparent whether you are accomplishing the purpose and intent of the learning objective. For example, perhaps your first outcome could be revised to read....” Students will demonstrate historical and theoretical understanding of the field of imaginative writing by __________________________(fill in the blank with the performance you will observe and measure that will lead you to infer that they have sufficient historical and theoretical understanding of imaginative writing.

2. Concerning the assessment of demonstrating understanding of teaching of imaginative writing, I would urge you to follow through with the suggestions made in the presentation of your 2011-12 assessment finding to this objective; that is, to formalize the collection of the reports of faculty observing GTA teaching performance.

3. It is unacceptable to report “no data in this cycle” as an acceptable assessment finding. It renders the program out of compliance with UA policy when you do so. You may want to add the security of a 3rd assessment measure to ensure you will be able to report findings for at least two executed measures.

4. The absence of attention to the three common program outcomes renders the degree program out of compliance with both UA and SACS requirements.

PhD Degree Program in English

Strengths:

1. The four student learning outcomes are very appropriate for a doctoral level degree program and the measurement approaches you have identified are quite reasonable to monitor achievement of the stated objectives.

2. I think it wise to have more than two measures in place for your second student learning
objective. It might even be wise to create 2 or even 3 different objectives (outcomes) from this single one so as to maximize the diagnostic value of examining more systematically where strengths and opportunities reside.

**Opportunities for Improvement:**

1. Passing an exam is certainly an acceptable assessment measure, but it would be more informative if greater detail was provided identifying what content areas were mastered at what performance levels. If students do not pass an exam, it is helpful to systematically examine where they fall short so that improvement initiatives might be advanced.

2. I would encourage you to take advantage of Dr. Jon Acker (Coordinator of Student Assessment in OIRA) to provide at least guidance if not assistance in your efforts to track your students. He has repeatedly demonstrated his willingness to be a collaborative partner in assessment efforts.

3. Because it is a PhD degree, I think you might want to consider a separate and distinct SLO related to research skills with an associated set of metrics addressing these analytical skills.

4. The absence of attention to the three common program outcomes renders the degree program out of compliance with both UA and SACS requirements.
Critique of Assessment Activities in the English Department
Bob Smallwood, Ph.D.
Assistant to the Provost for Assessment
November 3, 2013

Overview:

This critique is based on an examination of the 2012-13 Department Assessment Plans and the results of the assessment activities that were executed and reported in the 2012-13 English Annual Assessment Reports.

The focus of the critique is on identifying strengths of the assessment efforts in monitoring the achievement of student learning outcomes and my suggestions for potential improvements. It is also my intention to identify any areas where the departments’ assessment efforts may fall short of SACS institutional effectiveness expectations.

2012-13 English Department Assessment Plans

It is the University of Alabama’s policy and a SACS expectation that there be an assessment plan for all degree programs offered by the university. There are four degree programs offered in the Department of English at UA, including the following:

1. B.A. Degree
2. M.A. Degree
3. M.F.A. Creative Writing Degree
4. Ph.D. Degree

Critiques

BA Degree Program in English

Strengths:

1. The breadth of knowledge and skills expressed as student learning outcomes is excellent.

2. The Disciplinary Knowledge Survey is an excellent indirect measure of content mastery by majors and should be continued
3. The awards and recognitions your students have received are excellent indicators of the quality and effectiveness of the teaching-learning process within the undergraduate program.

**Opportunities for Improvement:**

1. The student learning outcomes (SLOs) address a number of excellent areas of learning within the discipline but are expressed more as objectives than as outcome. The SLO need to be expressed in more concise measurable terms such that one can readily identify what performance outcome will be observed that will affirm the achievement of the outcome.

2. The absence of disciplinary standards within the discipline appears to pose uncertainty yet assessment results would suggest excellence and success. You may want to consider exploring the merits of the “VALUE Rubrics” as standards of excellence in your writing exercises and assignments.

3. The absence of attention to the three common program outcomes puts the degree program out of compliance with both UA and SACS requirements.

**MA Degree Program in English**

**Strengths:**

1. It is noteworthy that the Department has included 4 student learning outcomes (UA minimum requirement is 2), the chosen four represent and broad set of discipline-related skills.

2. The new MA exam allows the department leadership to track disciplinary knowledge.

3. Again, it is noteworthy that the department has chosen to do more than the minimum in assessing achievement of the outcomes they’ve deemed important. Having 3 and even 4 assessment measures should strengthen the quality and empirical soundness of the inferences drawn concerning student learning.

**Opportunities for Improvements:**

1. Actual MA exam results need to be posted in the findings section of WEAVE

2. Even though there may be an absence of disciplinary standards, it seems reasonable for a set of departmental or program-level standards might be crafted. Could such an initiative be an assignment in one of your graduate classes such that it would be a student prompted metric?

3. The absence of attention to the three common program outcomes renders the degree program out of compliance with both UA and SACS requirements.
3. M.F.A. Creative Writing Degree

Strengths:

1. The four student learning outcomes (SLOs) seem to be quite appropriate for the MFA degree program. I think it is excellent that you have included teaching and professional conduct as part of your expectations.

2. Tracking publications after the MFA student graduates is a significant potential improvement.

Opportunities for Improvement:

1. As is the case on your other degree programs, these SLOs are expressed more as objectives than as outcome. The SLOs need to be expressed in more concise measurable terms such that one can readily identify what performance outcome will be observed that will affirm the achievement of the outcome. When you add this level of clarity is becomes more apparent whether you are accomplishing the purpose and intent of the learning objective. For example, perhaps your first outcome could be revised to read…. “Students will demonstrate historical and theoretical understanding of the field of imaginative writing by ________________(fill in the blank with the performance you will observe and measure that will lead you to infer that they have sufficient historical and theoretical understanding of imaginative writing.

2. Concerning the assessment of demonstrating understanding of teaching of imaginative writing, I would urge you to follow through with the suggestions made in the presentation of your 2011-12 assessment finding to this objective; that is, to formalize the collection of the reports of faculty observing GTA teaching performance.

3. It is unacceptable to report “no data in this cycle” as an acceptable assessment finding. It renders the program out of compliance with UA policy when you do so. You may want to add the security of a 3rd assessment measure to ensure you will be able to report findings for at least two executed measures.

4. The absence of attention to the three common program outcomes renders the degree program out of compliance with both UA and SACS requirements.

PhD Degree Program in English

Strengths:

1. The four student learning outcomes are very appropriate for a doctoral level degree program and the measurement approaches you have identified are quite reasonable to monitor achievement of the stated objectives.

2. I think it wise to have more than two measures in place for your second student learning objective. It might even be wise to create 2 or even 3 different objectives (outcomes) from this
single one so as to maximize the diagnostic value of examining more systematically where strengths and opportunities reside.

**Opportunities for Improvement:**

1. Passing an exam is certainly an acceptable assessment measure, but it would be more informative if greater detail was provided identifying what content areas were mastered at what performance levels. If students do not pass an exam, it is helpful to systematically examine where they fall short so that improvement initiatives might be advanced.

2. I would encourage you to take advantage of Dr. Jon Acker (Coordinator of Student Assessment in OIRA) to provide at least guidance if not assistance in your efforts to track your students. He has repeatedly demonstrated his willingness to be a collaborative partner in assessment efforts.

3. Because it is a PhD degree, I think you might want to consider a separate and distinct SLO related to research skills with an associated set of metrics addressing these analytical skills.

4. The absence of attention to the three common program outcomes renders the degree program out of compliance with both UA and SACS requirements.
Our purpose in creating this governance document is to put in place an inclusive, collaborative, deliberative and transparent process whereby decisions are made with the Department of English. All members of the department should have access to current information in an official governance handbook concerning duties and responsibilities of the various administrative positions and committees within the department. All official decisions should be put into writing, typically in the form of minutes of meetings, and, when necessary, immediately integrated into the department’s governance handbook, which should be regularly evaluated and revised as the department’s composition and practices change over time.
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Department Mission:

The Department of English at the University of Alabama respects the power of the English language; we cultivate its study by fostering the arts of reading, writing, and speech. We encourage the creation and interpretation of imaginative works of literature, and the mastery of composition, linguistics, literary history, and other modes of critical engagement.

Our department grants five different degrees – BA, MA, MA-TESOL, MFA, and PhD – and offers two specific doctoral concentrations: in Renaissance Studies and in Rhetoric and Composition. Given the diversity of our programs, our goals are complex and multiform. Our department contributes to the general education of almost all University of Alabama undergraduates through its first-year writing courses and its sophomore literature surveys. Our emphasis on critical reading and careful writing structures a BA in English that offers a variety of literature, writing, and language courses for students preparing for both professional schools and careers in teaching. At the undergraduate level, our curriculum provides a variety of writing experiences as part of an education in literary history, the history of the language, and the variety of critical approaches that can be employed to understand and interpret texts. We strive to teach our undergraduates to read, write, speak, and think in a sophisticated and critical fashion, and to understand the historical development of American and English literatures and their relation to other literatures in English.

At the graduate level we promote the development of knowledge through scholarly research, publication, and creative writing, schooling our students to provide meaningful service to the state and nation as teachers, writers, and scholars in the areas of composition, literature, creative writing, linguistics, and teaching English to speakers of other languages. The curriculum for the MA prepares students to teach a variety of writing courses and a range of English and American literatures, and to pursue further graduate study in English. The MA-TESOL curriculum trains students in applied linguistics so that graduates can seek a broad range of positions in teaching English to speakers of other languages. The education we provide our MFA students seeks to develop their skills as readers and writers of literature, and prepares them to teach literature and writing as college or university faculty. At the PhD level our objective is to equip students to conduct original research for careers as college or university faculty.

Our objectives as teachers are part of our lives as scholars and creative writers who are dedicated to producing the research and writing that will have an impact on our fields. The relationship between

---

5 Taken from the Program Review Document.
teaching, research, and creative activity stands at the center of our professional lives, the excitement of our scholarship, writing, and publication constantly invigorating and transforming our teaching.
DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATION:

Department Chair

The Department Chair oversees the academic and financial operations of the department. The Department Chair is appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and serves for a term of five years, renewable.

Duties include:

1. Supervision of
   - Faculty
   - Staff
   - Those occupying Executive Positions

2. Committee Membership
   - Department of English Executive Committee (chair)
   - Department of English Graduate Studies Committee (ex-officio)
   - Department of English Undergraduate Studies Committee (ex-officio)

3. Responsibilities
   - Chair’s recommendation on applications for promotion and tenure
   - Chair’s recommendation on retention of pre-tenure faculty
   - Chair’s evaluation and ranking of faculty in response to Faculty Activity Reports
   - Chair’s evaluation and ranking of staff in response to Performance Evaluations
   - Following publication of upcoming vacancies and review of candidates, appointment of Directors of Composition, Undergraduate Studies, and Graduate Studies
   - Preparation of Course Profiles for fall, spring, and summer terms
   - Staffing of all courses
   - Submission of hiring requests to Dean (faculty and staff); preparation of ad copy; formation of search committees; negotiation of offers
   - Preparation of Soft Money and Summer Budget requests
   - Allocation of travel funds
   - Monitoring of department endowment and fund accounts
   - Preparation of department’s Annual Report
- Preparation of strategic planning and review documents
- Program Outcomes Assessment
- Approval of Purchase Orders
- Management of department facilities
- Approval of sabbatical requests
- Review of student grade appeals
- Crisis management
Assistant Chair

The Assistant Chair oversees the construction of the department’s course schedule, adjudicates all departmental-level grade disputes, maintains all program-level assessment plans, and, in the absence of the Chair, serves as Acting Chair of the Department. The Assistant Chair is appointed by the Department Chair from among the tenured faculty and serves for a term of three years, renewable.

1. Supervision
   
   • Direct administrative supervision of GTAs in their capacity as teachers and employees of the Department. Indirect supervision of all faculty, instructors, and GTAs through the construction and maintenance of the class schedule.

2. Committee Membership
   
   • Department of English Executive Committee
   • Instructor Hiring Committee

3. Responsibilities include
   
   • Academic Schedule: constructs, maintains, staffs and assigns to rooms the department’s complete academic course schedule for all three terms (fall, spring, summer [interim, summer I, summer II]); with the Chair, hires all FTTIs and PTTIs for the upcoming academic year
   • Assistantship Oversight: upon receiving notification—usually from the Director of Graduate Studies, the Director of the Writing Center, or the Director of the MFA Program—that a GTA is not fulfilling the terms of his or her assistantship, arranges for a meeting with the GTA to review his or her contractual responsibilities and the consequences of not meeting them (i.e., the cancellation of the assistantship); refers the GTA to the Chair for possible termination of the assistantship should he or she continue to fail to live up to its terms
   • Grade Disputes: serves as the departmental-level point of appeal for all grade disputes that cannot be resolved at the instructor level
   • Program Assessment: maintains all departmental program assessment plans not specifically administered by Directors; records results of assessment each spring on UAOPS; attends assessment training and strategy sessions offered by the university and the college
   • Acting Chair: in the absence of the chair, serves as Acting Chair of the department; at the direction of the Chair, attends university and college-level meetings in the Chair’s stead
Director of Composition

The Director of Composition oversees the curricula and teaching of all undergraduate expository writing classes, in particular, the First-Year sequence of English 101 and 102, but also EN 103 and 104. The Director of Composition is appointed by the Department Chair from among the tenured faculty and serves for a term of three years, renewable.

Duties include:

1. Supervision
   - Associate Director of Composition
   - Graduate Teaching Mentors
   - High School Liaison
   - GTAs, full-time Instructors, and part-time Instructors teaching 100-level writing classes
   - Composition Program office staff and student workers

2. Committee Membership
   - University Writing Committee
   - Department of English Composition Committee (chair)
   - Department of English Executive Committee
   - Department of English Graduate Studies Committee
   - Department of English Instructor selection committee
   - Department of English Part-time Instructor selection committee (chair)
   - Liaison with UA’s summer Jump Start program

3. Responsibilities
   - Conduct week-long summer orientation for GTAs, new MAs, MFA, and Ph.D.s who will be teaching UA’s first-year sequence for the first time.
   - Assist with GTA training (includes being part of the teaching rotation for 532, 533, and any other training courses)
   - Develop GTA teaching manual for orientation with assistance of the Associate Director and Graduate Teaching Mentors
   - Develop Instructor teaching manual for full-time and part-time instructors
   - Hold pre-semester meeting for all full-time Instructors, part-time Instructors, and continuing GTA’s teaching composition
• Oversee curricula and textbook selection of 101, 102, 103, and 104.
• Attend Conference on College Composition and Communication (4Cs) yearly and other composition/rhetoric/WPA conferences as time permits
• Provide mission statement, goals, objectives, and outcomes for Writing Program and its courses with assistance of Associate Director, GTMs, and Composition Committee
• Call for 103 course proposals each October and February and select instructors
• Work with Associate Director on curriculum for Harris/Parker Adams sections
• Write, oversee approval process, and place yearly national ads for full-time instructors (MLA JIL, Chronicle of Higher Ed if necessary) and local ads for part-time instructors (Tuscaloosa News, Birmingham News, UA job board)
• Oversee creation of writing faculty development workshops
• Oversee maintenance of Composition website
• Invite CWPA external program review every 5 years
• With the Coordinator of TESOL, oversee curricula of EN 120 and EN 121
Director of Creative Writing

The Director of Creative Writing oversees the curriculum and teaching in the MFA program and the undergraduate minor. The position of Director of Creative Writing rotates among the tenured creative writing faculty and is held for a term of two years.

Duties include:

1. Supervision
   - MFA students teaching 200- and 300-level creative writing courses
   - Administrative Assistant to the Director
   - Graduate Assistant to the Director

2. Committee Membership
   - Department of English Executive Committee
   - Department of English Graduate Studies Committee
   - Department of English Creative Writing Admissions Committee
   - Department of English Bankhead Visiting Writers Series Committee
   - Department of English Coal Royalty Chair Committee
   - Director’s Meeting of the Associated Writing Programs

3. Responsibilities
   - Administration: Serve as supervisor of the Reading Series, Coal Royalty Chair, and Black Warrior Review
   - Curriculum Reform: Guide and implement undergraduate and graduate creative writing curriculum development
   - Advising: Advise all graduate students in creative writing each semester on course of study and progress toward degree; maintain records for all active students in program; assign thesis directors to all students; handle appointments and walk-ins for advising and curricular issues
   - Admissions: Oversee the graduate admissions process; review applicant files; write nominating letters for scholarships and fellowships; make recruiting and follow-up phone calls to all accepted students; meet with prospective graduate students and undergraduates who have an interest in studying creative writing
   - Fellowships and Awards: Solicit and adjudicate applications for departmental and university-wide graduate fellowships and awards; oversee maintenance and disbursement of endowed funds.
- Advertising, Public Relations, and Outreach: Maintain records of alumni publication/employment and report annually to English Department; supervise alumni outreach; create and supervise the program’s advertising and fundraising; meet with interested press and public; consult with web designers on maintaining and updating of public and in-house creative writing web sites; conduct exit interviews with graduate students completing the MFA program; serve as liaison to Associated Writing Programs.
Director of Graduate Studies

The Director of Graduate Studies oversees the curriculum and teaching of graduate courses in the MA, Applied Linguistics-TESOL, and PhD programs and, in the absence of the Chair, Assistant Chair, and the Director of Undergraduate Studies, serves as Acting Chair of the Department. The Director of Graduate Studies is appointed by the Department Chair from among the tenured faculty and serves for a term of three years, renewable.

Duties include:

1. Supervision
   - Administrative Assistant to the Director

2. Committee Membership
   - Department of English Graduate Studies Committee (chair)
   - Department of English Executive Committee
   - College of Arts and Sciences Graduate Committee

3. Responsibilities
   - Meetings: conducts monthly meetings of the Graduate Studies Committee
   - College and University Liaison: attends meetings of the College Graduate Committee and Graduate School DGS meetings and represents the department on university-wide issues related to graduate study
   - Catalog: works with appropriate university offices on UA graduate catalog revision, and makes sure that the online catalog is updated
   - Website: makes sure that the graduate program information on the departmental website is updated
   - Recruitment: identifies graduate student prospects at home institution (e.g., at Graduate Preview Day); arranges visits for prospective graduate students from other institutions; reviews new student applications
   - Admissions: organizes the selection process for applications for admission to the graduate program
   - Orientation: conducts orientation for incoming graduate students
   - Professionalization: works with faculty members on Placement committee and with EGO on issues of professionalization of the graduate students
• Advising: maintains database of English MA and Ph.D. students (past and present); is responsible for the advising of all MA and Ph.D. students each semester (with some advising delegated to individual programs); handles appointments and walk-ins for advising and curricular issues
• Transfer Credit: resolves transfer credit questions, adjudicating course equivalency applications for transfer students to UA and granting pre-approval for courses to be taken abroad
• Departmental Scholarships: solicits applications and nominates promising candidates for departmental scholarships; determines winners and financial awards for travel funding
• University Scholarships: is responsible for selecting and putting forward candidates for Dean’s Merit and Graduate Council Fellowships
• Oversight: tracks the academic progress-to-degree of all non-MFA graduate students
• Exams: coordinates the master’s comprehensive examinations and the doctoral preliminary examinations
• Academic Counseling: meets with students in academic difficulty
• Curriculum Reform: guides graduate curriculum development: new course development, changes to MA/Ph.D. requirements, instructional innovation
• Fiscal Management: Manages departmental funds for graduate student travel
• Graduate Faculty List: Ensures that Graduate Faculty status is up-to-date for the English Department
• Honors Day: Represents the department at Honors Day
Director of Undergraduate Studies

The Director of Undergraduate Studies oversees the curriculum and course profiles of undergraduate courses in the general education sequence and the English major and serves as Acting Chair of the Department as needed. The Director of Undergraduate Studies is appointed by the Department Chair from among the tenured faculty and serves for a term of three years, renewable.

Duties include:

1. Supervision
   - Coordinator of Undergraduate English Advising
   - Administrative Assistant to the Director/ Receptionist
   - Instructors and GTAs teaching 200-level literature courses

2. Committee Membership
   - Department of English Undergraduate Studies Committee (chair)
   - Department of English Executive Committee

3. Responsibilities
   - Curriculum Reform: guides undergraduate curriculum development: new course development, changes to major/minor requirements, changes to syllabi and mentoring for 200-level, instructional innovation
   - Advising System: oversees departmental advising system: contacts faculty for course descriptions, maintains database of English majors, assigns advisors, provides faculty with instructions and support during two-week advising period
   - Advising: handles appointments and walk-in for most advising issues for majors and minors outside two-week advising period
   - Transfer Credit: resolves transfer credit questions, adjudicating course equivalency applications for transfer students to UA and granting pre-approval for courses to be taken abroad
   - Academic Counseling: meets with students in academic difficulty and provides academic “plan of success” for students needing their financial aid reinstated
   - Grade Disputes: acts as an intermediary between faculty and students so as to settle grade disputes
   - Scholarships: solicits applications for departmental scholarships, determines winners and financial awards
- Honors Day: presides at the English Department’s Honor’s Day ceremony and represents Department at the College ceremony
- Recruitment: supports University and College recruitment efforts by meeting with visiting high school students and their parents; also represents Department at Capstone Scholars Day and similar events
- Internships: oversees, approves, and awards grades for departmental internships and directed readings
- College Liaison: attends A&S DUS meetings and works closely with A&S Student Services on advising and graduation issues
- Catalog: works with appropriate university offices on UA catalog revision
- ADD: Management of Lily and Iris Fund.
**Director of the Writing Center**

The Writing Center Director oversees the administration (budget, resources, tutorial offerings), training, and university-wide services associated with the Writing Center. The Director of the Writing Center is appointed by the Department Chair from among the tenured faculty and serves for a term of three years, renewable.

Duties include:

1. **Supervision**
   - Associate Director of Writing Center
   - Graduate Teaching Assistants working in the Writing Center
   - Undergraduate peer tutors

2. **Committee Membership**
   - University Writing Committee
   - Department of English Composition Committee
   - Department of English Instructor selection committee
   - Department of English part-time Instructor selection committee

3. **RESPONSIBILITIES**
   - Conduct 3-day summer orientation for new GTAs who will be tutoring in the Writing Center during their first year at UA
   - Develop Writing Center tutoring manual for WC orientation
   - Develop Writing Center undergraduate peer-tutoring manual
   - Attend Conference on College Composition and Communication (4Cs) and/or national and regional Writing Center Directors conferences
   - Oversee creation and development of undergraduate courses in peer tutoring
   - Oversee creation and implementation of graduate courses in Writing Center pedagogy and theory
   - Train consultants for onsite departmental workshops
   - Train consultants for science and social science writing workshops

---

6 This position does not yet exist; once it does, a description will have to be included in this document.
• Work with faculty from across the curriculum to construct successful writing assignments in their courses
• Develop modules on specific writing problems for use in Writing Center and Online Writing Lab
• Develop modules and tutorials on specific forms of writing—such as the lab report
• Start up ESL conversation groups
• Develop and maintain Writing Center web site, including online chat sessions for writing problems, email consultation and Online Writing Lab
• Write yearly report on Writing Center activity
• Invite Writing Center external review every 5 years
Associate Director of Composition

The Associate Director of Composition assists the Director in administration of the freshman Writing Program. The Associate Director is appointed by the Department Chair in consultation with the Director of Composition from among the full-time instructors and untenured faculty, and serves a term of three years, renewable.

Duties include:

1. Supervision
   - Assist with supervision of Graduate Teaching Assistants

2. Committee Membership
   - Department of English Composition Committee

3. Responsibilities
   - Assist with training and mentoring of GTAs (including summer orientation)
   - Assist with training of Writing Center Tutors (including summer orientation)
   - Provide teaching observations and written evaluations of GTA teaching effectiveness as requested
   - Read and summarize student course evaluations of Writing Program courses: compile data.
   - Provide letters of recommendation for GTAs and instructors as requested
   - Assist in Writing Program administration, plagiarism review and remediation, student complaints, grade appeals, registration problems, and placement credit
   - Teach EN 533 (or EN 533/534 in past years) as assigned
   - Assist in development of Writing Program curriculum and instructional materials (EN 101 and 102 syllabus development, GTA training materials and handbook, Writing Program Handbook for Instructors, evaluation materials)
   - Assist with Writing Program faculty development workshops and Writing Program outreach events
   - Serve as Writing Program liaison for athlete academics
   - Serve as Coordinator for Harris-Parker Adams living learning community
   - Serve as assistant to Writing Center Director, including assistance with tutor training and mentoring, Writing Center research and development, and conference attendance
Coordinator of English Department Computer Lab

The Coordinator of the English Department Computer Lab manages the operation of the Morgan Hall computer lab and teaches two sections of computer-intensive English classes each semester, either at the 100 or 200 level. This is currently a staff position.

Duties Include:

1. Supervision of
   - Graduate student assistants working in the computer lab
   - Work-study assistants working in the computer lab

2. Committee Membership
   - Department of English Technology Committee
   - Department of English Composition Committee

3. Responsibilities
   - Maintain department computer records
   - Manage all department distribution lists
   - Serve as technical advisor and computer liaison to External Degree Program
   - Serve as technical advisor to faculty on grant proposals for computer and media equipment
   - Address hardware problems in computer lab; act as liaison to A&S and Seebeck for lab and department machines
   - Provide faculty support and training with media classrooms, with AV equipment, and with portable computer carts
   - Train GTAs and work-study students in the computer lab and coordinate work schedules
   - Conduct computer software tutorials and/or serve as workshop coordinator
   - Provide instructional and pedagogical support to faculty and GTAs teaching computer-assisted classes
   - Maintain expertise in computerized composition and literature studies
   - Attend conferences to present and learn new strategies in CAI
   - Lead computer orientation for new teaching graduate students
   - Teach two sections of computer-intensive courses each semester, either at the 100 or 200 level
Coordinator of TESOL

The Coordinator of the TESOL Program oversees the operation of the M.A.-TESOL Program, in collaboration with the Director of Graduate Studies; the teaching of EN 120 and 121 classes, in collaboration with the Director of Composition; and the supervision of ELI apprenticeships, in collaboration with the ELI Directors. The Coordinator of the M.A.-TESOL Program is appointed by the Department Chair from among the tenured faculty and serves for a term of three years, renewable.

Duties include:

1. Supervision
   - M.A.-TESOL students teaching EN 120 and 121
   - M.A.-TESOL students doing apprenticeship in the ELI (shared responsibility with ELI faculty mentor)

2. Committee Membership
   - Department of English Linguistics Committee
   - Department of English Graduate Studies Committee
   - Department of English Composition Committee
   - University Writing Committee

3. Responsibilities
   - Curriculum: oversee M.A.-TESOL curriculum; prepare annual schedule of courses, including potential for cross-listed courses; work with departmental administrative assistants to manage enrollment in EN120 and 121
   - Teaching Assignments: submit annual teaching assignments of both full-time faculty and GTAs to Department Chair; supervise M.A.-TESOL students teaching EN 120 and 121
   - Testing: organize placement testing for incoming undergraduates in consultation with the ELI and undergraduate admissions; coordinate with the ELI on incoming M.A.-TESOL students (and any other graduate students in the English Department) who need to take the ITAP Program (for international teaching assistants) administered by the ELI before the fall semester begins; coordinate the comprehensive examinations in February of each year
   - Mentoring: assist DGS in semester advising for M.A.-TESOL students; publicize tutoring opportunities for M.A.-TESOL students; conduct a fall orientation meeting for all incoming M.A.-TESOL students; motivate students to participate in regional and national TESOL meetings
   - Apprenticeships: assign second-year M.A.-TESOL students to ELI apprenticeships; at the end of the spring semester, meet with the apprentices for the coming year and the ELI directors for orientation; with ELI faculty, supervise apprentice teaching at the ELI; identify and develop further internship opportunities
• Grants: track potential funding sources for M.A.-TESOL students from department and university; provide letters, when appropriate in support of funding applications; ensure compliance of all research with IRB requirements

• Recruitment: advertise the program in appropriate venues; maintain updated information about the program on the departmental website; track Applicant Status Sheets from the Graduate School, follow up with promising applicants, and collaborate on admission decisions; maintain database of graduates of the program

• Liaison: represent the department’s M.A.-TESOL program to faculty, students, university library, other university entities with related interests, and National TESOL; coordinate with ELI on any teaching observations done at the ELI for the TESOL Methods course or any other courses in the M.A.-TESOL Program

• Program Reporting: prepare end-of-year program review for submission to Chair, to be read orally to full faculty during the first faculty meeting of the following academic year; arrange periodic outside review of program
Coordinator of Undergraduate English Advising

The Coordinator of Undergraduate English Advising assists the Director of Undergraduate Studies with advising, enrollment and database management. The Coordinator of Undergraduate English Advising is appointed by the Department Chair from among the full-time instructors and untenured faculty and serves for a term of three years, renewable.

Duties include:

- Assign faculty advisors to newly declared undergraduate majors
- Serve as default advisor for majors who are, for whatever reason, unable to contact their advisor, or who have not yet been assigned an advisor
- Maintain departmental databases which list major advisees and their statuses. The four databases are: active advisees, advisees whose graduation is pending, advisees whose status is unknown, and advisees who are currently inactive. These databases are both in paper copy and on the shared drive as Microsoft Outlook files.
- Field questions from professors that deal with advisee status, curriculum requirements, and advisee registration problems.
- Assist Director of Undergraduate Studies with student questions about course overrides, transfer eligibility, and eligibility issues.
- Solicit undergraduate course descriptions from professors and compile course offerings for future terms.
Director of the Hudson Strode Program in Renaissance Studies

The Director of the Hudson Strode Program in Renaissance Studies is responsible for overseeing the Strode endowment and budget; running the Program; and maintaining the Hudson Strode house and grounds. The Director is appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences from among the tenured faculty.

Duties include:

1. Supervision
   - Strode Assistant

2. Committee Membership
   - Department of English Graduate Studies Committee

3. Responsibilities
   - Oversight of the Strode endowment and budget.
   - Organizing the Hudson Strode Seminar, held biennally and involving the participation of about five visiting lecturers.
   - Organizing, in non-Seminar years, a lecture series or a weekend symposium, usually focused on a theme and involving about four or five lecturers.
   - Organizing, each year, a “local readings” symposium, featuring colleagues in Renaissance studies from institutions in the southeast.
   - In the fall, marketing and promoting the program every year, through mailings and emailings.
**Director of the Writing Center**

The Director of the Writing Center supervises tutoring services for students from all disciplines and at all levels. This is currently a staff position.

Duties include:

1. **Supervision of**
   - graduate student tutors

2. **Committee Membership**
   - Department Composition Committee

3. **Responsibilities**
   - Manage tutoring service for University of Alabama students
   - Keep records of student visits and report regularly to the appropriate instructors
   - Manage the Grammar Hotline
   - Advertise WC services through presentations, workshops, and print material
   - Prepare and review materials for use in the Writing Center
   - Train, supervise, and evaluate Writing Center tutors
   - Conduct summer training workshop for tutors
   - Prepare tutor work schedule
   - Prepare end of semester report on Writing Center activities
   - Serve as writing consultant for university faculty
   - Conduct community outreach to local organizations and educational institutions
   - Serve as a liaison between tutors and clients of the Writing Center
   - Direct Basic Writing Program (EN 099): conduct diagnostic testing; monitor student placement; evaluate texts and materials for use in EN 099; teach EN 099 and follow-up sections of EN 101; consult with university advisors regarding basic writing issues
Assistant to the Chair
(Senior Office Associate)

Assists the Department Chair in the operation of the department and serves as chief budget assistant.

Assistant to the Chair
(Administrative Specialist)

Assists the Department Chair in the operation of the Department and serves as chief budget assistant.

[Draft]

- Supervise Departmental staff.
- Responsible for all financial accounting in Department; Travel Reimbursements, Departmental Transfers, Miscellaneous Disbursement Vouchers, Purchase Orders.
- Responsible for budget matters, budget changes, handling and depositing payments to Department.
- Responsible for Departmental Purchasing Card and monthly reconciliation.
- Assist professors with grants.
- Assist professors with expenditures and any expenditure questions.
- Prepare payroll for all tenure-track professors, instructors and staff.
- Prepare and keep up-to-date all personnel files.
- Schedule appointments for Chair and assist Chair with scheduling meetings.
- Liaison between Dean’s Office and Department.
- Liaison between all other areas on campus and Department.
- Manage faculty and staff job searches and on-line employment system operations.
- Manage and keep record of all job search expenses.
- Ordering office supplies and purchasing equipment.
- Responsible for building maintenance with work order system.
- Responsible for assisting Chair with renovation decisions.
- Responsible for any renovations/refurbishing in Departmental building and classrooms.
- Responsible for maintenance/keep of Strode House and property.
- Planning for special events and receptions.
Assistant to the Director of Graduate Programs

Assistant to the Director of Graduate Programs and Director of Creative Writing
(A&S Associate II- Program Support Assistant)

Assists the Directors in the operation of the Graduate Program, the Creative Writing Program, and the Strode Program and Coordinators of the CRES and MA-TESOL programs

Immediate supervisor of the Office Associate II working with the Graduate and Creative Writing Program and research assistant(s) assigned to the Graduate office.

Responsibilities:

- Manage fellowship nomination paperwork.
- Coordinate with Writing Program on GTA summer practicum and EN 533.
- Liaison between Graduate School and graduate students
- Liaison between Graduate School and Directors of Graduate Studies and Creative Writing
- Assist department chair with GTA research assignments and coordinate research assistants with their assigned jobs and supervisors.
- Manage deadline paperwork, reminders, and notification for student competitions and awards.
- Maintain budget information on Henry Jacobs and Miriam Locke Endowment Funds for graduate student travel and research.
- Maintain budget information for the Creative Writing Program; Miscellaneous disbursements.
- Prepare payroll and tuition grant forms for graduate teaching assistants.
- Prepare department Honor’s Day program.
- Maintain list of all PhD graduates with current employment and other information.
- Plan and coordinate annual Graduate Appreciate Day luncheon.
- Coordinate academic graduate advising.
- Manage and proctor PhD preliminary examinations.
- Manage and proctor MA and MA-TESOL comprehensive examinations.
- Coordinate MFA, MA and PhD oral defenses.
- Support other department units as requested.

Assistant to the Director of Undergraduate Programs

(Office Associate II)

Assists the Director in the operation of the Undergraduate Programs and serves as the department receptionist.

Duties include:
1. Supervision of
   • Student workers and Research Assistants

2. Responsibilities
   • Screen calls and make appointments for the Director of Undergraduate Studies and Department Chair
   • Distribution of daily mail
   • Route incoming calls for entire department
   • Oversee 200-level-and-above class cancellations
   • Produce course descriptions each semester
   • Assist with all aspects of advising English majors each semester
   • Manage schedule book for Strode Library and conference room
   • Collect and file instructor vitas and syllabi, and upload them onto UAOPS in pdf format
   • Manage course evaluations for 200- through graduate-level courses
   • Manage data for scholarship applications, awards and Honors Day Ceremonies
   • Schedule visits for prospective students
   • Process change-of-grade and drop/add forms
   • Assist students with registration, drop/add, and major/minor declaration
   • Assist the Director with special projects
   • Manage book orders for 200-500 level courses
   • Assist in planning for special events and receptions
   • Support other units in the department as requested

Assistant to the Director of the Writing Program

(Office Associate II)

Assists the Director of the Writing Program in the operation of the freshman Writing Program.

Duties include:

1. Supervision of
   • Student workers

2. Responsibilities
- Maintain and supervise media equipment
- Screen calls and make appointments for the director of the Writing Program
- Supervise and supply the copy room
- Handle 103 proposals and nominations from 101 instructors
- Oversee 100-level class cancellations
- Collect and file instructor vitas, syllabi, and grade books
- Manage course evaluations for 100-level classes
- Collect enrollment and other data for annual report
- Schedule visits for prospective students
- Process change-of-grade and drop/add forms
- Assist students with registration, drop/add, and grade
- Assist the Director with special projects
- Manage book orders for 100-level classes
- Assist with GTA orientation
- Assist with Writing Center orientation
- Assist in planning for special events and receptions
- Support other units in the department as requested
FACULTY

Tenured and Tenure-Track

Full Professor
Associate Professor
Assistant Professor

Instructors

Full-Time, Five-Year Contract
Full-Time, One-Year Contract
Part-Time Temporary

7 This section of the document will eventually contain brief descriptions of the various ranks of faculty who teach and serve in the department and the degree to which each rank is enfranchised within the department. Decisions about these matters will need to be made in consultation with the Faculty Handbook (see esp. the final paragraph on p.12 and pp. 14-16) and appropriate Faculty Senate and other university guidelines.
STANDING COMMITTEES

**Composition Committee:** The Composition Committee develops the Writing Program mission statement, goals, objectives, and outcomes assessment; plans faculty development; conducts textbook review and selection; performs curriculum review and writing course development; and plans outreach activities.

Membership: Director of Composition (chair), Rhetoric and Composition faculty, Associate Director of Composition, Director of the Writing Center, and other appointed or elected members.

**Creative Writing Committee:** The Creative Writing Committee is charged with graduate recruitment and admissions; retention efforts; awards; curriculum review; and assessment. Membership: Creative Writing faculty.

**Diversity Committee:** The Diversity Committee is charged with minority student recruitment. Membership: two tenure-track faculty (appointed).

**Ethics Advisory Textbook Committee:** The Ethics Advisory Textbook Committee reviews any requirement to purchase materials where the individual making the requirement stands to gain financially from the requirement.

Membership: Department Chair, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Director of Graduate Studies, Director of Creative Writing, Director of First Year Writing.

**Executive Committee:** The Executive Committee reports on the activities of other department committees; advises the Chair on matters related to the budget, priorities for hiring, and development and funding; represents the concerns of constituencies; drafts department mission and goals; drafts new policies or reviews proposals for new policies; formulates the department assessment plan; and reviews curriculum change proposals. The agenda for all Executive Committee meetings shall be distributed to all represented constituencies one week prior to all meetings.

Membership: Department Chair, Director of Graduate Programs, Director of Creative Writing, Director of Composition, Director of Undergraduate Programs, and four members of the tenure-track faculty elected at large by preferential ballot, one of whom must be untenured. Faculty members may opt to withdraw their names from the ballot.
I. Description of the Committee
   A. Mission: Elected annually in the fall by those members of the department currently holding Full graduate faculty membership, the Graduate Faculty Committee considers applications for appointment to the Graduate Faculty.
   B. Membership: Three members of the Full graduate faculty, one of whom will be elected by the committee to serve as chair.
   C. Proceedings: The chair of the committee shall consult the Graduate School website to determine individuals whose graduate faculty membership terminates at the end of the current academic year, or individuals not listed as graduate faculty members (to determine the latter, compare the list on the Grad School website with the latest iteration of the department’s own faculty directory). Those with expiring or expired membership should be invited to submit a current CV to the Committee to begin the review process. Also, any faculty member desiring a change in status should also notify the Committee and supply a current CV in the Fall semester no later than October 1. Other explanatory or supporting materials may be provided at the discretion of the applicant or at the request of the committee. Candidates who have questions about the way their productivity is likely to be evaluated may ask members of the Graduate Faculty Committee for a confidential nonbinding opinion before deciding whether to submit a formal application. Once all materials are in hand, the Committee shall meet to discuss the merits of each case, with a simple majority vote required to render a decision.

II. Categories of Graduate Faculty Membership
   A. Temporary: Temporary graduate faculty membership is granted for up to three years to individuals who do not otherwise qualify for or desire Associate or Full graduate faculty membership to perform specific tasks (i.e., teaching a given course numbered 500 or above, supervising a particular thesis or dissertation, serving on a committee that requires graduate faculty membership). Temporary graduate faculty membership may be granted by the Graduate Faculty Committee as a result of its consideration of a particular case, or by the Department Chair as required. No tasks outside of those specified can be performed.
   B. Associate: Associate graduate faculty membership is granted in six-year terms and entitles individuals to teach courses numbered 500 or above, to direct MA or MFA theses, and to serve on dissertation committees. Probationary faculty will be accorded Associate membership on the graduate faculty at the beginning of their appointments. Those whose tenure decisions have been deferred are eligible only for reappointment as Associate members while they remain in the probationary period. Full-time administrators who are tenured in the English Department, who have served in their administrative positions continuously for at least one year prior to their review, and who are not otherwise Full members of the graduate faculty will also be accorded Associate membership on the graduate faculty during the period of their administrative service, and for whatever period of time completes their respective six-year terms.
C. **Full:** Full graduate faculty membership is granted in six-year terms and entitles individuals to teach courses numbered 500 or above, to direct MA or MFA theses, to serve on dissertation committees, to chair dissertation, special field, and prospectus defense committees, to hear appeals of the decisions of the Graduate Faculty Committee, and to vote on changes in the structure, curriculum, and requirements of graduate programs. Full graduate faculty membership does not entitle anyone to teach any particular course.

### III. Criteria for (Re)Appointment to Full Graduate Faculty Membership

A. **Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity:** Graduate faculty members are expected to maintain consistent and high-quality research productivity. Individuals seeking (re)appointment should have had published or accepted for publication, over the previous six years, at least four substantial peer-reviewed articles, or their creative equivalent.

B. **Teaching:** Evidence of "excellence in teaching" at the graduate level will be tied to the College of Arts and Sciences' student opinion survey forms in conjunction with the English Department's discursive forms and any other documentation the candidate chooses to submit. Evidence of a pattern of poor teaching, as documented by SOIs, student discursive evaluations, or other material provided to the committee by the DGS or the Department Chair may lead to loss of standing, regardless of other qualifications.

C. **Service and Professional Involvement:** At issue here is not normal service on departmental, college, and university committees, but the fulfillment of a candidate's professional responsibility toward graduate students. Evidence of the quality of supervision of graduate students may include

1. Proper supervision of theses and/or dissertations
2. Timely grading of special field examinations and evaluation of prospectuses
3. Periodic evaluation of students registered for thesis/dissertation direction
4. Mentoring graduate students in their professional development.

D. **Final Caveat:** In making its determinations, the committee reviewing applications for Graduate Faculty status will consider the evolving complexities of the profession, some of which may be less relevant to the tenure sprint than they are to later phases of our careers: a recognition of the possibility that truly distinguished individual publications or a spate of multiple publications packed into a brief period may in some cases establish a national visibility whose value to graduate students extends beyond six years; and the regrettable fact that, regardless of quantity, publications judged weak by the committee will not be sufficient for graduate faculty status.

### IV. Appeal Process

A. **Departmental-Level Appeals:** Any candidate who is denied membership may appeal to the Full members of the graduate faculty who are certified for the following academic year at the start of the appeals process.

B. **College-Level Appeals:** An appeal from any adverse judgment at the departmental level will follow the approved uniform Arts and Sciences procedure for making such an appeal.

---

**Graduate Studies Committee:** The Graduate Studies Committee is charged with graduate recruitment and admissions; retention efforts; awards; curriculum review; and assessment. Membership: Director of Graduate Programs (chair); Chair of Literature Steering Committee; representative from Composition/
Rhetoric; representative from Linguistics/TESOL; Director of the Strode Program; an elected representative from literature; MA student; PhD student.

**Instructor Hiring Committee:** Consists of the Chair and the Directors of Undergraduate studies, Graduate Studies, First Year Writing, and Creative Writing. Posts the JIL Instructor ad, reviews the online and hardcopy components of applications, evaluates applications, and meets to rank applicants. The Chair oversees in-person or telephone interviews, makes the actual job offers, and negotiates with A&S about the specific details of offer letters. Eventually, as the summer lengthens, the Chair will often follow-up on the agreements reached by the Committee and wrap up FTTI hiring on his or her own.

**Instructor review Committee:** this Committee was formed during the 2008-2009 academic year as a condition for the indefinite renewal of FTTIs. The Committee’s charge as voted in by the Department reads as follows:

“This committee plays an advisory role to the Instructor Hiring Committee: that is, based on its evaluation of Instructors, this committee will determine whether or not an individual Instructor meets the criteria for reappointment. It does not make final decisions regarding the employment of Instructors, which necessarily take into account other criteria such as budgets, enrollment, and Departmental need. The evaluative process conducted by this committee is also intended to recognize and document Instructor contributions to the Department and to give Instructors opportunities to assemble employment dossiers.

Committee membership will consist of five faculty members, four tenure-line faculty plus one member of the Instructor Hiring Committee serving in an ex officio capacity. Members will serve two-year terms and every member of the tenure-line faculty will serve on this committee on a mandatory rotation. This rotation will be enforced by the Departmental Chair.”

The work of the Committee as voted in by the Department will be as follows:

“During the fall 2009 semester, the Instructor Review Committee will review the course syllabi, A&S quantitative evaluations, the new online 100-level evaluations, and the department’s discursive evaluations for all FTTIs in their final contract year. The Committee will decide among themselves about 1. a specific timetable for the completion of their work; 2. the nature and page limits of the materials FTTIs may voluntarily submit; and 3. the form of the evaluative
report to be submitted to the Hiring Committee. The Instructor Review Committee will report on their first-year’s experiences to the Department at a spring 2010 Department meeting and at that time make recommendations for standardizing the practice of the Committee with respect to the 3 issues listed just above.”

**Linguistics Committee:** The Linguistics Committee represents the concerns of the linguistics/TESOL faculty to the department administration, drafts curriculum change proposals or new policies, and engages in other tasks as determined by the linguistics/ TESOL faculty. Membership: Linguistics and TESOL faculty, Department Chair (ex-officio)

**Literature Steering Committee:** The Literature Steering Committee represents the concerns of the literature faculty to the department administration, drafts curriculum change proposals or new policies, and engages in other tasks as determined by the literature faculty.

Membership: a chair and four members, all elected by the literature faculty

**Retention Review Committee:** Elected annually in the fall, the Retention Review Committee reviews the dossiers of pre-tenure faculty and then meets with each pre-tenure faculty member to provide advice on progress toward tenure, including a written evaluation that will be provided to the pre-tenure faculty member and the department chair. Membership: One tenured faculty member from each of the areas of specialization represented by the pre-tenure faculty; one member will be elected by the committee to serve as chair.

**Space and Facilities Committee:** The Committee on Space and Facilities gathers data and promotes action to improve the facilities used by the Department of English.

Membership: Department Chair, at least one tenure-track faculty member, at least one instructor, at least one graduate student, at least one undergraduate student, a member of the Technology Committee, and the staff member responsible for building maintenance.

**Technology Committee:** The Technology Committee is responsible for identifying, articulating, and, when required, conducting preliminary deliberations upon issues of technology relevant to the daily functioning and short- and long-term goals of the department. Once the department has determined a course of action concerning issues brought before it by the Technology Committee, the Committee is further responsible for implementing that course of action.

Membership: a chair and three members, all elected by the committee of the whole
**Tenure and Promotion Committee:** Convened by the senior faculty member, the Tenure and Promotion Committee meets to consider applications for tenure and promotion.

Membership: for tenure applications, all tenured faculty; for promotion to Associate Professor, all Associate and Full Professors; for promotion to Full Professor, all Full Professors.

**Undergraduate Studies Committee:** The Undergraduate Studies Committee is charged with undergraduate recruitment, retention, awards, curriculum review, assessment, and outreach. Membership: Director of Undergraduate Studies (chair); two members of the tenure track faculty (elected); one instructor (elected); one GTA (elected)

**Visiting Writers Series Committee:** The Visiting Writers Committee invites and schedules visiting writers for the Bankhead Visiting Writers Series and the Coal Royalty Professorship. Membership: Creative writing faculty.

**Department Service Assignments:**

- Graduate Placement Advisor
- MFA Graduate Placement Advisor
- Library Liaison
- Instructor Liaison
- English Honors Advisor
- Sigma Tau Delta Advisor
- Webmaster
DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES

PROCEDURES FOR BUDGET OPERATIONS

Reimbursements of expenses
P-card usage
whatever

PROCEDURES FOR CURRICULUM REFORM

Curriculum reform begins during a review initiated by the appropriate area standing committee or a review at the request of the department chair or dean. A proposal for curriculum change, upon approval by the area standing committee, proceeds to the program-level standing committee for review (and, if necessary, revision). A proposal approved by the program-level standing committee proceeds to the Executive Committee for review before going before the department for a vote.

For example, a proposal for reform of the undergraduate literature curriculum would begin in the Literature Steering Committee, proceed to the Undergraduate Studies Committee, go on to the Executive Committee, and finally receive a binding vote at the department. The purpose of this procedure is to ensure that constituencies that may be affected by such a change have an opportunity to speak to the proposal well before a binding vote is imminent. Thus, while interim reviews of the proposal may result in a return of the proposal to its originating committee for reconsideration and possible revision, the procedure is not designed to prevent a proposal from reaching the department level for final discussion and a vote.  

PROCEDURES FOR FUND MANAGEMENT

---

8 This portion of the document remains under construction, pending in part the successful university-wide implementation of the Banner system.
9 We need to decide if there’s a limit to how many times a proposal can be returned, or if it can be voted down before reaching the department for a binding vote.
Department endowment and gift accounts and files are managed by the unit responsible for disbursement of monies. Each unit must prepare an annual fund report outlining income and disbursements for the period from May 1 to April 30 (information which will be included in the department’s annual report to the Dean). The fiscal year for university accounts is October 1 to September 30; interest income funds are deposited at the beginning of the fiscal year.

Each fund must be employed according to the guidelines set out in the fund’s Memorandum of Agreement (for endowments) or other initial document; changes to fund usage must be approved by university legal counsel.

Fund files should include: The Memorandum of Agreement, annual fund reports beginning in May 2006, records of disbursements, and any document related to changes in fund usage. Duplicates of the Memorandum of Agreement and annual fund reports are kept on file in the Department Chair’s office.

PROCEDURES FOR HIRING

Tenure-track positions:

Tenure-Track Search Protocols (revised Aug. 2013: approved 8/27/13)

Institutional Procedures

The procedures outlined in this section may change along with the evolution of UA’s broader hiring procedures and modifications to the department’s committee structure; this portion of the document should be updated by the chair as needed to conform with these broader institutional processes.

Hiring priorities are determined by the tenure-track faculty. The department chair composes (in consultation with the relevant program heads) and sends the annual hiring request (using a standard form which calls for rationales, diversity plans, duties and course load/credit hour production, and data on enrollment trends) to the dean, typically by mid-July. When the dean has approved one or more positions (typically in early September), a search committee is constituted. The search committees draft ads for their respective searches. These ads are revised as necessary by the chair and placed in appropriate publications. Diversity efforts may include letters to targeted departments or prospective hires, or other
appropriate strategies for diversifying the faculty. Applicants are required to apply through the online UA Human Resources job portal, and all materials except letters of recommendation should be uploaded by candidates through this site; letters of recommendation should arrive separately by mail.

Once the pool of candidates has been winnowed by the search committee down to those with reasonable potential for campus visits (i.e., the dozen or so invited for face-to-face “conversations” at MLA, by phone, or by Skype, or otherwise prescreened in depth and via direct interaction by the search committee), the search committee chair should complete the Permission to Interview form required by the dean’s office. This and all other required forms are the responsibility of the search committee chair; the department chair is responsible for using the contents of these forms to direct his/her administrative staff to update appropriate electronic databases of candidates’ status. Approval of the Permission to Interview form is required before inviting two or three candidates for campus visits, which should occur as soon as possible in the spring semester. The dean’s office will pay for two campus visits; the department must pay for the third and any beyond that.

Once a decision has been reached about whom to hire, the department chair contacts the dean for permission to make an offer, contacts the candidate regarding the offer, asks for permission for the university to conduct a background check, follows up on references as appropriate, and conducts negotiations. The department chair keeps the search chair informed during the negotiation process. Upon acceptance of the offer, the dean follows up with an official letter which includes any special agreements reached during negotiations.
Departmental Policies

The policies described in this section, which are binding upon the department’s search committees, have been adopted by a majority vote of the tenure-track faculty and are amenable to change only via the same process.

Search committees should be constituted as early in the fall semester as possible. The department chair should consult with faculty in the area(s) appropriate to the search, and recruit committee members as appropriate. Within the constraints of the current membership of and competing service obligations within the department, each committee should consist of three to five members, all of whom should ideally be within the same broad subfield (CRES, Creative Writing, Linguistics, Literature), but not necessarily the same narrow specialty as the position itself. Ideally, a majority of the committee should be tenured, and a senior in-field committee member should be selected by the committee’s members, in consultation with the department chair, to be the committee’s chair. All members of the committee are equally enfranchised (one member, one vote). Committees should strive to achieve consensus when making decisions.

Members of the department who know themselves to have written or to have been asked to write a letter of recommendation for a candidate who has indicated that he/she will definitely apply for the position should decline to serve on the committee. Should a member of the committee discover that he/she has written a letter of recommendation in favor of one or more of those in the pool of applicants, that committee member should abstain from votes involving the recommended applicant or applicants.

Once the committee has been constituted, the job advertised, and the applications received, the search committee’s ultimate responsibilities are to narrow the field of applicants to the two or three to be invited to campus; to organize and facilitate those visits (working with the Chair and Administrative Specialist); and to construct a ranked list of candidates to be presented to the full department. All tenure-track job candidates should be required to submit a cover letter, CV, prospectus of research or creative activity, writing sample, and three or more letters of recommendation. The search committee should agree upon a method and a schedule for reviewing these materials, and plan to conduct in late December or early January whichever form of intensive interaction is appropriate to the broad subfield (e.g., traveling to the MLA convention for face-to-face conversations). If travel to MLA or a similar venue is required, members should commit themselves to making the trip. Based upon this intensive review stage, the committee should decide as quickly as possible which two or three candidates to invite to campus. The department chair should send a general email of invitation to each candidate, and then the search committee chair should contact the candidates individually and arrange their itineraries. All candidates should have as close to the same campus visit experience as possible, and should meet with as many constituencies within the department (faculty, graduate students, undergraduates, etc.) as practicable. All
members of all constituencies should be reminded to refrain from mentioning to a candidate any information about the search that does not immediately pertain to that candidate (this includes whether a given candidate is the first to be interviewed, where other candidates received their degrees, whether or not previous candidates experienced technical difficulties during their formal presentations, etc.). As soon as the campus visit candidates have been selected, each visitant’s complete application packet should be printed and gathered into a folder, placed in an accessible but secure location within the departmental office suite, and made available for review by all tenure-track faculty. The search chair should notify the faculty once this has been done, and should encourage all colleagues to review these materials. Campus visit itineraries and candidate CVs should be distributed to the full department, and everyone—including graduate and undergraduate students—should be encouraged to attend the candidates’ main job talks. After each visit, the search chair should solicit feedback from members of the broader department. Members should be asked to provide their feedback electronically, and should identify their bases for judgment (e.g., witnessed the job talk, visited with the candidate at lunch or dinner, reviewed all written materials, etc.).

The search committee should be entrusted with collecting, reviewing, and judiciously weighing all feedback, especially that from tenure-track colleagues, and then in crafting a ranked list of candidates. In a subsequent departmental meeting, held as soon as possible after the conclusion of campus visits, the search committee chair should present to the faculty a summary of the search process (how many applicants in total, how many applicants selected for in-depth screening, what sort of screening was employed and who conducted it, how many of those screened were deemed suitable for a campus visit, how many campus visits were conducted, what was the quantity and tenor of feedback received from all constituencies within the department), and an explanation for how the committee arrived at its prioritized hiring list. A motion from the floor supporting the list should be invited and seconded, and then a frank but civil discussion should occur. At the end of this discussion, which should be moderated by the search committee chair, an up or down vote on the recommended list should be taken. A majority vote of the tenure-track faculty present at the meeting is required to approve or reject the list; neither absentee nor proxy voting shall be permitted. If the list is rejected, then the search committee chair shall move that the position be offered to that candidate identified as first on the list; candidates shall be considered as acceptable to the committee of the whole individually in the order in which they appeared on the original list. If no candidate receives a majority vote, or if for reasons of time a vote cannot be taken, the search committee and the department chair shall consult together about how to proceed. In no event shall a decision about whom to hire be made without a majority vote of the tenure-track faculty in a departmental meeting. In the event that no offers are approved in the meeting where the committee’s list is presented, the committee and the department chair might wish to schedule another departmental meeting, or to bring further candidates to campus (a decision requiring the approval of the dean’s office); but the committee and the department chair may not offer the position to any candidate or cancel the search altogether without sanction from a majority of the tenure-track faculty present at a subsequent meeting or meetings. The diagram provided on the following page may be helpful for visualizing the process.
Committee proposes a list of candidates (A, B, C) →

List approved by a majority → an offer is made to candidate A (with candidates B and C preapproved to receive offers if needed) process complete (further votes required if candidates A, B, and C reject offer)

List rejected by a majority of votes → committee proposes a single candidate, A →

Candidate A approved by a majority → an offer is made to candidate A process complete (further votes required if candidate A rejects offer)

Candidate A rejected by a majority → committee proposes a single candidate, B →

Candidate B approved by a majority → an offer is made to candidate B process complete (further votes required if candidate B rejects offer)

Candidate B rejected by a majority → committee proposes a single candidate, C →

Candidate C approved by a majority → an offer is made to candidate C process complete (further votes required if candidate C rejects offer)

Candidate C rejected by a majority, or time expires without a vote being taken → committee consults with chair about how to proceed

**Instructors:**

Department Chair sends a hiring request (including rationale, position description, names of search committee, and ad) to the Dean; upon approval, a job listing is posted in appropriate printed and web venues. The Instructor Hiring Committee reviews applications and selects top candidates for personal or telephone interviews, then provides a ranked list of approved candidates to the Department Chair. The Department Chair, with the Dean’s permission, makes offers according to the number of positions available, including those which become available later in the spring or summer. The Instructor Search Committee typically includes the Department Chair, the Director of Composition, the Director of Undergraduate Studies, and the Director of Creative Writing.

**Part-time Instructors:**
Department Chair sends Teaching Request forms to current PTTIs prior to the end of the semester and maintains a file of PTTIs approved for renewed hiring. New hires are generated by regional or local newspaper ads which include a request for a letter of application, vita, and recommendations. In the absence of the Department Chair, the Director of Composition is empowered to make decisions regarding the hiring of PTTIs. Personnel files on hired PTTIs will be maintained in the English Department office for up to three years after the last contract.

**PROCEDURES FOR MEETINGS**

- Meeting dates, times and agendas will be published at least one week in advance.
- Committee members will receive the text of motions with the agenda at least 24 hours before the start of the meeting.
- There will be a two-minute time limit per person in response to motions.
- Civil discourse maintained at all times
- Those proposing motions to committees of which they are not members may speak to motion when it is introduced to committee; non-members will then leave before the committee votes
- Minutes will record attendance, motions, and results only, not discussion, and will be distributed to committee members with a copy to the department chair
- All standing committees must meet at least once per semester during the academic year.

**PROCEDURES FOR POLICY REFORM**

Policy reform begins during a review initiated by the appropriate standing committee or a review at the request of the department chair or dean. A proposal for policy change, upon approval by the standing committee, proceeds to the Executive Committee for review (and, if necessary, revision) before going before the department for a vote.

For example, a proposal for reform of the fast-track PhD admissions policy would begin in the Graduate Studies Committee, go on to the Executive Committee, and finally receive a binding vote at the department. The purpose of this procedure is to ensure that constituencies that may be affected by such a change have an opportunity to speak to the proposal well before a binding vote is imminent. Thus, while interim reviews of the proposal may result in a return of the proposal to its originating committee for reconsideration and possible revision, the procedure is not designed to prevent a proposal from reaching the department level for final discussion and a vote.10

---

10 We need to decide if there’s a limit to how many times a proposal can be returned, or if it can be voted down before reaching the department for a binding vote – also, if there are some policies that cannot be handled this way –
like the salary process, for instances, which is set by the college and university. Also, we need to decide on the appropriate procedure for reviewing and, if necessary, revising the governance document (one idea is to incorporate this review into the annual department retreat); at the very least, the committee agrees that all changes should be dated, and past versions of the governance document kept on file in 106.
APPENDICES:

Discursive Course Evaluation Form

Faculty Activity Report Form

Five Year Plan(s)

List of Department Accounts

Minimal Requirements of Academic Citizenship

Program Review Action Plan(s)

Teaching Request Forms

Tenure and Promotion Document

Travel Fund Request Form

Note: A, B, and C missing when I assumed the Chair position [WAU, 2007]
D. DEPARTMENT ACCOUNTS: fiscal year October 1 to September 30

**Operating Budget:** maintained by Assistant to Department Chair; approved by Department Chair

**Travel Budget:** maintained by Assistant to Department Chair; allocated to faculty annually, in the early fall; managed by Department Chair

**Composition:**

- **Otis William Bynum:** for composition/rhetoric lecture series; managed by Director of Composition
- **Composition Fund:** for travel and research by comp/rhet faculty and comp/rhet graduate students; managed by Director of Composition

**Creative Writing Scholarships, Awards, and Funds:**

- **Jerome K. Phipps:** for graduate student in creative writing; managed by Director of Creative Writing
- **Greer Marechal:** for a male undergraduate creative writing minor; managed by Director of Creative Writing
- **Truman Capote:** for four entering graduate students (one-time award), two residents of Alabama, two non-residents; managed by Director of Creative Writing
- **Michael Dalton Goodson:** undergraduate poetry award; managed by Director of Creative Writing
- **Don Hendrie Memorial:** undergraduate fiction award; managed by Director of Creative Writing
- **Barnwell Sellers:** for outstanding faculty teaching, preference given to creative writing faculty; managed by Department Chair and appointed committee
- **Creative Writing Fund:** for miscellaneous expenses; managed by Director of Creative Writing
- **Bankhead Endowment:** for visiting writers series; managed by Director of Creative Writing
- **Susie B. Duckworth:** for support of Black Warrior Review; managed by Director of Creative Writing
- **Coal Royalty Endowment:** for visiting professor of creative writing; managed by Director of Creative Writing

**Graduate Scholarships and Awards:**

- **Emerson Robert Loomis:** for graduate and undergraduate literature majors; managed by Director of Graduate Studies
- **Buford Boone Scholarship:** for graduate student; managed by Director of Graduate Studies
- **Buford Boone Fellowship:** graduate Teaching Fellow; managed by Director of Graduate Studies
• **Henry E. Jacobs:** graduate student travel fund; managed by Director of Graduate Studies

• **Mary Austin Locke:** graduate student travel fund; managed by Director of Graduate Studies

### Strode Funds:

- **Strode Endowment:** for graduate student fellowships and various expenses; managed by Director of Strode Program
- **Strode Professorship:** for visiting professor of Renaissance studies; managed by Director of Strode Program
- **Strode Maintenance Fund:** for upkeep of Strode House; managed by Director of Strode Program

### Undergraduate Scholarships and Awards:

- **Lee & Florence Black:** for undergraduate English or History major; managed by the Director of Undergraduate Studies
- **O.B. Emerson:** for undergraduate English major with interest in African-American or Southern literature; managed by the Director of Undergraduate Studies
- **William March Memorial:** for undergraduate English major; managed by Director of Undergraduate Studies
- **Prof. Brooks Forehand/Privett:** for incoming freshmen majoring in English; managed by Director of Undergraduate Studies
- **Mary Shiras Fitts Bennett:** alternates with Theatre; for graduate or undergraduate student in English; managed by Director of Undergraduate Studies
- **May Strickland:** for outstanding English major; managed by Director of Undergraduate Studies
- **I. Willis Russell Memorial:** for undergraduate English major; managed by Director of Undergraduate Studies
- **Norton Textra:** for minority undergraduate English major; managed by Director of Undergraduate Studies
- **Watkins Family:** for undergraduate English major, resident of Alabama; managed by Director of Undergraduate Studies

### Other Endowments and Funds:

- **May Strickland:** for instructional equipment; managed by Department Chair

---

E.) **Minimal Expectations for Academic Citizenship**

---

11 What about the Iris and Lily fund?
So that all faculty understand the obligations conferred on them by their membership in the Department of English at the University of Alabama, the Department offers this brief description of the minimal responsibilities of all faculty in addition to serving on departmental committees:

Responsible academic citizens . . .

- attend Department meetings regularly
- attend Area meetings (Lit, CW, CRES, Ling.) and do their share of Area work
- participate in searches (presentations, dinners, sends email reaction to search Chair)
- cooperate with advising procedures and do advising properly (use Degree Audit System)
- answer professional email promptly
- submit requested materials promptly (syllabi, UAOPS/assessment related materials, course descriptions, course and day/time teaching requests, etc.)
- complete Faculty Activity Reports thoroughly and accurately and publish them in a timely fashion
- follow graduate program guidelines when directing dissertations
- treat students, staff, and fellow faculty with courtesy and respect
- familiarize themselves with the Governance Document and Faculty handbook

Ancillary Materials:

APPROVED 3/25/09, revised 2012 (12/5/12)

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

1. IMPLEMENTATION

These guidelines are effective as of August 1, 2009. Tenure and promotion cases for those who joined the faculty before August 1, 2009 will be evaluated according to the guidelines which were in effect at the time of appointment. A copy of these guidelines will be furnished to each new member of the Department. These guidelines will be
reviewed by the faculty every six years to ensure they are in keeping with generally accepted criteria for tenure and promotion in the discipline.

2. INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL GUIDELINES

The Department recognizes that decisions regarding professional advancement are among the most important a faculty makes. Both probationary and tenured faculty members are entitled to clear guidance regarding the criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion, active departmental support for meeting those criteria, and assurance that all deliberations regarding these matters will kept in strict confidence.

Transactions involving retention, tenure, and promotion will be conducted in accordance with the relevant procedures set forth by the University’s Faculty Handbook, the College of Arts and Sciences’ College Manual, and the Departmental guidelines below.

A faculty member usually completes at least four years in rank before being considered for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor or from Associate Professor to Professor. Consequently, candidates normally do not apply for promotion before their fifth year in rank.

3. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

The Departmental criteria for tenure and promotion should be construed independently; that is, outstanding achievement in one area may not be considered a counterweight for inadequacy in another.

3.1. RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION

The standards for promotion to tenured rank are excellence of scholarly work and/or creative activity, and consistent and continuing publication. The tenured faculty assess the quality, quantity, and significance of the candidate’s body of work, keeping in mind the standards appropriate to the candidate’s particular sub-discipline. It is generally expected that during the candidate's time at the University, he or she will have published a book with, or had a book manuscript accepted for publication by, a well-regarded press with appropriate standards of peer review. (In some cases the major published or performed project may be other than a book.) Alternatively, a candidate may demonstrate substantial progress toward the completion of a published book as evidenced by submission of a completed book manuscript to a well-regarded press, or by significant peer-reviewed journal publications and a pre-publication prospectus which includes 1) a project narrative describing the work's argument, its intended audience, its expected length, and its contribution to the field; 2) an annotated table of contents including the contents and completion status of each chapter, including whether or not a version of the chapter has already been published in article form; and 3) a complete draft of the proposed book project's critical introduction. The tenured faculty also assess the quality, quantity, and significance of the candidate’s ongoing work, and his or her potential for future achievement. The Department acknowledges that different publication profiles may be appropriate in different cases, and that no uniform set of guidelines is possible.
3.2. TEACHING

The Department places great emphasis on the importance of effective teaching. The successful candidate for tenure will have demonstrated excellence in undergraduate and graduate teaching throughout the probationary period. A candidate’s success in teaching will be assessed by review of, at minimum, the Department’s discursive student evaluation forms, the College of Arts and Sciences’ computer-graded evaluation forms, and the candidate’s syllabi. Candidates should include all these materials, for every class they have taught, in their dossiers.

The Department will also consider additional evidence of success in teaching, such as thesis and dissertation direction, reading of dissertations and theses, innovations in teaching and curriculum development, academic advising, mentoring of students and student groups, letters from senior colleagues who have seen the candidate teach, or any other information the candidate deems relevant and useful.

3.3. SERVICE

The Department advises non-tenured faculty to limit their service activities until they are established as scholars and teachers, and will not interpret limited service as a fault. At the same time, the Department expects the candidate to have been a responsible departmental citizen, and to provide some evidence of his or her commitment to service. The Department also expects that whatever service does appear in the candidate’s record will have been effectively and conscientiously carried out.

4. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

4.1. PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
The criteria for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor are identical to the criteria for tenure described above.

4.2. PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR
Successful candidates for Professor will have achieved a national or international reputation based on distinguished work, normally including two published books (at least one since promotion to Associate Professor). In some cases, the Department may recommend promotion to Professor on the basis of one important and well-received book and a substantial body of articles or creative works.

Successful candidates for Professor will have demonstrated outstanding teaching and significant involvement in the Department's undergraduate and graduate programs, including but not limited to directing theses and serving on degree committees. Successful candidates for Professor will have participated consistently in professional life, providing effective and conscientious service to the Department, College, and/or University, and/or to the national or international academic community, and/or to the local community, state, or nation.
5. PROCEDURES GOVERNING TENURE CASES

5.1. NOTIFICATION

Faculty members who wish to be considered for tenure should inform the Department chair of that intention by March 1 in the year in which the decision-making process is to be initiated.

5.2. OUTSIDE REVIEWERS

The candidate should provide a list of eight to ten experts in his or her field to the Department chair by March 1 of the year of application. The Department chair must request evaluating statements from at least two of those persons suggested by the candidate, but the chair is not limited to names furnished by the candidate. Should one or both of the candidate’s suggested reviewers not respond, the chair is not required to seek out other letters from the candidate’s list to be part of the final minimum of four.

External letters of review must address a specific tenure and/or promotion case and be dated no earlier than January 1 of the year of a candidate’s application. Reviewers must be at or above the rank being applied for by the candidate. Reviewers are expected to be a scholar or creative expert in the candidate’s field. The candidate should suggest possible reviewers from a variety of institutions excluding where the candidate received his/her terminal degree. In no case should the reviewer have participated in the degree evaluation of the candidate. The Department chair and the candidate’s senior colleagues may suggest potential reviewers. The candidate will meet with the chair to review all possible reviewers. The candidate may appeal to the chair not to consider some of the potential reviewers. The chair and the candidate should confer and together select appropriate materials to be sent to the reviewers.

Confidential letters of review have the greatest impact. Confidentiality of external reviews is an issue to be decided by the candidate. A candidate’s choice to waive or not to waive the right to view external letters must be documented in the dossier with a letter initiated by the Department chair and signed by the candidate. The waiver of rights to review letters is irrevocable and precludes the candidate from seeing any portion of the letters. All external reviewers must be informed by the chair as to whether their letters will be confidential.

5.3. DOSSIER

In all cases, the candidate is responsible for presenting a complete dossier for consideration. The Department chair is responsible for ensuring that the candidate has clear and timely guidance as to how and when this dossier should be assembled and submitted. External letters will be added to the dossier by the Department chair. The dossier will be available for inspection by all faculty entitled to vote on the candidate’s case for a minimum of two weeks prior to the faculty meeting when the case will be
The dossier will be available at a central and secure location.

5.4. FACULTY EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION
The Department chair, in consultation with the candidate, will choose a tenured faculty member to present the candidate's case to the faculty. All tenured faculty will be invited to attend this presentation. Absentee ballots may be submitted to the Department chair prior to the meeting by tenured faculty members unable to attend the meeting. The presenter will be given approximately twenty minutes to present the candidate’s dossier. After this presentation, the presenter will yield the floor to the Department chair, who will preside over a discussion period of approximately twenty minutes, and then administer an official vote by secret ballot. The Department chair will not participate in the discussion or vote. Following the immediate announcement of the official vote by the Department chair, the presenter will distribute copies of a written report that might constitute a basis for the faculty recommendation. The faculty will then propose and discuss potential changes to this document. Following this discussion, the meeting will adjourn. Within seven days, the presenter will produce a recommendation which records the numerical vote of the faculty and argues the majority opinion. The final version of the recommendation must be signed by all voting faculty members before it becomes a part of the candidate’s file.

5.5. DEPARTMENT CHAIR EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION
The Department chair will make a separate recommendation to the dean and will write a narrative justifying his/her recommendation. The recommendations of the faculty and the Department chair will be forwarded to the dean’s office according to the schedule set by the College.

5.6. CANDIDATE OPPORTUNITY FOR RESPONSE
The chair will provide the candidate with copies of the faculty and chair recommendations. The candidate may provide explanatory and/or rebuttal statement(s). Any such statement becomes part of the dossier.

6. PROCEDURES GOVERNING PROMOTION CASES
The promotion process will follow the same procedures outlined in the Procedures Governing Tenure Cases section above, except that the candidate’s dossier will be reviewed, discussed, and voted upon by tenured faculty members at or above the rank to which the candidate wishes to be promoted.
Retention Review Committee

The Retention Review Committee will consist of not more than six tenured faculty members. The Department chair will not serve as a member of this committee. The committee will be elected by vote of the faculty, and will choose its own chair. At least one member of each year’s committee will be asked to serve a second year, normally in the capacity of chair. The committee may invite up to two additional English faculty members to serve in an *ex officio* capacity as resource persons for better assessment of each individual’s progress.

*The purpose of the Retention Review Committee in the English Department is to provide annual reviews of progress for untenured faculty members with the goal of mentoring the junior faculty in establishing a consistent and continuing research agenda indicating a promising scholarly trajectory beyond tenure, as well as guidance in developing excellence in teaching skills.*

The committee acts as a resource and advocate for all untenured faculty members, and seeks to ensure that all junior faculty are kept well-informed of all aspects of the retention, tenure, and promotion processes. Untenured faculty should seek out members of the committee at any time with any questions they may have pertaining to those processes.

The committee will administer annual reviews of the professional progress exhibited by each non-tenured faculty member. The review and recommendation will be based on the dossier submitted by the person under review.

For each person reviewed, the committee will prepare a written statement evaluating current strengths and weaknesses, with suggestions for improvement as necessary, and recommending retention or non-retention. These written statements will explain in detail any shortcomings the candidate must address before tenure can be recommended.

The annual review of non-tenured faculty is normally held in late September or early October. Reviews of first-year members of the Department are held in January of their initial year of appointment.
Approved during 2009-2010 academic year:

M.A. Comps Committee:

The M.A. Comps Committee oversees the annual administration of the M.A. Comprehensive Examination, which serves as the capstone experience in the graduate program and final proof of qualification for the M.A. degree for M.A.-Lit students. In accordance with the M.A. Comprehensive Examination Guidelines, the Committee receives and reviews students’ examination questions and answers, ultimately awarding each student a grade of Distinction, Pass, or Fail. Membership: three members appointed by the Chair from the department’s graduate faculty, always including one member from the previous year and one tenured member (these two members might or might not be the same person); additionally, every member of the committee will have taught at least one UA English graduate course; membership on this Committee rotates among all graduate faculty members and is a responsibility conferred by graduate faculty membership.


8-YEAR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW (Form 3)
http://graduate.ua.edu/apr/formmain.html

**Directions:** The information requested on this form is essential for academic program review. Responses should be entered in the space underneath the blue question box, not inside of it.

*Refer to the OIRA Academic Program Review (APR) report which includes information about Degree Designations and Titles, Credit Hour Production, Courses and Sections, Number of Undergraduate Students, Degrees, ACT & SAT scores, GPA, and Letter Grades.*

---

**1. Requirements**

Describe the general **requirements** for each undergraduate major in your department and attach a typical **program of study** for each of the degree programs (majors) in your department.

Please see **Attachment 1 for the English Major Requirements**, and **Attachment 2 for a Typical Program of Study**.

---

**2. Changes (Credit Hours)**

Describe any anticipated **changes** in undergraduate semester **credit hour production** in your department for the next 3 years and discuss the reasons for anticipated changes. (Refer to Table 5 of the OIRA APR Report for Credit Hour Production information.)

As can be seen in Table 5, we have experienced significant growth since the past Program Review, which has led to increased credit hour production. As an important service department for the university, we will have to respond to whatever decisions are made about increasing enrollment.
3. Changes (Students)

Describe any anticipated changes in the number of undergraduate students in specific majors in your department for the next 3 years and discuss the reasons for anticipated changes. (Refer to Tables 2, 3, and 4 of the OIRA APR Report for Enrollment, Degrees Awarded, and Course Level and Section.)

We continue to attract English majors in a way that appears to be congruent with overall undergraduate enrollment increases. We have been working on ways to highlight the important perspectives and skills that English majors bring to any career. The dean has selected us this year to fund a video advertising the English Department and the value of an English major, so perhaps we will attract more majors as a consequence.

4. Curriculum Reviews

Describe the department’s process for regular reviews of the undergraduate curriculum. Summarize the primary actions taken as a result of undergraduate curriculum reviews since the last OAA program review.

The Undergraduate Studies Committee in the English Department is charged with overseeing the curriculum for the English major and minor. Questions, queries, proposals are brought before the members of this committee where they are vetted and discussed. If a change of any sort is deemed worthy, it will then be forwarded to the Department as a whole for further discussion and a vote.

The most significant changes to the undergraduate curriculum have been:

(1) All proposals for new courses are received, discussed, and voted on by members of the Undergraduate Studies Committee. If the vote is positive, the Committee’s recommendation is then forwarded to the faculty as a whole for a vote either approving or disapproving the Undergraduate Studies Committee’s recommendation. The most recent addition to the undergraduate curriculum is EN 317. This course was deemed a worthy addition because it is designed to help undergraduate English majors develop the skills they will need as writing tutors, helping them to be more effective in their work at the University’s Writing Center.

(2) The English Honors Program has also been reformulated recently. The offerings at the 200-level have remained unchanged, but the program was revamped to allow for a 300-level offering (EN 399) and a requirement added for a senior thesis (EN 499) to be completed...
under the direction of a member of the tenured or tenure-track faculty. These reforms broadened the program significantly because the changes allow for fuller participation in our departmental honors by those students whose primary interest are in creative writing.

(3) The rules and regulations surrounding our Directed Readings and Directed Studies courses (EN 329 and EN 429) had been vague and relaxed. They have been tightened. An application must now be made that must include a topic or theme, a list of the reading(s), a syllabus that indicates exactly when the reading(s) are to be accomplished, a description of the written work that is to be required, and finally a statement of how the student's work is to be evaluated by the faculty sponsor who then makes a recommendation to the Director of Undergraduate Studies.

(4) The English Internship (EN 430) has also recently been restructured. It is now made clear that internships for English majors, such as editorial work with a magazine or a press or work with the public defender's office, require student initiative. It is now up to the student to identify an agency that is willing to sponsor an internship. The student must then prepare an application. That application is to make clear how the proposed internship would develop or improving the skills expected of an English major. There should also be an outline of just what the intern will be doing on the job a week-by-week basis. The student must also identify whoever is going to serve as the intern's direct supervisor and provide appropriate contact information. Finally, there should be a statement of how the student's work is to be evaluated. For instance, what is to be the penalty if absenteeism should become a problem? We are currently piloting an internship with West Alabama Literacy Council entitled "Literacies Old and New."

(5) The Creative Writing Minor was restructured.

The old CW minor, consisting of 5 courses or 15 hours, looked like this:
EN 200
EN 301, 303, and 308
EN 401 or 403

The new CW minor, consisting of 6 courses or 18 hours, looks like this:
EN 200
EN 301 and 303
EN 408 (a special topics course with very widely varying topics) taken 3 times.

The old CW minor was based on two traditional assumptions: that the two primary genres of creative writing study are poetry and fiction, and that the primary mode of instruction is "the workshop." Thus, after a poetry/fiction mixed introduction (EN 200), the students proceeded on to take two 300-level workshops, one in poetry and one in fiction, a special topics course at the 300-level (EN 308), and then their choice of a 400-level workshop in either fiction or poetry (EN 401 or 403), which presumed that, as seniors, they had decided to specialize in one of these two genres.

The problems with this system were several:
1. Students could take all the 300-level courses at once. Hence, a 308 “special topics” course having to do with poetry would have some students with prior preparation and some without. This made for difficulty in teaching the “topics” courses.

2. The time-worn division of the field of creative writing into poetry and fiction was dated. Creative non-fiction had become a burgeoning genre in the discipline that needed to be included (EN 301 was changed from “fiction” to “prose” that now includes CNF) and, even more profound, the field of creative writing had become far less genre-defined overall, with many contemporary writers blurring genre boundaries, combining genres, or writing seriously in more than one genre.

3. The CW faculty wanted to make the minor more rigorous by increasing it from 15 to 18 hours.

4. The special topics courses, then a single course in each student’s minor curriculum taken at the 300 level (EN 308), were proving to be the most exciting, innovative, rigorous, and stimulating courses in the curriculum. These “hybrid” courses included a great deal of literature and an abundance of lively pedagogical approaches, and the flexibility of the special topics designation allowed for an enormous range of subject matter to enter the curriculum, drawing directly on the research and creative activity passions of the faculty. The CW faculty decided to capitalize on the success and popularity of these special topics courses. The special topics designation was promoted to the 400 level, so that students, having already prepared themselves by taking the prerequisites of EN 200, 301 and 303, are now required to take the new EN 408 special topics course three times. in the new curriculum.

The new CW minor provides more courses, a more coordinated sequence, a more inclusive and flexible approach to genre, and a constantly re-invigorated and thorough-going offering of special topics courses. The changes to the minor have been very well received by both students and faculty.

(6) The Composition Committee and the First-year Writing Program Director and administrative staff conduct informal curriculum reviews every year. Some of that work takes place in the FWP Textbook Committee, which looks at newly available materials twice yearly, in the fall and spring semesters. Some of that review takes place also in the Curriculum Subcommittee of the Composition Committee, which annually reviews and tweaks the EN 101 and EN 102 curriculum taught by the GTAs who are teaching for the first time. These informal annual reviews take into consideration feedback from the previous year (both teacher and student feedback), new theoretical and pedagogical information gleaned from attendance at national conferences (primarily CCCC and WPA), and newly available texts and software.

Since the last OAA program review in 2005, the First-year Writing Program has made several important changes in the 100-level composition curriculum. The first major change took place in 2007-2008, with the creation of a set of program goals, objectives, and outcomes. This allowed for the next major change, in fall 2008, when the program adopted a common text to be used by all the GTAs teaching for the first time. This also led to the development of a common syllabus for EN 101 and EN 102 with common assignments and detailed guidelines for the development of those assignments, allowing the FWP staff to better mentor and guide our newest teachers at the same time as providing more consistency between sections of our 100-level courses and for more targeted focus on our learning outcomes. Our current common rhetoric text for EN 101 and EN 102 has a Writing-across-the-Curriculum (WAC) focus; this text is paired with a required writing handbook, customized for our program, to better inform
students of our program’s learning outcomes, to provide them with important local information, and to insure consistency in instruction on the conventions of composing. We have also revised our online course offerings to match our on-campus curriculum. In addition, we advocate the pedagogical use of TurnItIn.com, to allow students to receive originality reports at the draft stage in the writing process so that they can ask for help to avoid plagiarism before final papers are due for grading. In the 2013-2014 academic year, we are piloting a self-paced online personalized learning plan in both our online and on-campus courses, to assist students with surface-level writing problems (such as grammar, mechanics, usage, and sentence structure).

Our EN 102 courses are now themed, to allow students to self-select into one of five “problem-solving” content areas that most appeals to them (Advancing Mind and Body, Sustaining Planet Earth, Imagining the 22nd Century, Engaging Southern Culture and Diversity, and Enterprising America and the World). Another curriculum development affects our EN 103 courses. While we continue to offer regular proposal-driven themed EN 103 (advanced or honors) courses, we now also collaborate with the Honors College to offer a large number of linked EN 103 sections each fall. These sections have a common theme and incorporate common readings, allowing Honors College students to have a similar EN 103 experience, no matter which section they take, and extending learning opportunities because these students can participate in fruitful discussions across sections and beyond the classroom. With funding help from Housing and the Honors College, we are also able to bring guest speakers or speaker panels to campus and to hold a yearly film festival featuring films related to the common theme and with student-led discussion for students in these collaborative EN 103/Honors College sections. Previous themes have been Language (2008, with guest speak Shirley Brice Heath and a film series), Place and Culinary Culture (2009, with guest speaker Frank Stitt, a speakers panel related to the local foods movement, and a film series), Unusual Places (2010, with guest speaker Ted Conover and a film series), The Story of Stuff (2011, with a speakers panel and film series), Monsters (2012, with guest speaker Josh Neufeld and a film series), and Authenticity (2013, with a film series). In addition to this collaboration with the Honors College, we continue to work closely with the College of Arts and Sciences on their Freshman Learning Community initiative and with new Living Learning Communities (currently including the Blount Undergraduate Initiative, Parker Adams, the Arts, Nursing, and Business). In conjunction with these specialized courses, we also developed an annual Writing Fair in fall 2007, which allows students in our Parker Adams LLCs to publicly showcase researched visual arguments created around their EN 102 course theme.
UNDERGRADUATE INFORMATION

ATTACHMENTS

1. Attachment 1, English Major Requirements
2. Attachment 2, Typical Program of Study for English Majors or Suggested Sequence
The English Major Requirements
2012-2013 Catalog
36 hours of EN courses

6 hours in 100-level \textbf{COMPOSITION} courses:
- \textit{EN} 101 English Composition
- \textit{EN} 102 English Composition

**OR**
- \textit{EN} 103 Adv. EN Comp
- \textit{EN} 104 Blunt Composition

9 hours in 200-level \textbf{LITERATURE} courses:
- \textit{EN} 205 English Lit I (REQUIRED)

12 TOTAL hours in 200-level \textbf{LITERATURE} courses:
- \textit{EN} 206 English Lit II
- \textit{EN} 207 World Lit I
- \textit{EN} 208 World Lit II
- \textit{EN} 249 African-American Lit (may be crosslisted)

6 hours in 300-level \textbf{ELECTIVES} (any 300 course counts)
- \textit{EN} 330 Intro to English Studies
- \textit{EN} 331 Technical EN
- \textit{EN} 332 16th CE. Lit
- \textit{EN} 333 Shakespeare
- \textit{EN} 334 17th CE. Lit
- \textit{EN} 335 Milton
- \textit{EN} 336 Comedy
- \textit{EN} 337 Tragedy
- \textit{EN} 338 18th CE. Lit
- \textit{EN} 339 Victorian Lit
- \textit{EN} 340 Am. Lit to 1900
- \textit{EN} 341 Am. Poetry to 1900
- \textit{EN} 342 Am. Fiction to 1900
- \textit{EN} 343 Brit. Fiction to 1900
- \textit{EN} 344 Major Authors
- \textit{EN} 345 Nonfiction in EN, 1660-1900
- \textit{EN} 346 Drama, 1660-1900
- \textit{EN} 347 EN Lit During the Enlightenment
- \textit{EN} 348 Romantic Lit
- \textit{EN} 349 Victorian Lit

Note: \textbf{EN} 200 & \textbf{EN} 430 are not applicable to EN major req.
\textbf{EN} 408 & \textbf{EN} 430 do not comply with the core Writing (W)

3 hours in 300-level \textbf{THEORY, WRITING, or LINGUISTIC} course
- \textit{EN} 300 Intro to English Studies
- \textit{EN} 301 Fiction Writing
- \textit{EN} 302 Poetry Writing
- \textit{EN} 303 Advanced Expository Writing
- \textit{EN} 304 Writing Special Topics

3 hours in a 300-level course covering \textbf{EARLY LITERATURE TO 1700}
- \textit{EN} 310 Writing Special Topics

3 hours in a 300-level course covering \textbf{EIGHTEENTH-AND NINETEENTH-CENTURY LITERATURE}
- \textit{EN} 320 Intro to Linguistics
- \textit{EN} 321 Linguistic Approaches

4 semesters or equivalent proficiency in one \textbf{FOREIGN LANGUAGE}
- **Evidence of a 202-level proficiency**
- **Computer science does not fulfill this requirement**

- 101
- 201

[3 Credits in \textit{ARB} 202 or \textit{CHI} 202 or \textit{CRL} 202 or \textit{CROA} 202 or \textit{CZE} 202 or \textit{DUT} 202 or \textit{FR} 202 or \textit{GN} 202 or \textit{GR} 202 or \textit{HEB} 202 or \textit{INDO} 202 or \textit{IT} 202 or \textit{JA} 202 or \textit{KOR} 202 or \textit{LA} 202 or \textit{MDGR} 202 or \textit{POR} 202 or \textit{RUS} 202 or \textit{SP} 202 or \textit{SWA} 202 or \textit{SWED} 202 or \textit{THAI} 202 or \textit{TURK} 202 or \textit{VIET} 202]
Major Requirements

The major in English requires 36 hours of EN courses:

- 12 hours in 200-level courses: EN 205 and three courses chosen from among EN 206, EN 207, EN 208, EN 209, EN 210, or EN 249 (or honors equivalents)
- 3 hours in a 300- or 400-level theory, writing, or linguistics course
- 3 hours in a 300-level course covering Early Literature to 1700
- 3 hours in a 300-level course covering Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Literature
- 9 hours in 400-level courses
- 6 hours in 300-level electives
- 4 semesters or equivalent proficiency in one foreign language is also required

Suggested Sequence of Courses for the English Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRESHMAN YEAR</th>
<th>First Semester</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Second Semester</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN 101</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EN 102</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH(^3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>History(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural science</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Natural science</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language</td>
<td></td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Fine arts(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foreign language</td>
<td></td>
<td>3–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOPHOMORE YEAR</th>
<th>First Semester</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Second Semester</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN 205</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EN 300</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN 206, EN 209 or EN 210</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300-level English: Area I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foreign language</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and behavioral sciences(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Social and behavioral sciences(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### JUNIOR YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Semester</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Second Semester</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>Course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor or elective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor or elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-level English: Area 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>English theory, writing, or linguistics course above 299</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-level English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>English elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History or social and behavioral sciences¹</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

------

15

### SENIOR YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Semester</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Second Semester</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>Course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English elective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EN 400 or EN 499</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English elective above 399</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>English elective above 399</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>3⁵</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

------

15

**Total: At least 120⁺**

- ¹A maximum of 6 hours in any one department may be applied to the humanities, literature, and fine arts (HU, L, FA) and history and social and behavioral sciences (HI, SB) requirements.
- ²Six hours in courses designated W must be included in the junior or senior year. A minimum of 36 hours in 300- and 400-level courses must be completed on this campus (33 for students entering after Fall 2000 but before Fall 2002), including 12 hours in the major and 6 hours in the minor.
- ³MATH course number is determined by placement. MATH 110 or higher is required.
- ⁴For students entering after Fall 2000 but before Fall 2002, an added 3 hours of electives is suggested.
- ⁵For students entering after Fall 2000 but before Fall 2002, the suggestion is 6 hours of electives.
GRADUATE INFORMATION
1. Requirements and Program of Study

Describe the general requirements for each graduate degree program in your department and attach a typical program of study for each of the graduate programs.

Everything can be seen on our website in the section devoted to graduate programs at http://english.as.ua/grad

We have a general M.A. degree that can be done in literature (and within that with a focus on the Renaissance with the Strode Program), or in CRES (composition/rhetoric). We also have an M.F.A Program. In addition, we have the strangely-named MA in ESL (English as a Second Language). This last program was set up in the mid-1980s to move the department into the international arena by offering preparation in teaching English as a Second Language to adults (with supervised teaching experience both in a university freshman writing program and also in an intensive language institute that is part of the University of Alabama). We are currently working on changing the name of the degree.

Copied in below is relevant material from the website. Attachments show typical programs of study as relevant. Attachment 1 is an MA advising sheet that we have created that can be used by all of the MA programs and shows the progression of the degree (in either the thesis
or non-thesis option). Both student and advisor have a copy of this form and both track with it. This constitutes a typical program of study for the Lit/CRES M.A. The M.F.A. program does not have a “typical program of study” because students normally spend four years in the program and have many options. **Attachment 2 is the typical program of study for the MA-TESOL/Applied Linguistics degree**, which requires a particular sequence of courses.

For the Ph.D degree, the general requirements are pasted below after the M.A. requirements. **Attachment 3 is proposed Ph.D. timeline** that students follow with their graduate advisors. **Attachment 4 is our current Ph.D. Advising Sheet** that we created to try to demystify the long process of earning a doctorate and to keep students on track.

### MA Literature Program Requirements

**Degree Requirements | Thesis Options | Languages | Comprehensive Exams**

#### Degree Requirements

With the exception of students admitted into the master's program to pursue a concentration in Renaissance studies, all candidates for the master's degree are required to take the following:

- 3 hours in bibliography and research (EN 537 Introduction to Graduate Studies, which is normally offered every fall and which students are encouraged to take in their first semester, for maximum benefit);
- 3 hours of critical theory (EN 535 Literary Criticism, EN 536 Advanced Modern Criticism, or EN 635 Seminar in Literary Criticism);
- 3 hours of teaching practicums (students with teaching assistantships take the summer practicum, EN 533, and EN 534, for a combined three hours of pass/fail credit); and
- Students not writing the thesis (Plan II) will take 6 credits of electives to acquire the 30 credits for completion. Students writing a thesis (Plan I) will take 6 thesis hours.

[Top of Page]

#### Thesis Options
Plan I (thesis plan) students must complete at least 24 semester hours of coursework in English before writing the thesis, which must be a historical, critical, or otherwise analytical treatise. Thesis-plan students must take 6 semester hours of thesis research (EN 599) in addition to their 24 hours of coursework for a total of 30 hours. At least three of these courses must be at the 600 level. (See the general requirements for a master's thesis listed under "Academic Policies" in this catalog. For additional information regarding the master's thesis in English, contact the director of graduate studies in the English department.)

Plan II (nonthesis plan) students must take at least 30 semester hours of coursework in English. At least three of these courses must be at the 600 level. See the course requirements for all master's students cited above.

**Foreign Language Requirement**

A reading knowledge of one foreign language is required. The foreign language requirement may be satisfied by one of the following: (a) the certification through the appropriate department of a "B" average or the equivalent of two years of undergraduate- or graduate-level study in a single foreign language, completed within five years of admission to the master's program; or (b) passing the foreign language reading examination prepared by the Department of Modern Languages and Classics. Students who are not native speakers of English may use their native language to fulfill this requirement.

**MA Strode Program Requirements**

We offer an MA in English Literature with a special concentration in Shakespeare and the Renaissance. This program gives students the opportunity to take advantage of the resources of the Strode Program within the context of a two-year degree.
The MA requires thirty hours of graduate coursework; fifteen of those hours are required courses in the Renaissance, including:

- Shakespeare
- Shakespeare in Performance Practicum (team-taught by a member of the Strode Committee and a professor in the Theatre Department)
- Renaissance Drama; or Sixteenth-Century Poetry and Prose
- The Strode Seminar
- One interdisciplinary graduate course, approved by the Strode Committee, in the Departments of History, Theatre, Modern Languages, Classics, Music, Religion, or Art History

The remainder of the coursework includes Introduction to Graduate Study, a course in Critical Theory, at least one course in medieval literature, and a teaching practicum.

All other requirements for the MA Strode program are the same as those for the MA Literature program.

**MA CRES Program Requirements**

The Master's concentration in CRES requires the following distribution of courses for a total of 30-32 hours. Students are required to take at least 15 hours in 600-level courses.

- 6 hours in CORE English requirements
  - 3 hours in EN 537: Introduction to Graduate Studies (Research & Bibliography)
  - 3 hours in EN 538: Research and Critical Prose (generally taken in the fourth semester to satisfy the Master's graduate requirement)
- 9 hours in CRES requirements
  - 3 hours in EN 532: Approaches to Teaching Composition
  - 3 hours in history of composition-rhetoric (either EN 638: History of
Composition Rhetoric, Part I, or EN 658: History of Rhetoric, Part II)

- 3 hours in EN 512: Computers and Composition
- 3 hours in linguistics (EN 620: Introduction to Linguistics or other)
- 12 hours in approved general electives
  - These courses may include CRES electives or courses in literature, linguistics, creative writing, or interdisciplinary fields related to English Studies.
- 4 hours in teaching practicum (for teaching assistants)
  - 2 hours in EN 533: Teaching English 101
  - 2 hours in EN 534: Teaching English 102

A student writing a thesis (Plan I) will take 6 thesis hours (EN 599) and in consultation with the field advisor, drop 6 hours of coursework from his or her concentration. A student not writing a thesis (Plan II) will satisfy the graduation requirement by completing EN 538 with an oral defense of a paper generated in that course (See Exams).

**MA-TESOL Program Information**

**Degree Requirements**

Students will be required to complete 30 semester hours for the degree: 21 hours of required courses and 9 hours of department-approved electives; for students who choose the thesis option, 6 of the elective hours will be of thesis research.

Students who choose the non-thesis option will be required to pass a comprehensive examination towards the end of their coursework; the examination is normally given once a year, in late February. The examination will cover all the major areas of study, including Second Language Development, Linguistics, and Language Teaching Methodology.

An optional thesis may be written under the guidance of the Applied Linguistics/TESOL
To earn the degree, native speakers of English must demonstrate proficiency in a second language; consult the program coordinator for further information. Students whose native language is not English must demonstrate satisfactory proficiency in spoken and written English.

Coursework

30 credits are required for completion of the degree (7 required courses and 3 electives; for students who choose the thesis option, 2 of the elective courses will be thesis hours).

Required

(Please see the suggested sequence of courses below in Time Lines)

- 3 cr. EN 524 English Structure and Usage
- 6 cr. EN 610 TESOL Theory and Methods
- 3 cr. EN 613 Second Language Development
- 3 cr. EN 617 Teaching Academic Writing to Non-native English Speakers
- 3 cr. EN 620 Introduction to Linguistics

Students writing a thesis will take 6 thesis hours (EN 599). Students not writing a thesis will take nine credits of electives to acquire the 30 credits needed for completion. Electives are to be chosen in consultation with the coordinator from available courses, typically in the following departments or colleges: English, Education, Anthropology, Romance Languages and Classics. Directed studies are also an option.

Students on an assistantship as a co-teacher for EN 120 or EN 121 are required to take EN 617 in the fall. In all subsequent semesters of a teaching assistantship involving EN 120 or EN 121, MA-Applied Linguistics/TESOL students are required to attend a weekly meeting, day
MFA Program Requirements

The Program in Creative Writing at the University of Alabama offers a lively and innovative 48-hour course of study culminating in the MFA degree.

The MFA thesis and its oral defense are required of all degree candidates. While this final project usually consists of a book-length manuscript, theses that are not strictly print-based may also be submitted. Thesis projects are prepared under direction of a thesis adviser.

Candidates for the MFA are examined on their final projects by a committee of four faculty members.

Students in the program in creative writing give a presentation of a significant portion of their own written work produced while in residence. In this public reading/performance, the student exhibits his or her work before an audience of peers, faculty, and the general public. Our MFA student reading series tends to be a lively, standing-room-only event. The introductions themselves are always an unexpected verbal, visual or theatrical event!

Candidates for the MFA degree are required to spend a minimum of two semesters in residence and to complete 48 hours of graduate-level coursework, divided as follows. Half of all coursework must be at the 600 level.

24 hours in graduate-level writing workshops and forms courses [3 hours each]. These courses may be repeated for credit. All MFA students are welcome to take any of these courses:

- EN 601 Fiction Workshop
- EN 603 Poetry Workshop
- EN 605 Nonfiction Workshop
- EN 608 Forms of Writing. These courses examine traditional and contemporary practice. Students read primary works and theory, and respond with their own creative

- 3 hours in EN 609: Writers at Work: Form. Theory. Practice. [1 hour each] This short course examines a specialized topic of interest to creative writers. May be repeated for credit. This course is often taught by visiting writers. Sample topics include: Profession of Authorship, Teaching Creative Writing, Magazine Scene, Public Poetry, Writing Internship, Publishing: A Brief History, Poetry & Performance.

- 12 hours in literature, criticism, or linguistics courses [3 hours each] in the Department of English at the 500 or 600 level.

- 3 hours in any elective course at the 500 or 600 level [3 hours each] in English, a foreign language or literature, The Program in Book Arts, Women's Studies, American Studies, or any other department in the university).

- 6 hours in EN 599 (thesis preparation).

**PhD Literature Program Requirements**

Courses | Languages | Preliminary Exams | Dissertation | Teaching

**Courses**

There is a minimum requirement of 30 hours beyond the master's degree (earned here or elsewhere), of which no more than 15 hours can be at the 500 level. To meet University requirements, doctoral students must have 48 credit hours. This means that 18 credit hours earned at the master's level must be formally transferred and applied to the requirements for the doctoral degree. Only credit earned during the six-year period preceding admission to the doctoral program may be considered for transfer. If a student's master's degree is more than six
years old at admission, therefore, that student may have to complete up to 18 additional hours of coursework. Doctoral students whose work at the master's level does not meet the course distribution requirements of the department's MA program may be required to complete those distribution requirements with courses taken toward the PhD in addition to coursework.

Twenty-four hours of dissertation research is required.

To be formally admitted to candidacy for the PhD degree, all students must receive a pass in EN 637, Workshop in Academic Writing, which will normally be taken in the final year of coursework.

Languages

The foreign language requirement may be satisfied by one of the following options:

- **A reading knowledge of two foreign languages**: This reading knowledge can be demonstrated by either of the following: (a) the certification of at least a "B" average or the equivalent in two years of study of a single foreign language completed, as either an undergraduate or graduate student, within five years of admission to the PhD program; or (b) passing the foreign language reading examination prepared by the Department of Modern Languages and Classics. The language used to satisfy the MA language requirement — whether gained here or at another school — can satisfy one of the languages required for the PhD program. Students who are not native speakers of English may use their native language as one of the two required languages.

- **Advanced proficiency in one foreign language**: Advanced proficiency can be demonstrated by (a) an undergraduate major in the language completed within five years of admission to the PhD program; (b) the certification of at least a "B" in two advanced literature courses (400-level or higher) taught in the foreign language.
Students who are not native speakers of English may use their native language to fulfill this requirement.

**Preliminary Exams**

After finishing coursework, the student must be formally admitted to candidacy for the degree. To meet this requirement, each student must pass a written preliminary examination, and engage with his or her dissertation committee in a one-hour conference concerning the dissertation prospectus. The written preliminary examination will be given at a date agreed upon by the student and his or her examination committee in consultation with the director of graduate studies. The oral conference concerning the dissertation prospectus can be scheduled after the student passes the written examination, when the student and dissertation director agree that the prospectus is ready (date to be arranged by the student in consultation with the graduate studies director and the dissertation committee). The examination and conference will be governed by the following guidelines:

**A. Written preliminary examination:** The written preliminary examination will be of two to four hours in duration in the field or genre of the dissertation. The examination committee will consist of three faculty members from the English department chosen by the student for their expertise in the field. The precise nature of the examination — its length, the type and number of the questions to be asked and answered — will be negotiated between the student and the committee. The fields and genres from which students normally choose the examination specialty include the following:

**Fields:** Old and Middle English, Renaissance (including Shakespeare), 17th century, Restoration/18th century, 19th-century British, modern British, early American, late American; applied linguistics, rhetoric and composition
Genres: drama, fiction, poetry, intellectual prose, literary theory (e.g., deconstruction, new criticism, new historicism, psychoanalytical criticism)

At the beginning of the semester prior to the semester in which the written preliminary examination is to be taken, the student — working with his or her committee — will formulate a reading list of 30-40 works from which questions will be drawn.

The purpose of the written preliminary examination is to demonstrate competence in the student's area of specialization. Students who fail the written preliminary examination may take it a second time.

Students who fail the examination a second time will not be allowed to continue doctoral work.

View the step-by-step protocols for implementing the preliminary exam.

B. Dissertation prospectus conference: The conference concerning the dissertation prospectus will be a one-hour discussion between the student and his or her dissertation committee. Generally, that committee will be composed of the dissertation director, plus three other faculty members from the department and one graduate faculty member from outside the department.

The conference will focus on both the soundness of the prospectus and the student's readiness to undertake the research and writing of the dissertation. The purpose of the conference is to help the student begin the writing of the dissertation, to identify areas of potential difficulty, and to prepare the student for the project that lies ahead.

Once the written preliminary examination has been passed and the dissertation prospectus conference completed, the student and his or her dissertation committee must complete an application to candidacy and submit it to the Graduate School. The graduate studies director will notify the Graduate School that the written preliminary examination has been passed and the dissertation prospectus conference completed.
View the step-by-step protocols for organizing the prospectus conference.

Dissertation

Once the prospectus conference is completed, then the student may proceed to the dissertation. The dissertation defense consists of an oral defense of the dissertation before four English department faculty members (including the director) and an external faculty member. Normally, the members of this committee are those faculty members who formed the dissertation prospectus conference committee. They will be appointed by the director of graduate studies in consultation with the student, who will have a clear understanding with the faculty members involved of whether they will be able to read the dissertation and conduct the final oral examination during summer months or during sabbatical leave if necessary. Faculty members have the prerogative to serve on a committee when they are not teaching; it is the student's responsibility to schedule investigation, writing, and examination in time periods acceptable to members of the committee. All five members of the dissertation committee must have time to read and analyze the dissertation before the oral examination on the dissertation; final approval of the dissertation must be received at least six weeks before graduation.

Teaching

All candidates for the PhD degree are required to have college or university teaching experience in English composition or literature. Teaching assistants in all programs must enroll in EN 533:534 Teaching College English during their first year of service. Completion of the summer practicum, EN 533:534, will result in a combined 3 hours of pass/fail credit.
2. Graduate Curriculum Reviews

Describe the department’s process for regular reviews of the graduate curriculum. Summarize the primary actions taken as a result of graduate curriculum reviews since the last OAA program review.

Just as with the undergraduate curriculum, we are constantly reviewing our graduate curriculum. We use the Graduate Studies Committee and follow the process outlined in our Governance Document whereby changes move from the GSC to the Executive Committee to the full Faculty. Then they are directed to the appropriate College and Graduate School entity.

The primary actions taken since the last OAA program review are as follows:
(1) Revision of the preparation for GTAs by changing the timing of orientation workshops, revamping the EN 533/534 sequence during the second year in the program, and eliminating the EN 532 course because the creation of syllabi was out of synch with the process of learning to teach.
(2) Elimination of the Ph.D. fast-track. In principle this was a good idea, but in practice it was a nightmare.
(3) Elimination of the distribution requirement in literature.
(4) Revision of guidelines for the M.A. Exam (see Governance Document).
(5) As noted in #1 above, we have created advising sheets that have been very helpful in informing students about their programs and in tracking their progress.
3. Slash-Listed Courses

In a table or list, show the number of slash-listed courses offered in the department and describe any efforts to increase the number of graduate-only courses for graduate students, i.e., decrease the number of slash-listed courses.

The only program that still uses slash-listed courses is Linguistics. We do it because we are trying to serve, with a limited number of faculty, both the MA students and the upper-division undergraduates.

4. Time to Complete Degree

Use the graduation lists received from the Graduate School to compute the average time to complete each graduate degree.**

M.A.: 5.52
MA-TESOL: 2 years: 5.52 (with one problematic student who took 15 semesters)
M.F.A.: 10 semesters
Ph.D.: 17.76 semesters average

5. Graduate Employment

Indicate success of graduates in securing employment (or acceptance for additional graduate work) within and outside Alabama by attaching a list of graduates during the last 5 years and indicating where each was employed or went for additional graduate work.

Attachment 5--Graduate Employment or Additional Graduate Work is a spreadsheet of our graduates from the last five years with the information that we have about their employment or additional graduate work.
6. Employers’ Satisfaction with Graduates

Provide any objective or subjective information you have on employers’ satisfaction with graduates of your graduate degree program(s).

We have long been proud of the placement of our graduates. A notable recent example is Norman Golar, who completed both an MFA with us and a Ph.D. in CRES, and then was hired directly into the English Department at Stillman College as department chair in 2010. Additional examples can be seen in Attachment 5. Phone conversations that we have had with employers and colleagues have yielded praise for our graduates.

7. Monitoring Academic Progress

Describe procedures for regularly monitoring academic progress of graduate students.

Our Director of Graduate Studies and the graduate program directors meet twice a year with all graduate students for advising, using the sheets attached above. The Graduate School also monitors and advises us of any GPA problems. Since the last Program Review we have formulated a set of guidelines for Dissertation Directors, which can be seen in Attachment 6.

8. Sources of External Funding

Indicate sources of external funding and dollar amounts for the following:

   a. research grants
   
   b. service or teaching contracts
   
   c. training grants

The main source of funding for graduate student support comes from our own endowments. These provide modest support for travel to conferences to present papers. In 2012-2013 the department gave 28 awards totalling $8,400, and this amount was matched by the Graduate
In the last several years we have had support from the Truman Capote Literary Trust to fund Prison Arts Fellows from among the MFA students. These fellowships allow students to be released from their regular GTA duties and to instead teach creative writing in Alabama state correctional facilities under the aegis of the Alabama Prison Arts + Education Project, housed at Auburn University.


If you have a doctoral program included in the National Research Council rankings of research-doctorate programs, describe what is being done to increase its standing. If you have a doctoral program not included in NRC rankings, describe the major efforts at continuous improvement of the doctoral program.

See Attachment 1D for Form 2, Memo to Dean re Aspirational Peers. During the fall of 2012 we went through a process of identifying a set of aspirational peers and beginning to examine their RTP procedures to see how we could increase our standing. That memo contains recommendations concerning the kind of institutional support that we believe would help.
10. Financial Assistance

Using the spreadsheet data provided to you, use the table below to show the number of students receiving funds from each of the six Graduate School sources.**

1. Graduate Council Fellowships (GCF)
2. National Alumni Association (NAA license tag) Fellowships
3. McNair Fellowships
4. SREB Fellowships
5. Research and Travel Fund
6. Fellowship Enhancement Program (FEP) support since the program began in 2010-2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Year Ago</th>
<th>2 Years Ago</th>
<th>3 Years Ago</th>
<th>4 Years Ago</th>
<th>5 Years Ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCF</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREB</td>
<td>2 recently</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsch/Tvl</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Awarding Assistantships

Briefly describe the criteria and process for awarding assistantships. If there is a maximum time for a student to have an assistantship, please indicate.

All full-time students who are admitted to our graduate programs are offered an assistantship. The only exception is the Applied Linguistics Ph.D. concentration, which currently has no GTA lines and has received authorization to admit self-funded students. The criteria for admission to the Graduate School and the Department can be seen on our website. The applications are vetted by the faculty in each program.

The maximum time that we provide support for an MA degree is two years, for an MFA degree four years, and for a Ph.D degree five years.

12. Off-Campus and Distance Learning

If the department has any off-campus and/or distance learning graduate courses, describe staffing and procedures to assure that the quality of such courses is comparable to the quality of on-campus courses.

Our only off-campus courses are taught through the Gadsden Center, but our relationship to that Center has become less clear over the past number of years. Our only control over quality appears to be the periodic vetting for Graduate Faculty status of the faculty who teach there.

13. Quality of Faculty Teaching

How and how often is the quality of faculty teaching of graduate courses evaluated in the department?

The department chair conducts annual evaluations of all faculty by means of the Faculty Activity Report Conference in April. During this evaluation SOIs and departmental discursive evaluations for graduate courses are examined.
We also have recently revised our guidelines for the Graduate Faculty Committee, which conducts required periodic reviews of faculty for Graduate Faculty Status. Those revised guidelines are here:

**GRADUATE FACULTY COMMITTEE**
Guidelines for Proceedings and Standards
Amended November, 2012; approved by Faculty with additional amendments 2/27/13

I. Description of the Committee
   A. **Mission:** Elected annually in the fall by those members of the department currently holding Full graduate faculty membership, the Graduate Faculty Committee considers applications for appointment to the Graduate Faculty.
   B. **Membership:** Three members of the Full graduate faculty, one of whom will be elected by the committee to serve as chair.
   C. **Proceedings:** The chair of the committee shall consult the Graduate School website to determine individuals whose graduate faculty membership terminates at the end of the current academic year, or individuals not listed as graduate faculty members (to determine the latter, compare the list on the Grad School website with the latest iteration of the department’s own faculty directory). Those with expiring or expired membership should be invited to submit a current CV to the Committee to begin the review process. Also, any faculty member desiring a change in status should also notify the Committee and supply a current CV in the Fall semester no later than October 1. Other explanatory or supporting materials may be provided at the discretion of the applicant or at the request of the committee. Candidates who have questions about the way their productivity is likely to be evaluated may ask members of the Graduate Faculty Committee for a confidential nonbinding opinion before deciding whether to submit a formal application. Once all materials are in hand, the Committee shall meet to discuss the merits of each case, with a simple majority vote required to render a decision.

II. Categories of Graduate Faculty Membership
   A. **Temporary:** Temporary graduate faculty membership is granted for up to three years to individuals who do not otherwise qualify for or desire Associate or Full graduate faculty membership to perform specific tasks (i.e., teaching a given course numbered 500 or above, supervising a particular thesis or dissertation, serving on a committee that requires graduate faculty membership). Temporary graduate faculty membership may be granted by the Graduate Faculty Committee as a result of its consideration of a particular case, or by the Department Chair as required. No tasks outside of those specified can be performed.
   B. **Associate:** Associate graduate faculty membership is granted in six-year terms and entitles individuals to teach courses numbered 500 or above, to direct MA or MFA theses, and to serve on dissertation committees. Probationary faculty will be accorded Associate membership on the graduate faculty at the beginning of their appointments. Those whose tenure decisions
have been deferred are eligible only for reappointment as Associate members while they remain in the probationary period. Full-time administrators who are tenured in the English Department, who have served in their administrative positions continuously for at least one year prior to their review, and who are not otherwise Full members of the graduate faculty will also be accorded Associate membership on the graduate faculty during the period of their administrative service, and for whatever period of time completes their respective six-year terms.

C. Full: Full graduate faculty membership is granted in six-year terms and entitles individuals to teach courses numbered 500 or above, to direct MA or MFA theses, to serve on dissertation committees, to chair dissertation, special field, and prospectus defense committees, to hear appeals of the decisions of the Graduate Faculty Committee, and to vote on changes in the structure, curriculum, and requirements of graduate programs. Full graduate faculty membership does not entitle anyone to teach any particular course.

III. Criteria for (Re)Appointment to Full Graduate Faculty Membership

A. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity: Graduate faculty members are expected to maintain consistent and high-quality research productivity. Individuals seeking (re)appointment should have had published or accepted for publication, over the previous six years, at least four substantial peer-reviewed articles, or their creative equivalent.

B. Teaching: Evidence of "excellence in teaching" at the graduate level will be tied to the College of Arts and Sciences' student opinion survey forms in conjunction with the English Department's discursive forms and any other documentation the candidate chooses to submit. Evidence of a pattern of poor teaching, as documented by SOIs, student discursive evaluations, or other material provided to the committee by the DGS or the Department Chair may lead to loss of standing, regardless of other qualifications.

C. Service and Professional Involvement: At issue here is not normal service on departmental, college, and university committees, but the fulfillment of a candidate's professional responsibility toward graduate students. Evidence of the quality of supervision of graduate students may include

1. Proper supervision of theses and/or dissertations
2. Timely grading of special field examinations and evaluation of prospectuses
3. Periodic evaluation of students registered for thesis/dissertation direction
4. Mentoring graduate students in their professional development.

D. Final Caveat: In making its determinations, the committee reviewing applications for Graduate Faculty status will consider the evolving complexities of the profession, some of which may be less relevant to the tenure sprint than they are to later phases of our careers: a recognition of the possibility that truly distinguished individual publications or a spate of multiple publications packed into in a brief period may in some cases establish a national visibility whose value to graduate students extends beyond six years; and the regrettable fact that, regardless of quantity, publications judged weak by the committee will not be sufficient.
for graduate faculty status.

IV. Appeal Process

A. Departmental-Level Appeals: Any candidate who is denied membership may appeal to the Full members of the graduate faculty who are certified for the following academic year at the start of the appeals process.

B. College-Level Appeals: An appeal from any adverse judgment at the departmental level will follow the approved uniform Arts and Sciences procedure for making such an appeal.

---

**14. GTA Training Coordinator**

Who is the department’s designated GTA Training Coordinator? (SACS requires that all GTAs must have “direct supervision by a faculty member experienced in the teaching discipline.”)

The department’s primary GTA Training Coordinator is Dr. Karen Gardiner, the Director of the First-year Writing Program. Her program conducts teacher training workshops and pre-service teacher orientation for the GTAs who are teaching at UA for the first time. She also oversees the EN 533/534 practicum sequence required of all GTAs in their first-year of teaching. Additional GTA Training Support is provided by members of the First-year Writing Program staff (CLTF- or FTTI-level faculty members) and by members of the Composition Rhetoric and English Studies tenured or tenure-track faculty.

---

**15. New GTAs**

Does each new GTA receive:

- a letter of appointment that details the GTA’s duties?
  
  YES

- a previous syllabus for the course(s) to be taught?

Syllabi for previous semesters of EN 101, EN 102, and EN 103 are available on the First-year Writing Program Web site (www.comp.ua.edu, in the password-protected Instructor Handbook section). In addition, detailed course design guidelines, detailed paper assignment guidelines, and a syllabus template for upcoming semesters of EN 101 and EN 102 are
provided in pre-service orientation meetings, in EN 533/534, and on the FWP Web site.

New GTAs can also find syllabi for undergraduate literature courses through the OSM system.

c. information concerning the department’s GTA Training Coordinator?

Information concerning the training coordinator is available on the English Department Web site. Information concerning teacher training is available on the First-year Writing Program Web site in the very thorough Instructor Handbook.

d. a departmental orientation to being a GTA, in addition to the University’s Workshop for New Graduate Teaching Assistants?

The First-year Writing Program conducts a one-day orientation workshop for new GTAs in the spring of the year prior to their first teaching assignment. The department chair typically addresses the group and emphasizes the important role of the GTA in the English Department. An additional three-day orientation workshop is held in the week prior to the beginning of their first teaching assignment.

16. GTA Evaluation

Describe the SACS-required “planned and periodic evaluation” the department uses for assessing all GTAs. Also, indicate where copies of those periodic evaluations are maintained and for how long. Attach a template or 1-2 completed examples, but redact information that identifies particular students.

In their first year of teaching, GTAs are observed in the classroom in their first semester by a member of the First-year Writing Program staff, a CRES faculty mentor, or an FTTI mentor. This is followed by an informal conversation about their teaching. During their second semester, a more formal observation is done by the Director of the First-year Writing Program, a member of the FWP staff, or a CRES faculty mentor. This is followed by a formal conference with their observer regarding their teaching progress.

In addition, all GTAs in their first year of teaching are required to use a student-learning-outcomes matrix to self-assess their first semester of teaching, noting what lessons they taught that met which outcomes, how they assessed their students, and how they would adjust their lessons for better effectiveness in future semesters. This completed matrix
is also discussed at the formal teaching conference, along with the reports from their two teaching observations.

GTAs are observed periodically during their subsequent years of teaching, generally at their request or if deemed warranted by administration. The job description of the Assistant Chair of the department includes oversight of GTAs.

17. Regular GTA Training

Describe the SACS-required “regular in-service training” that the department provides to assist GTAs in continuing to develop their teaching skills throughout their time serving as GTAs in the department. Again, this is beyond the UA Workshop for New GTAs.

The First-year Writing Program offers 2-3 workshop opportunities per year for GTAs. The topics generally involve how to enhance teaching through technology or how to get the most from the program’s default texts. Often these workshops include guest visits from textbook authors.

For GTAs teaching classes above the 100-level, the department offers several opportunities for professional development workshops organized by our own instructors and faculty. These include a Blackboard Learn shell with resources created and linked by our instructors, a mentoring program organized for those teaching a literature course for the first time, a monthly “literature salon” in which professors and instructors share ideas around a particular topic (e.g., how to talk about race), and mentoring of creative writing courses by creative writing faculty.

18. New GRAs

Does each new GRA receive:

a. a letter of appointment that details the GRA’s duties? The letter is the same as for the GTA because we are able to assign a limited number of GRAs and only during the first year of graduate study.
b. **orientation** as a GRA? We strive to make professors with GRAs recognize the importance of structuring and monitoring the work and time spent by the GRA. The Director of Graduate Studies has created a spreadsheet that can be used to track hours and tasks.
19. Research by Graduate Faculty

Describe how the quality of research by graduate faculty is assessed, what rewards (in addition to merit increases and promotion/tenure) are provided as research incentives, and what is done to increase the quality/quantity of research for those not meeting expectations.

The quality of research by graduate faculty is assessed
(1) by the department chair and deans and provost each year as part of the Faculty Activity Report evaluation process. In addition to productivity, quality is assessed in relation to prestige of placement of work;
(2) by the Graduate Faculty Committee during required periodic reviews (see committee charge and details in response to question 13 above);
(3) through the use of external reviewers (at least 4) as part of the T&P process.

There are no particular rewards beyond merit increases and promotion/tenure as research incentives. The College has provided resources (such as the “Publisher in Residence” program, and the first and second-year faculty seminars) to encourage faculty to publish and to increase the quality of their scholarly and creative work. Some faculty have created writing support groups within their own cohort

For those not meeting expectations for quality/quantity of research, the Retention Review Committee (for untenured faculty) and the department chair provide feedback and encouragement. Lack of merit raises and failure to have Graduate Faculty status are two consequences that may or may not have the desired effect. In extreme cases in the past the department has reduced the percentage of assignment devoted to research and increased the teaching load.
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M.A. Advising Sheet/Plan of Study

Name: ___________________________  CWID #: ___________________________  Year of Entry: ___________________________

☐ Plan I (Thesis)  ☐ Plan II (Non-thesis)

Course Requirements: 30 hours = 10 courses @ 3 hrs, including:

☐ EN 537 (Introduction to Grad Studies)  and  ☐ EN 535, ☐ EN 536, or ☐ EN 635 (Literary Criticism and Theory)

*NB: Although mandatory, EN533 and EN534 are not counted in hour/course tallies.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1: Fall</th>
<th>Semester 2: Spring</th>
<th>Semester 3: Fall</th>
<th>Semester 4: Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 courses (Course#, Professor, Grade)</td>
<td>3 courses (Course#, Professor, Grade)</td>
<td>3 courses (Course#, Professor, Grade)</td>
<td>3 courses (Course#, Professor, Grade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. EN537</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1. EN533</td>
<td>1. EN534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GTA Assignment (Classroom TA, Writing Center, etc.)</td>
<td>• GTA Assignment (Classroom TA, Writing Center, etc.)</td>
<td>• Teach 2 courses</td>
<td>• Teach 2 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meet prerequisite, pass exam, or begin Reading Proficiency Course for foreign language requirement</td>
<td>• 18 hours (6 courses) must have been completed by the end of semester to be eligible to teach</td>
<td>□ Submit “Admission to Candidacy for the Master’s Degree” form to Grad School</td>
<td>□ Submit “Application for Degree” Form to Grad School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If doing language proficiency course, complete second semester (or take exam)</td>
<td>□ Plan I – Begin Thesis (= 3rd Course)</td>
<td>□ Plan I – Submit Thesis (3rd Course)</td>
<td>□ Plan I – Submit &quot;Thesis Committee Acceptance&quot; Form to Grad School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Plan II – Submit Questions to Exam Committee</td>
<td>□ Plan II – Take M.A. Exam</td>
<td>□ Plan II – Submit &quot;Masters Exam Form&quot; to Grad School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Apply for Degree (mybama.ua.edu)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foreign Language Requirement:  Language ___________________________  Date: _____________  Means of Meeting Requirement: ___________________________

M.A. Comprehensive Exam:  ☐ questions submitted in semester 3  Exam Date: _____________  Exam Results:  ☐ Distinction  ☐ Pass  ☐ Fail
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Typical Program of Study
MA in Applied Linguistics/TESOL
(Total of 30 credit hours)

First semester (9 credit hours)
EN524: English Structure and Usage
EN 613: Second Language Development (3 hours)
EN 620: Intro to Linguistics (3 hours)

Second semester (9 credit hours)
EN 610: Theory and Methods of TESOL (3 hours)
EN 612: Topics in Applied Linguistics/TESOL (3 hours)
EN 617: Teaching Academic Writing (3 hours)

Third semester (6 credit hours)
EN 500: Language and Culture (3 hours)
An elective on linguistics or language teaching/assessment (3 hours)
Or for students on the thesis option: thesis (3 hours) in lieu of the elective

Fourth semester (6 credit hours)
EN 612: Topics in Applied Linguistics (3 hours)
An elective on linguistics or language teaching/assessment (3 hours)
Or two elective courses on linguistics or language teaching/assessment
For students on the thesis option: thesis (3 hours)

Additional practicum/internship experience (equivalent of additional 15 hours)
1. During first year of study, the student will work as a co-teacher with a second year-student as the teacher of record teaching one or two sections of EN 120/121 (freshmen composition for nonnative speakers of English); during the second year, the student will work as a teacher of record.
2. During the third or fourth semester, the student will work as an apprentice teacher at the English Language Institute, observing classes and teaching one class.
Proposed Ph.D. Timeline

First year

Semester 1
- Coursework (normally 2 + EN 533)
- Submit "Request for Transfer of Graduate Credit" form to GS
- Determine second foreign language and means of satisfying the requirement

Semester 2
- Coursework (normally 2 + EN 534)
- 2nd Foreign language

Second year

Semester 3
- Coursework (normally 2)
- Attend the Workshop for Writing Theses and Dissertations offered by the Graduate School each semester
- 2nd Foreign language

Semester 4
- Coursework (normally 2, may include EN 637)
- Complete 2nd Foreign language requirement
- Identify chair and members of Preliminary Examination committee
- Submit "Outline of Ph.D. Program (Plan of Study)" form to GS

Third Year

Semester 5
- Coursework (normally 2, may include EN 637)
- Formulate Preliminary Examination Questions in consultation with committee chair

Semester 6
- Register for Research Hours (usually 6)
- Complete Preliminary Examination
- Identify members of dissertation committee
- Submit "Appointment of Doctoral Dissertation Committee" form to GS
- Complete and defend dissertation prospectus
- Submit "Admission to Candidacy for the Doctoral Degree" form to GS

Fourth Year
- Register for Research Hours (normally 6 hours per semester)
- Complete any unfulfilled requirements
- Research and Writing

Fifth Year
- Register for Research hours (normally 6 hours per semester)
- Research and Writing
- Defend of Dissertation in Semester 10
- Submit "Committee Acceptance Form for Electronic Thesis or Dissertation" to GS
- Submit dissertation to ProQuest
- Complete "Survey of Earned Doctorates" (through NORC website)
- Complete "Application for Degree" (through mybama.ua.edu website)

Sixth and Seventh Years (if needed)
- Register for Research hours (normally 6 hours per semester)
- Student is no longer eligible for assistantship after semester #10 but may compete for University and external funding.
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Ph.D. Advising Sheet

Name: __________________________ CWID #: __________ Year of Admission: _____

M.A. FROM: __________________ IN: __________________

GENERAL CHECKLIST FOR THE DEGREE

☐ Submit "Request for Transfer of Graduate Credit" form
☐ Submit "Outline of Ph.D. Program (Plan of Study)" form
☐ Attend Workshop on Writing Theses and Dissertations (offered by GS each semester)
☐ Complete coursework (including EN533, EN534, EN637)
☐ Satisfy two consecutive semester residency requirement
☐ Complete foreign language requirement
☐ Constitute preliminary examination committee (3 members)
☐ Pass written preliminary examination
☐ Add additional members (one intra- and one extra-departmental) to preliminary examination committee to constitute dissertation committee.
☐ Submit "Appointment of Doctoral Dissertation Committee" form
☐ Write and defend dissertation prospectus
☐ Submit "Admission to Candidacy for the Doctoral Degree"
☐ Write Dissertation (students should contact their director at least once each semester).
☐ Register for 24 hours of dissertation research (EN699) during the writing of the dissertation.
☐ Submit Application for Degree form at beginning of semester of intended graduation
☐ Defend Dissertation
☐ Submit "Committee Acceptance Form for Electronic Thesis or Dissertation" to GS
☐ Submit dissertation to ProQuest
☐ Complete "Survey of Earned Doctorates" (through NORC website)
☐ Submit "Application for Degree" form (through mybama.ua.edu website)

TRANSFER CREDIT (up to 6 courses = 18 hours from MA degree at another institution)

Student must initiate request for transfer credit through the Graduate School. If equivalents for Introduction to Graduate Studies (537) and a literary criticism/theory course (535, 536, or 635), are not transferred, they must be taken here IN ADDITION TO the regular coursework required for the Ph.D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>UA Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total courses/credits accepted for transfer: __________

For those with an M.A. degree from elsewhere, courses that must be taken in addition to their regular coursework:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised Fall 2013
Ph.D. Advising Sheet

COURSE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PHD

72 Total Credit Hours, comprising:

☐ 48 hours (= 16 courses) of course work (may include up to 18 hours from MA studies = 6 courses), including:

☐ EN 637 (Workshop in Academic Writing, 3 hours): This course is normally taken during the final year of coursework, and must be passed before a student can be formally admitted to candidacy for the Ph.D. degree.

☐ 24 hours of dissertation research

In addition, all students with a GTA must take ☐ EN 533 and ☐ EN 534. *Hours from these courses are not counted toward the degree.*

500-LEVEL (NO MORE THAN 5 COURSES CAN COUNT TOWARD THE PH.D.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>537 or equiv.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

600-LEVEL: 11 COURSES (+ THE 5 ABOVE AT THE 500-LEVEL):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISSERTATION RESEARCH (24 HOURS REQUIRED, TAKEN AS EN699 (SEE GUIDELINES IN GRADUATE CATALOG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FOREIGN LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT: (1st typically transferred in from MA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Means of Satisfying Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT: Specify two consecutive semesters ____________ & ____________

WRITTEN PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION COMMITTEE (3 From English)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Preliminary Examination Date: ____________ Result: __________________

☐ "Appointment of Doctoral Dissertation Committee" form submitted

DISSECTATION AND DISSERTATION PROSPECTUS COMMITTEE (4 From English, 1 Extra-Departmental—all Graduate Faculty)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Extra-Departmental Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dissertation Prospectus Conference Date: ____________ Result: __________________

ADVANCEMENT TO CANDIDACY

☐ Submit "Outline of Ph.D. Program (Plan of Study)" form to GS

☐ "Admission to Candidacy for the Doctoral Degree" form submitted to GS

DISSECTATION DEFENSE

Dissertation Defense Date: ____________ Result: __________________

☐ "Committee Acceptance Form for Electronic Thesis or Dissertation" submitted to GS

☐ PDF file of Dissertation submitted to ProQuest

☐ "Survey of Earned Doctorates" completed (through NORC website)

☐ "Application for Degree" completed (through mybama.ua.edu website)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Major/Minor</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Current Position/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Abston</td>
<td>English As Second Language</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Instructor at Florida Atlantic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA Working for Teach for America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA Writing full time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Beasley</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Pursuing PhD at the University of Nebraska-Kearney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirstin</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Instructor - UC Rivery Language Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathanael</td>
<td>Booth</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Pursuing PhD - UA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Brathwaite</td>
<td>English As Second Language</td>
<td>MA Academic Coordinator/Instructor at Indiana University-El Paso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Britt</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Writing Center Director and Instructor at Indiana University-El Paso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Bronsted</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Pursuing PhD at Florida Atlantic University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Brunson</td>
<td>English As Second Language</td>
<td>MA Pursuing PhD-UA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Burgess</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Tenure-track position at Maysville Community College's Cynthiana campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Callahan</td>
<td>English As Second Language</td>
<td>MA Instructor at English Language Institute - UA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA Pursuing PhD in American Studies at Indiana University Bloomington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Pursuing PhD - UA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Conner</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA Instructor-UA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Cotsonas</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA Teaching in New York, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>English As Second Language</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Instructor of a South Korean University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>Delong</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA Teaching in New Orleans, LA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Dixon</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD Instructor - UA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teranda</td>
<td>Donnatto</td>
<td>English As Second Language</td>
<td>MA Working for Samsung in South Korea teaching Samsung employees English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandee</td>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Pursuing PhD at University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy</td>
<td>Ekberg</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Ellenburg</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Tenture Track Instructor at Marion Military Institute, Marion, Al</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Pursuing PhD in Rhet Comp at the University of Maryland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keri</td>
<td>Epps</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Pursuing PhD in Rhet Comp at the University of Louisville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>Espino</td>
<td>English As Second Language</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Fagan</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>Farris</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Pursuing PhD at University of North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Finfrock</td>
<td>English As Second Language</td>
<td>MA Teaching in Middle East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Fink</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA Living in Chicago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tessa</td>
<td>Fontaine</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA Performing with a traveling circus for a year then will pursue PhD at University of Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>English As Second Language</td>
<td>MA Instructor at Vanderbilt University's English Language Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>English As Second Language</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Fuqua</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Pursuing PhD at the University of Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pia</td>
<td>Garber</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA College Assistant-College of Staten Island, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Garner</td>
<td>English As Second Language</td>
<td>MA Instructor of a South Korean University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Golar</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD Assistant Professor and Chair of the Department of English at Stillman College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>Golar</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD Tenture-track position at Shelton State Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA Resident Artist at Florida State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devin</td>
<td>Gribbons</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA Teaching in New Orleans, LA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Harrell</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Instructor, Alabama Southern Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Hartnett</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA Won $20K Boston public Library Writer in Residence Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Pursuing PhD - UA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA Teaching in Birmingham, Al</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Hess</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA Pursuing PhD - University of Chicago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Hess</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA Managing Editor at The Georgia Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Hinds</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Pursuing Law Degree at LSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandi</td>
<td>Hodo</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Instructor - UA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Hopper</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Pursuing PhD - UA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlin</td>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Humann</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD Instructor-UA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kedra</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD Assistant Professor at North Carolina Wesleyan College, Rocky Mount, NC - Tenture Track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>English As Second Language</td>
<td>MA Pursuing PhD in Rhetoric and Composition at Ohio University in Athens, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA Instructor - UA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA Pursuing PhD at Binghamton University in NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnie</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsten</td>
<td>Jorgenson</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA Part-time Instructor at Appalachian State University-El Paso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>Jorgenson</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA Part-time Instructor at Appalachian State University-El Paso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Major/Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Position/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>English As Second</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor and Director of the Legal Writing Center, Charlotte School of Law, Charlotte, SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>English As Second</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Instructor in English Language Institute at the University of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Keen</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching in Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Instructor of English at Elon Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnie</td>
<td>Lamarr</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching English at Martin's Episcopal High School in New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>LeeBaker</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pursuing MA-UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Letz</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Teaching in Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pursuing MA-University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>English As Second</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching at Rutgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Liebeck</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Instructor in Creative Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Leopold</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Graduated from Middlebury School, Working in a middle school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Mahaney</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Teaching in Portland, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Mahony</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pursuing MA in poetry at Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Matheny</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Directed Outreach Coordinator for UA Digital Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Maynard</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Teaching in Portland, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>McGaugan</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Pursuing MA at University of Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paige</td>
<td>McCormick</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Instructor - UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>McKnight</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Teaching in Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobias</td>
<td>Meehl</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Living in Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Memin</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pursuing MA in History - UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pursuing MA at Miami University, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Nabors</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Serving Peace Corps in Nicaragua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittany</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching at Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danika</td>
<td>Obnesoku</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of English at Pennsylvania State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy</td>
<td>Pautz</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Teaching in Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pursuing MA-UCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Payne</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pursuing MA-UCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cot</td>
<td>Peddie</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Teaching in Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Pelzsch</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Teaching in Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Phelps</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pursuing MA at University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching in California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Plavanich</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching in California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>English As Second</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pursuing MA - University of Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadie</td>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>English As Second</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malory</td>
<td>Porch</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>Reyes</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Assistant Professor at Northern Arizona University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Schwerer</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Seymour</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Assistant Professor at Northern Arizona University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td>Shoyen</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitlyn</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Beth</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Stafford</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delia</td>
<td>Suprenen</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mingyala</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>Swanson</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaa</td>
<td>Tellin</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dariko</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Tonelli</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Townley</td>
<td>English As Second</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Trampides</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Tucker</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Wade</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoo</td>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>English As Second</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Teaching in Arizona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Major Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collyn</td>
<td>Warner</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Communications and Fundraising Assistant, the Campaign for Southern Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Watson</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Instructor at Stillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Wear</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pursuing PhD at UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Welburn</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Instructor-UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Weidner</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Pursuing PhD in Fiction at University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Weinstein</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Instructor-UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pursuing PhD - UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik</td>
<td>Wennergrenk</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Living in Srilanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Whiston</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Instructor - UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Whitener</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Instructor-UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Whitney</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Instructor-UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith</td>
<td>Whitten</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Received MA in Women's Studies - UA/Pursuing PhD in Literature at University of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Wilkes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pursuing MA in Library Science - UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arisa</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pursuing PhD at University of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Wingard</td>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Instructor and Assistant to the DCS - UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Wien</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pursuing PhD - UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pursuing PhD at University of Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ning</td>
<td>Yang</td>
<td>English As Second Language</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pursuing PhD - UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Yocom</td>
<td>English As Second Language</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pursuing PhD - UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rui</td>
<td>Zuo</td>
<td>English As Second Language</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Quality Assurance Engineer at Fidelity Business Services, Dallas, Cities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Overall Assessment

The Department of English at the University of Alabama is a well-established program with some significant strengths and a number of problems. Its strengths include a very good tenure/tenure track faculty. The Department has hired new Ph.D.'s from good programs with excellent reputations. In general the recent hires came with some publications and appear to have been publishing at a rate comparable to that in other similar institutions. The Department works at recruiting excellent candidates and helping them see that a future at the University of Alabama can be bright for them. The number of English majors is substantial, an achievement even more noteworthy since the percentage of students electing to major in English has generally been on the decline nationally. The survey of undergraduates indicated that majors think well of their teachers and like the Department. The Department provides several opportunities for study abroad and a variety of activities and research projects for undergraduates such as an active chapter of the English honorary, Sigma Tau Delta.

The Department has several problems that are interwoven and which have had an impact on its programs and potential. The most immediate pressure is an enrollment growth from 19,171 in 2001 to 30,000+ in the last two years. This growth has placed a strain on resources to teach even required courses to incoming students. The tenure-track faculty has not grown proportionately and the instructors now outnumber the TT faculty (the most recent figures in the material for the review set the numbers as 34 TT and 42 instructors, not to mention the 114 GTAs). College resources have been invested in hiring instructors to meet enrollment pressure, and TT faculty has experimented with some large lectures with the use of GTAs as discussion leaders. No one seems to believe this is a good situation, but there is also little evidence of a viable
long-range plan to improve it. The Department makes a reasonable but, in the near future, unrealistic case to hire a dozen new TT faculty to reduce the imbalance between TT and non-TT. These hires would be used to cover 300-level courses and the 200-level large lectures, but the plan does not address the approximately 58%-60% of the Department’s courses that are taught in sections of first-year writing where both the instructors and the teaching assistants are clustered.

The second of these interwoven problems is the divisions within the department that function virtually as separate mini-departments of Creative Writing, Literature, Linguistics, Composition and Rhetoric, and First Year Writing. The Department's Five Year Plan states that it is “framed in terms of a vision for each program and what we perceive to be the needs associated with achieving that vision.” Each of these groups has a list of their priorities, but the Department of English as a whole does not seem to have a vision for itself as a department. One of my questions was to find out what the Department wanted to be known for, what it saw as its identity as a department. The Department knows it wants to hire more TT faculty and add some office staff, but each group wants to hire in its area. In the existing budgetary climate, departments must decide how they want to be known and then prioritize hiring accordingly. Looking back to the 2004-05 review, the Review Committee noted the disagreement among faculty about what areas needed strengthening and that it needed a hiring plan to deal with retirements. The report also noted the need to make a decision about linguistics. In the action plan of March 18, 2005 and the update, the Department voted to place the Ph.D. in linguistics on inactive status. However, the hiring plan was soon essentially scrapped and revised as the situation changed from year to year; linguistics made a new hire and seems solidly on its feet and developing a new minor; class size and the non-TT faculty grew; and, according to the 2013 progress report, "it is not clear, given the Assistant Director of Undergraduate Studies position, that the rationale still holds” about needing an additional staff person. While there are reasonable things to say to explain all of these directions, collectively they add up to a department that has no consistency in its planning, most likely because it has no clear sense of what kind of department it wants to be. A department that had a clear vision of itself and a set of priorities to which it was collectively committed would have seen the retirements and departures of faculty as opportunities to reshape itself and move ahead with its plans, not the occasion to change them in order to preserve the status quo.

The third major problem is a lack of cohesive leadership in the last ten to fifteen years. Chairing a large department is one of the most complex administrative jobs in a university, and one for which there is typically little or no training. Departments that are changing chairs every two, three, or five years tend to change directions frequently and are constantly rebuilding relationships with the dean and other administrators. The "rule of thumb" is that, in a large university, it takes a chair the better part of three years to learn how to be effective and have any real impact on the department's priorities.
These three problems—intense enrollment pressure in a relatively short period for which there was no adequate plan, a department that functions around four or five separate program definitions, and an extended period of frequent changes in leadership—are an academic “perfect storm.” Some faculty described the situation as “dead in the water,” and it is fair to say that progress on many of the most important things the Department needs to do is on hold.

The campus administration has two priorities that most affect the Department and must be reconciled in some way if the Department wants to make progress. Those campus priorities are to increase research and to build tuition revenues by increasing enrollments, and especially from out of state students. For English this means two contradictory things: 1) focusing even more investment in graduate programs (in a discipline where the majority of new Ph.D.’s will not get tenure-track jobs), and 2) focusing even more investment in undergraduate programs, and especially First Year Writing, to meet student demand. The first commitment in any college has to be meeting demand in the courses the faculty requires of its students to graduate, and some 42 instructors and 114 GTAs are employed to do so. Given the number of sections needed to accommodate first year writing, the number of majors who are preparing to be teachers, and the very large number of graduate students who need to be trained in teaching composition for UA and most likely in their future beyond UA, the TT faculty in composition and rhetoric is disturbingly small and without any departmentally approved clear priority or staffing plan for the future. The Five Year plan for First Year Writing asks only for “a permanent staff position” and not for TT faculty hires.

The Department has a large graduate program and hopes to grow it. Clearly that is a priority for UA, but it is not clearly a way for English to improve quality and national reputation. From the perspective of the discipline and its professional associations, there is no rationale to increase the number of doctorates in English. Most departments in the last twenty years have reduced the number of graduate admissions in English, but most departments with such a large number of graduate students also have a much bigger faculty. Given that there are only 34 TT faculty whose time is so heavily committed to the graduate level that the Department cannot cover the 300 level courses, growing the graduate degree programs will deepen the imbalance between TT engagement with graduate studies and its lack of engagement in the lower division curriculum. Calculating from the data supplied by Institutional Research, the TT faculty is teaching less than a quarter of the 506 sections of English taught in 2012 or about 4,000 of the 32,000 credit hours produced in 2012 (1028 of which are at the 500 and 600 level).

The graduate programs, especially the MFA, might gain more prestige by making admission more selective than by growing the size. The two basic measures of quality
in graduate programs are 1) how good the faculty is, and 2) how good the students are whom they graduate. One reason the Iowa Writers Workshop remains atop everyone’s list of the best is that it is highly selective and admission itself carries considerable status.

Currently, the First Year Writing program fields 420+ sections of 100-level writing a year to serve over 9,000 student enrollments and over 150 teachers (GTAs and instructors) and trains between 30-40 new GTAs a year. This program alone is larger than many colleges, but it is directed by an instructor and co-directed by a lecturer with a small staff of part-time assistance. The Department has been lucky to have such conscientious and hard-working staff, but they need to be working with and at the direction of TT faculty in composition and rhetoric. Their work is further complicated by having three different kinds of GTAs to train—Ph.D. students who should have coursework in Composition Theory along with the practicum; MA students who will lead discussion sections of the large lectures, and MFA students, some of whom do not plan on being college teachers and do not want composition theory. The staff in First-Year Writing is doing their best with this complex and demanding situation, but the Department needs to “own” First Year Writing and make a commitment to placing TT faculty in the leadership of this program and the training of Ph.D.-level TAs. Such a commitment will require assigning TT hiring priority to composition and rhetoric.

I was asked to offer a comment on the new Clinical/ Lecture Track policy. This policy offers a path toward greater job security with some hope of promotion to non-TT faculty. It provides the institution greater stability and higher quality at a lower price in its course instruction than it has had in the past. The policy itself seems unduly rigorous and, given the number of non-TT faculty UA needs to meet enrollment demands, could become too cumbersome to be practical if more than a handful of faculty are appointed as CLFT. If only a few people are accorded this status, the policy won’t accomplish the ends of better and more stable instruction from non-TT faculty. An example of unnecessary rigor is requiring outside letters for promotions of faculty who are not expected to have publication. UA faculty is probably better equipped to judge the merits of the items in a teaching-related dossier than outside reviewers. An “up or out policy” (II.B.4) for a six-year appointment that did not apply for promotion wastes the investment of time and development if that person is a good teacher and a responsible citizen of the department. The goal of this policy should be to hire a good teaching faculty and to keep them to bolster the quality and continuity of instruction. The many conditions, reviews, and requirements of this policy seem almost to discourage instead of ameliorating a situation plagued by low pay, low status, and little job security.

Finally, in this section on Overall Assessment, I want to stress that this department has borne the brunt of the enrollment growth because of core requirements in first-year writing and the college requirement for two-semester literature sequences. It has
worked hard to be creative and conscientious in managing these demands for courses. Every new first-year student who enters UA will basically spend six hours in the English Department. Just hiring and training the instruction to teach writing to 9,000 students a year has been a massive chore. This growth in enrollment is UA's path to the tuition revenue needed to become a better and more prestigious institution. There is a concomitant responsibility to use some of that revenue to guarantee to the students the same quality of instruction that the institution seeks in research. English is carrying a lion’s share of providing core requirements to those students, but the weight of doing so is also displacing the resources that a very good department should have to support its legitimate ambitions for its other programs. The TT faculty is simply not of the size it should be to teach its programs and hiring 42 instructors and growing a GTA pool to 114 to teach core university requirements should not be a permanent plan. A department that carries this kind of responsibility to the student body as a whole should share the resources from that increased tuition necessary both to maintain the standards of quality expected of an institution like the University of Alabama and to build those programs of special distinction and promise.

2. Departmental Assessment Activities

Please read the assessment attachments to the General Information form (Form 2) and the analysis and recommendations by the Assistant to the Provost for Assessment. Offer any additional thoughts on the department’s assessment activities from your perspective as someone highly experienced in the same discipline as that of the department.

The Department of English apparently took the charge to assess learning quite seriously and invested some serious time in creating a plan. The plan had numerous expectations for student learning that are appropriate to “English,” which has a widely varied disciplinary identity. However, the plan also had numerous measures more designed to measure the quality of the Department than would be usual in a plan for assessing student learning. I refer to Section I. Department Mission Statement and Expected Outcomes. These measures include such items as providing writing services, holding public events, and publishing well. Perhaps the University of Alabama expects the Department to address these things in its assessment plan, but including assessment of the Department’s quality and scholarly productivity with assessment of
student learning confuses two important kinds and purposes in evaluation that need to be kept separate. Combining them increases faculty anxiety that assessment of student learning will be turned into assessment of the faculty as teachers.

The kinds of learning outcomes that a student should show were sound, and the Department reports that they were largely “met.” While the nature of outcomes the Department wants are typical for English programs around the country, their means of measuring them were not as specific. Dr. Smallwood’s critique hit two salient points: A number of the student learning outcomes “are expressed more as objectives than as outcomes,” and “the absence of disciplinary standards” should not be a barrier to the Department setting its own standards that can be measured. As a discipline “English” is often uncomfortable with measuring learning. A decade or so ago many English departments wrestled with the difference in setting standards for what their students ought to have learned and identifying specific metrics to measure what the students have actually learned. There has been progress in this area, however, and many departments learn very specific and useful things about what students are, and are not, learning in their courses. Assessment of student learning in literature and writing requires defining what we want students to learn in our courses and then devising fairly specific ways to measure how much of it they learned. The Disciplinary Knowledge Survey consists of questions about familiarity with the names and works of prominent authors to which students offer their self-assessment. The value of this seems marginal to real assessment of student learning. Many English departments use a committee to assess student essays or portfolios of work, but to do that meaningfully requires a rubric for what exactly will be measured and what constitutes a measure of evidence of satisfactory accomplishment. Comparing a group of people’s individual assessment of the same essay can help colleagues define and normalize a standard of evaluation.

Overall, the Department’s assessment strategies are elaborate but shy away from measuring what students have actually learned and what constitutes an appropriate degree of success. Without greater specificity of measurement, assessment data is unlikely to produce the kinds of information that can result in significant improvements in student learning.

A clarification: Each section of the Smallwood Critique ended by saying that “The absence of attention to the three common program outcomes puts the degree program out of compliance with both UA and SACS requirements.” This apparently refers to program outcomes the Assessment Council recently adopted but which were not adequately communicated to departments. I understand that the Department will address the issue of program outcomes before the SACS review in 2015.
3. Promotion and Tenure

Brief evaluation of the department’s tenure and promotion guidelines.

The formal tenure and promotion guidelines generally reflect those used at other High Research universities. The requirements for tenure speak of a book or equivalent number of articles. It is appropriate for guidelines to allow for cases in which some particularly outstanding research productivity took the shape of articles or digital projects other than books. The flexibility of such a requirement can leave candidates uncertain of what they must do for tenure, however, and it can also feed a false hope that the candidate will be safe with just a few articles. Detailed and candid advice to candidates through the Retention Review process is critical to addressing the uncertainty that accompanies flexibility. However, the Department should be leery about using specific benchmarks, a practice that can quickly substitute numbers for evaluations of quality.

The Department has identified a “List of Aspirational Peer Institutions” within the Carnegie Classifications. These Very High Research universities are likely to require a book and some articles for tenure and to place primary importance on outside letters from senior experts in the field. The University of Alabama hopes to accelerate its research funding sufficiently over the next seven years to move from High to Very High Research classification. Given its list of Peers, the Department seems to share this aspiration. If so, the Department should begin to think about phasing in with its 2014-15 hires the expectation of a more rigorous review process. If the University is successful, it may well have achieved High Research status by the time these candidates are going up for tenure. Moving in this direction at this time should be discussed in terms of the campus planning and should be pursued only if the Department is comfortable that this is a direction it needs or wants to take. Doing so clearly makes tenure a moving target, but the reality is that tenure is a moving target in institutions that want to be competitive with Very High Research universities, and as it is among the universities already in the Very High Research classification.

The following discussion is advisory if the Department wants to change its practices to be more competitive in the next few years. The Aspirational Peers, for example, normally submit to outside reviewers only works that have been published or formally accepted for publication (and they do not submit evidence of teaching or service for outside review). A manuscript nearing completion or submitted but not accepted is not sent to reviewers (if accepted before the process ends, however, the file is amended to include the now accepted manuscript). The outside letters are given the greatest weight at all levels of review. The letters are asked to assess not just the quality of the material submitted but also its contribution to the field.
If the Department should embrace a revision in expectations for tenure, it should consider making the following shifts in its practice:

- Amend PT guidelines to add that outside reviewers should not be persons who have worked directly with the candidate in any significant professional way, including an edited book. The outside letters of review need to be from established people in the candidate’s field, and they should be from universities on the peer group list or from institutions more prestigious than the peer list.
- All manuscripts submitted to the reviewer for evaluation should be published or formally accepted for publication (or, in the case of digital work, available online in a site authorized by the institution where it is posted). Sending only work that has been published or accepted for publication sends the candidate a clear message that the tenure decision is based primarily on performance and, unlike hiring and reappointment, not primarily on promise.
- Urge pre-tenure faculty to give papers at major conferences such as the MLA or other national venues in their sub discipline, such as the 4Cs or AWP... This will give them and their work exposure to established scholars/artists in the field who may later serve as outside reviewers. Support giving papers at national venues with travel money.
- Provide at least a semester of reduced teaching assignments for completing a book manuscript.
- Limit the number of new courses, and especially the number of new graduate courses, pre-tenure faculty is expected to teach in the first few years.
4. Strengths

Strengths of the Department and its Degree Programs (in rank order).

By consensus of administration and this reviewer the strongest program is the MFA in creative writing. Historically, this degree program has had an outstanding faculty whose writing has been well published. It attracts graduate students and seems to serve these students well in preparing for life as a writer after graduate school. Rankings of creative writing programs are much scorned and debunked, so it is hard to say with any authority how this program ranks. The only current survey that lists them is Writers and Poets, which ranks them as #18, but that ranking is mainly by popular vote and thus may measure reputation but not academic quality. The field has become increasingly competitive as the number of CW programs has grown by leaps and bounds in the last twenty years. During the time that other programs have grown, the UA program has had a number of turnovers in the faculty and has had an uphill battle to maintain the status quo. The level of pride in the program is high, but so is the level of frustration. Complicating this situation is the considerable resources dedicated to the Department in the Coal Royal endowment and several other scholarship programs. The Dean would like to see the accumulated funds put to some good use in building the program, but the faculty believe that they can only use the endowment to bring in visiting writers. If that is not so, the Dean needs to clarify for the faculty the range of ways they can use the endowment. If it is the case, the academic administration should develop a strategy to win approval from the governing board to expand the kinds of uses to which the fund can be applied.

The BA has strengths in the literature and linguistics tracks. The Strode program is a long-standing strength and has an endowment that enables it to extend its activities beyond the curriculum. The literature curriculum is weighted toward the traditional. The preponderance of survey classes in British and American literature apparently reflects both the faculty’s commitment to a traditional curriculum, and a specific College requirement for a two-course survey sequence. Nationally, the curriculum has moved away from the dominance of surveys as both students and faculty have turned to a greater diversity in literature and a recognition of many literatures in English beyond those of England and the USA. Literary theory, film, literatures of the English-dominated former colonial powers, and interdisciplinary studies now claim much of the curricular space that once belonged to the traditional periods of English and American literature. These changes in the discipline are reflected in the leading journals, such as *PMLA*, and in the programs of national meetings.
While the survey of undergraduates reflected high levels of regard for the faculty and pleasure in their courses, the first thing the undergraduates who met with me said was that the curriculum “is skewed toward the surveys.” The literature curriculum is more likely to continue to be a strong program if it opens itself up to a broader range of less traditional literary study. The requirement for a two-course sequence in English or American literature needs to be revisited. Right now, it ties up much of the time of both the students and the faculty and makes it difficult to move toward an updated curriculum.

Linguistics, once on its way to being phased out, seems alive and well and planning for an interdisciplinary minor. Linguistics has dropped out of many English departments and been turned over to colleges of education since it was largely kept alive by the requirements of teacher training. Given the paucity of English departments with good linguistics programs, this area has the potential to become one of the new strengths if it can build an interdisciplinary program with an emphasis on sociolinguistics, cognitive, and/or theoretical linguistics. The growth of international students and the increasing bilingual nature of American society auger well for the future of an intellectually exciting linguistics program in the Department. Some areas, such as discourse analysis, can build synergy with faculty in composition and rhetoric, and the area has real potential for projects in digital humanities.

In a department with so many undergraduate and graduate students, both majors and minors and those simply taking electives, the Composition and Rhetoric program should be one of the strongest components. At UA, it appears to be small and weak. This observation is not a reflection of the professional ability of the four faculty in this area; it reflects the Department’s placing of its priorities elsewhere, though more than half of the courses it teaches every semester are in first year writing. Many majors need advanced courses in comp and rhetoric, and every PhD graduate student needs to be well prepared to teach composition, both at UA and in the jobs they will find upon completing their degrees. The tenure track faculty in this area should be sufficient to teach a concentration at the graduate level and a track within the major, to train TAs by providing at least a one semester seminar in teaching composition and a practicum, and to oversee and coordinate first year writing. Given the range and depth of composition needs in the curriculum and in training TAs, four faculty in the area is drastically small (compare, for example that Linguistics, with a much smaller share of the students and curriculum, also has four faculty, and literature, also with a large share of the curriculum and students, has 22). The tendency of the Department to plan by areas instead of the needs of the whole leaves the composition and rhetoric faculty
with little influence on hiring priorities. The Department has shifted major responsibilities in first year writing to non-tenure track faculty, a move that further undermines the priority this area should have.

5. Recommendations

Recommendations to Improve the Department and its Degree Programs (in rank order).

A. Low or No Cost (in rank order)

- The Department needs to create a plan for the Department as a whole instead of a plan for each of the various subdivisions. This will require some extended discussion about what the identity of the Department is, or could be, and how it wants to be known. The budgetary realities require that academic planning makes choices of what to do more of and what to do less of what to do first and what must wait. The plan must decide which areas will have priority over others based on what is best and possible to accomplish for the department to reach is collective goals. The plan should extend over at least three years. To build programs instead of competing internally to maintain the status quo may require phasing in resources to the same priorities over a period of a few years. Focusing on a new priority every year or revising the plan with each retirement or departure guarantees that nothing much will change. Each request for funding should have a clear rationale based on how it addresses the plan to build a better department.
- The Department has an unusually large number of endowments from various sources, but apparently is not benefiting from these resources as fully as may be possible. In consultation with the Dean, the Department needs to develop a full and open understanding of how these funds may be
used. Once you know the range of flexibility in each fund, you can better develop a plan for how best to invest these funds to further the departmental plan. If any of the endowment agreements limits its usefulness, work with the dean to change the agreement.

- Increase the prestige of the MFA by limiting admissions and making them more select.
- The Department should look for ways to reflect more of the range of the discipline in its curriculum and to ease the demand for survey courses and large lectures to meet college or campus requirements. Revising the College requirement of two sections of literature survey to allow a number of other literature courses to meet the required hours could open up the curriculum.
- Explore the possibility of a Writing Across the Curriculum program which approved courses in other departments that could satisfy three of the six hours of required composition.
- Revise the CLFT policy to make sure that it better fits the function of lecturers and to remove such unneeded procedures as outside letters of review and an “up or out” policy for those who are not tenure eligible.
- Develop assessment rubrics for specific courses for use in measuring student learning.
- Develop an interdisciplinary Linguistics minor.
- The Department has seven different enrollment caps for different kinds of courses. The use of so many different rules for capping courses creates a perception of inequities in work load. The Department should settle on three: one for writing classes (15-20); one for graduate seminars (12); and one for all other courses (28-32). As much as possible given the different fields, faculty assignments each year should strive for a rough equity so that one faculty member is not regularly teaching 20 students per semester and another is teaching 65.

B. Requiring New Funds or Reallocation of Existing Funds (in rank order)

- The number of needs in the writing curriculum and in training GTAs to teach composition far exceeds the ability of four TT faculty members to meet. TT faculty trained in Composition and Rhetoric should supervise First Year Writing and teach a required graduate-level seminar in Composition Theory and Practice to Ph.D. level TAs. At least two TT hires in Composition and Rhetoric should be authorized as soon as possible, and
a long-range plan to meet the anticipated growth in enrollment should be developed.

- The balance in the Department between the TT faculty and all other instructional personnel must be improved. The Department needs more TT faculty to teach more of the undergraduate courses, and when the Department has worked out a priority-driven plan for building its programs and can justify its requests for new lines in terms of that plan, the Dean’s office should give it a priority on new TT hires. A department that teaches 506 sections of English a year (and growing) and provides 114 GTAs to help cover the demand cannot do it at an acceptable university-level with 34 TT faculty without draining the strength of the Department in other areas. It should be an administrative priority to improve the balance between permanent and temporary faculty to preserve the integrity of the academic programs.

- Faculty salaries and graduate stipends are clearly lower than at the Very High Research institutions on the Aspiration list, but it is not clear from the review materials how they compare with other High Research institutions. The Department or College should do a comparative study of salaries and stipends at peer institutions in locations with similar costs of living to see what kinds of adjustments need to be made.

- Like many other departments which would like to reduce the 2-2 teaching load of GTAs, the Department is probably locked into the economics of staffing freshman English by funding teaching assistantships. What might be in the realm of possibility is finding scholarships or other funds to provide a 2-1 load for one year for each GTA. Teaching assignments that require only one preparation also help to reduce the time spent in teaching.

- The increase in enrollment at UA has increased the work load of a relatively small office staff. Non-TT instructors and GTAs generate more personnel paperwork than TT faculty, for one example, and the student traffic, scheduling, and advising demands on staff are heavy. One additional office staff is needed to alleviate some of the work pressure in the department office.
1. Program Description

Goals
State major goals for the department, as gleaned from its Strategic Plan, assessment activities and reports, completed program review forms, and other available information.

Curriculum
Give a brief description of emphasis in course offerings such as lower division vs. upper division; master’s vs. doctoral; and nature of curriculum in terms of theoretical vs. applied, research vs. service, etc. Include a brief summary of how curriculum assessment is accomplished in the department, how often, and what modifications the department has documented as being made in the most recent revision(s) of the curriculum.

Teaching/Research/Service Mix
Describe relative emphasis among activities in the department.

Goals:
The following departmental goals appear on the English Department’s website:

“The Department of English at The University of Alabama seeks to cultivate the arts of reading, writing, and speaking the English language. We encourage the creation and interpretation of imaginative works of literature; we strive for a mastery of composition, linguistics, literary history, and theory. We challenge our students to read, write, and think in a sophisticated and critical fashion; to understand the historical evolutions of American and English literatures; to participate in the development of knowledge through scholarly research, publication, and creative writing; and to provide meaningful service, to the state and nation, as teachers,
writers, and scholars. Our commitment is to enrich the intellectual and cultural life of our campus, our community, and the individuals who compose them.”

Curriculum:

The Department offers one B.A. degree and four graduate degrees (M.A. in English and TESOL, MFA in Creative Writing, and a Ph.D. in English). Because of the enrollment growth of the University as a whole, the English Department has had to increase substantially its course offerings at the undergraduate level, particularly at the 100 and 200-level. The number of graduate course offerings has slightly decreased since the last program review.

The undergraduate English major requires 36 hours of English courses and 4 semesters or equivalent proficiency in a foreign language:

6 hours in 100-level Composition courses

12 hours in 200-level Literature courses. All students must take EN 205 (English Lit I); the remaining hours can be chosen from among English Lit II, American Lit I & II, World Lit I & II, and African-American Lit.

3 hours in a 300-level Theory, Writing, or Linguistics course

3 hour in a 300-level course covering Early Literature to 1700

3 hours in a 300-level course covering 18th and 19th Century Literature

6 hours in 300-level electives

9 hours in 400-level electives

M.A. Degree

The Department has a general M.A. degree that can be completed in literature or in Composition/Rhetoric (CRES). They also have another M.A. which is referred to in various ways (ESL, TESOL, Applied Linguistics/TESOL) throughout the departmental report submitted for this review. The Committee assumes these are all referring to the same degree. According to the M.A. Advising Sheet/Plan of study, students take 30 hours of courses including two required courses: EN 537 (Introduction to Graduate Studies) and either EN 535, 536, or 635 (Literary Criticism and Theory). Students pursuing the non-thesis option take 6 credits of electives to fulfill the 30-hour degree requirement. Students pursuing the thesis option take 6 thesis hours.

Under the broad M.A. in literature umbrella, a student may focus on the Renaissance through the Strode Program. Fifteen of the 30 hours are required courses in the Renaissance. The remainder of the coursework includes Introduction to Graduate Study, a
course in Critical Theory, at least one course in medieval literature, and a teaching practicum.

The master’s concentration in Composition/Rhetoric requires that students take 6 hours of Core English requirements (EN 537 & 538), 9 hours in CRES requirements, 3 hours in linguistics, 12 hours in electives, and a teaching practicum.

The M.A.-TESOL/M.A. in Applied Linguistics/TESOL requires students to take 7 required courses and 3 electives.

**MFA Degree**

The MFA in Creative Writing is a 48-hour course of study. Generally, students take 4 years to complete it. A thesis and oral defense is required of all MFA students. Students are required to take 24 hours in graduate-level writing workshops and forms courses; 12 hours in literature, criticism, or linguistics, 3 hours in electives at the 500 or 600 level (can be outside the Department), and 6 hours of EN 599 (thesis preparation).

**Ph.D. Degree**

The Department’s sole Ph.D. program requires that students take a minimum of 30 hours beyond the master’s degree. All students must pass a written preliminary examination after they finish their coursework and participate in a dissertation prospectus conference before they are admitted to candidacy. The average time to degree is 17.76 semesters.

**Curriculum Reviews and Assessment:**

**Undergraduate Curriculum**

The Undergraduate Studies Committee in the English Department is charged with overseeing the curriculum of the major and minor. Any changes to the curriculum are first vetted by them and then forwarded to the Department for discussion and a vote. The most significant change to the curriculum since the last review was the addition of EN 317, designed to help students be better writing tutors. The English Honors Program was recently redesigned to allow for the addition of EN 399 and a required senior thesis (EN 499). They have also tightened the rules and regulations about Directed Readings and Directed Studies, and the English Internship (EN 430) has been restructured. The Creative Writing minor was also changed because the old Creative Writing minor was based on the outdated assumption that Creative Writing basically consisted of poetry and fiction and the best method to teach creative writing was through the workshop method. The new Creative Writing minor provides more courses, a more coordinated sequence, more flexibility and inclusiveness in terms of genre, and a robust list of special topics courses.

**First Year Writing Program**

According to the Departmental report for this review, the Composition Committee and the
First Year Writing Program (FYWP) Director and staff conduct informal curriculum reviews every year. The FYWP is responsible for training GTAs who teach freshmen composition courses and for overseeing the quality of the first year writing courses. The FYWP has instituted several changes since the last program review that have resulted in more standardized goals, objectives, and outcomes for EN 101 and EN 102 and the adoption of a common text to be used by all GTAs teaching for the first time. They also developed a common syllabus with common assignments for first-time teachers. Another major change instituted by the FYWP was that EN 102 is now themed to allow students to self-select into one of five “problem solving” content areas: Advancing Mind and Body, Sustaining Planet Earth, Imagining the 22nd Century, Engaging Southern Culture and Diversity, and Enterprising America and the World. They have also brought in several guest speakers and speaker panels to talk about topics related to these various themes.

Graduate Curriculum

The Graduate Studies Committee is charged with the responsibility of reviewing the graduate curriculum. However, it was unclear to the Committee whether or not Creative Writing is included in the Graduate Studies Curriculum or whether revisions in the MFA curriculum are part of the regular review process outlined in the submitted report. The curriculum revisions reported in the departmental document include: 1) revising the timing of the GTA orientation workshops, 2) revamping ENG 533/534, 3) eliminating EN532, 4) eliminating the Ph.D. fast track, 5) eliminating the distribution requirement in literature, 6) revising the guidelines for the M.A. Exam, and 7) creating advising sheets to inform students about their progress in the program.

Teaching/Research/Service Mix

The relative emphasis appears comparable to other departments in the College of Arts & Sciences and reflective of the typical 40/40/20 faculty appointments.

2. Description of the Program Review Process

Briefly describe committee membership, documents and information reviewed, interviews conducted, and any other relevant factors in the process.

Committee membership:

Dr. Natalie Adams, Professor, Director, New College

Dr. Andrew Huebner, Associate Professor, History

Dr. Karl DeRouen, Professor, Political Science
In addition to reviewing all related documents submitted by the English Department as part of their 8-year program review, the Program Review Committee also reviewed documents (e.g., Writing Program Annual Report, EN 101, 102, 103, 104 Enrollment numbers, descriptions of job responsibilities of staff) that different sub-groups gave to the Committee prior to, during, or after its various meetings. From September to November 2013, the Committee met with each of the following groups for approximately one hour:

- Tenured Professors in Literature
- Tenured Professors in CRES and Linguistics
- Tenured Professors in Creative Writing
- Assistant Professors (all programs)
- MFA Students
- Graduate Students in Lit, CRES, and Linguistics
- Department Chair
- Dean of the Graduate School
- Provost
- Graduate Director and Director of Creative Writing
- Undergraduate Students
- Staff
- Part-time Instructors
- Full-time instructors
- First Year Writing Program
- Director of Undergraduate Studies
- External Consultant
- Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences

Each committee member took copious notes during these discussions. One member was assigned to summarize each meeting in written form and share it with the rest of the Committee. At the end of all our meetings, we had 20 plus pages of written notes. Each Committee member read the notes individually and identified recurring themes that
emerged in our discussions. We met several times as a Committee to share our individual perceptions of the meetings and the themes we identified. The written report with recommendations was based on our analysis of the various forms of data.

3. Program Evaluation

Quality

Discuss things such as number of faculty, their assignments, qualifications, productivity, and other indicators of quality. Discuss quality of students as may be indicated by admissions scores, GPA, student recognition, acceptance to graduate schools, success in graduate programs, or career achievements of graduates. Additional items for discussion may include grade distribution in courses; physical facilities, space and other resources available; computer access; library holdings, etc. You also may include information related to program recognition such as accreditation, state/regional/national competitions, unique comparative advantages of programs, etc. Information from sources such as student performance on licensure/certification examinations, external examiner reports, student satisfaction surveys, exit interviews, or follow-up studies also may be included. Not all of these items must be addressed; they are examples.

Distinguishing Characteristics of the Department and its Programs

This is a brief discussion and should not duplicate what is included in the section on Quality. The committee may wish to discuss semester credit hour production, number of majors, number of degrees awarded at various levels, or any other measures that the committee feels distinguish the department and its programs. You might include discussion of past trends and future projections, as well as factors affecting enrollment, such as career opportunities. If relevant, discuss any specific relationships with business, industry, government, etc., as well as program relationships with other departments within the University or with other institutions of higher education.

Departmental Assessment Activities

The committee is asked to read the assessment attachments to the General Information form (Form 2) and the analysis and recommendations by the Assistant to the Provost for Assessment. Offer any additional thoughts on the department’s assessment activities from your perspectives as experienced faculty from disciplines outside the department under review.

Tenure and Promotion Guidelines
Provide a brief evaluation of the department’s tenure and promotion guidelines.

Quality

The English Department at The University of Alabama is comprised of 5 distinct program areas: Literature, Creative Writing, Linguistics, Composition and Rhetoric, and the First Year Writing Program. The Department also is the home to the Strode Renaissance Program (part of the Literature program), the First Year Writing Program, and the Writing Center. The Department offers one undergraduate degree and four graduate degrees (M.A. in English and TESOL, MFA in Creative Writing, and a Ph.D. in English).

The English Department employs 37 tenured/tenure-track faculty, 42 instructors, 2 CLTF, and 114 GTAs. The typical FTE for a tenured and tenure-track faculty is 40 percent teaching (2/2 load), 40 percent research, and 20 percent service. Faculty members with significant administrative responsibilities have a 1/1 teaching load. Typically, FTTIs teach 4 courses a semester with no expectations for research. PTTIs generally teach no more than 3 courses. The Committee concurs with the outside reviewer’s opinion that a primary strength of the English Department is its tenured and tenure-track faculty. The Department is comprised of strong scholars with national and international reputations. It has been aggressive in both recruiting and retaining excellent scholars from some of the top national and international universities. Overall, the Department is committed to students and teaching and has made significant adjustments to deal with the demands of UA’s increasing student population. An additional strength of the Department is the commitment of the FTTIs, the PTTIs, and the First Year Writing Program to providing quality teaching in the 400 sections of 100 and 200-level English courses taught annually. They have worked hard to respond to the growing enrollment demands (see below) with strained resources and increased class sizes. The FTTIs, in particular, take great pride in their pedagogy and understanding of how to teach writing to students in today’s media-saturated, technologically savvy culture.

Responding to the growing enrollment demands amid strained resources was the recurring theme in interviews with all the various constituents involved in teaching. The Committee agrees with the outside reviewer that the English Department has borne the brunt of the enrollment growth over the last 8 years. To give a sense of how enrollment growth has impacted the English Department, the following figures are illustrative:

* From **2005 to 2008**, the number of undergraduate majors in English hovered around 380 students. In **2009**, the number of undergraduate majors increased to
In 2012 the number of undergraduate majors was 531, representing a 40 percent increase in the number of English majors since the last program review.

- From 2005 to 2012, the number of undergraduate minors in Creative Writing has increased from 66 to 194.
- In 2005, the English Department taught 262 sections of 100 and 200-level courses; by 2012 that number had increased to 394 sections.
- In 2005 the English Department produced 22,204 semester credit hours; by 2012, they produced 32,201 semester credit hours.
- Since 2005, the number of students pursuing a Ph.D. has decreased from 47 to 32.
- Since 2005, there has been a slight decrease in the number of 500 and 600-level courses offered, from 53 to 47.

The Department as a whole has worked hard to initiate and implement creative solutions to the problems resulting from the enrollment growth of the last few years. One solution—as recommended in the last report—was to hire more PTTIs and FTTIs to teach additional 100 and 200-level courses that must be offered to fulfill the University core requirements in English. Since the last review, they have hired additional part-time and full-time instructors. Another solution was to create large lectures at the 200 level taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty. Finally, the Department worked to provide standardization of EN 101 and 102 courses under the direction of the First Year Writing Program as discussed in the above section.

The tremendous enrollment growth at the undergraduate level has created challenges for the English Department. First, the balance of tenure-track/tenured faculty and contract instructors does not reflect the 50/50 ratio that Provost Joe Benson stated as typical of research institutions like The University of Alabama. During the Program Review Committee’s discussions in Fall 2013, the following statement was repeated several times by different faculty and students: “An English student can go through his/her entire major and never take a course from a tenured or tenure-track faculty.” While the Committee cannot verify the accuracy of this statement, it is apparent that the tenure track faculty has not grown proportionally with the enrollment growth or the hiring of part-time and full-time instructors.

Secondly, the Committee concurs with the outside reviewer that the First Year Writing Program lacks the needed resources or personnel to oversee the teaching of all the sections of EN 101, 102, 103, and 104 or to ensure that all UA students taking freshmen composition courses will have a consistent, quality learning experience. The current staff
consists of a Director, an Associate Director, 3 Assistant Directors, 1 GTA, and 1 Senior Office Assistant. The FYWP reported in its interview with the Program Review Committee two primary purposes of the FYWP: 1) to help undergraduate students transition from high school to college writing (for whatever major they choose), and 2) to prepare GTAs for teaching the freshmen writing courses. As noted by the outside reviewer, the training of GTAs is further "complicated by having three different kinds of GTAs to train" with differing backgrounds and experiences in composition. Graduate teaching assistants are expected to teach 2 courses every semester, which is a heavy teaching load for graduate students and may impede a timely completion of degree requirements. Additionally, the FYWP requires all GTAs to take a required practicum in teaching, and the staff observes the GTAs teaching at least twice a year. An added challenge is that EN 101 must comply with State requirements that mandate 6 papers per student each semester. The FYWP helps provide the resources to their GTAs to meet these standards. **Overall, a staff of just 7 - none of whom are tenured or tenure-track faculty – are expected to carry out these multiple responsibilities.**

A **third challenge** associated with the increased enrollment growth and subsequent hiring of a number of FTTIs is the lack of coordination, supervision, and integration of the FTTIs. The FYWP does not oversee the training, observing, or evaluation of the FTTIs and PTTIs who teach freshmen composition courses. No structured, consistent plan for on-going summative and formative evaluations of FTTIs and PTTIs seems to exist. In the Committee’s interviews with instructors, many expressed concern about the lack of feedback and/or guidance they receive about their teaching. This lack of formal, structured, consistent feedback has led to some confusion about how one is retained from year to year. There was the perception, among some of the contract instructors, that the sole criterion for retention was positive student course evaluations, which has the potential, they noted, to lead to grade inflation. With the hiring of significant numbers of contract instructors to teach the lower-division English courses, FTTIs and PTTIs currently comprise the majority of the English department; however, they are not fully integrated within the culture of the department or decision-making processes.

**Fourth**, the number of staff positions has not increased proportionately with enrollment growth. While there has been a tremendous increase in the number of English majors, the number of undergraduate courses offered, and the number of instructors hired since 2005-2006, the number of office staff remains at 5 - exactly what it was in 2005-2006.

**Distinguishing Characteristics of the Department and its Programs**

**More than any other department on campus, English has borne the brunt of the enrollment growth.** While many students delay (often under the guidance of an academic advisor) taking their core math or science courses, almost every entering freshman at UA takes an English course during his/her first few semesters. This means that the English
Department is the unofficial welcoming department for the entire university. Amid these pressures, faculty, staff, instructors, and administrators in the English Department have worked hard to offer quality core requirement courses for all students while maintaining a strong undergraduate major in English with rigorous and robust upper-division courses. Yet, the Department has been forced to make significant changes in personnel, course delivery methods, departmental priorities, and allocation of resources without the corresponding growth in human, financial, and material resources. The Committee concurs with the outside reviewer’s analysis that

“English is carrying a lion’s share of providing core requirements to UA students, but the weight of doing so is also displacing the resources that a very good department should have to support its legitimate ambitions for its other programs. The TT faculty is simply not of the size it should be to teach its programs and hiring 42 instructors and growing a GTA pool to 114 to teach core university requirements should not be a permanent plan.” (Linda Pratt, report, 12/2013)

The growth in student enrollment has an impact on the quality of faculty and staff life that is not adequately captured in numerical data. This includes more walk-in traffic, more emails, more forms, more letters of recommendation, more requests for exceptions, more phone calls, more prospective student visits – just to name a few of the intangible outcomes of university growth not accounted for in any official reports, including the 8-Year Academic Program Review Report.

Despite the fact that most of the resources in the English Department have been directed at addressing issues associated with the increased enrollment at the undergraduate level (most notably the opening of additional sections of 100- and 200-level courses), the graduate programs in the English Department remain strong. The strength of graduate programs stems from the quality of faculty scholarship, funding for all graduate students, flexible curricula, and faculty commitment to recruitment. The Provost stated that he was impressed with the amount of external funding that the English Department receives since programs in the Humanities have far fewer grant opportunities than those in the Social Sciences and Natural Sciences. The students interviewed for this report were generally very positive about their program, its rigor, their funding, and the accessibility of faculty. While not every graduate student interviewed was positive about the requirement that all graduate students teach, the majority of them expressed great appreciation for that opportunity and many cited it as the reason they chose UA. They felt they were gaining “real world” experience that would enhance their job opportunities.

The consensus of upper administration and the outside reviewer is that the strongest program in the Department is the MFA in creative writing, followed by the Strode program. The Creative Writing Program and the Strode Renaissance Program are well-endowed programs that attract students from all over the US and the world. The Creative Writing program has revamped its curriculum to respond to the changes in its
field over the last decade, resulting in a writing program with a national reputation.

**Departmental Assessment Activities**

The English Department has a detailed assessment plan (2012-13 iteration) in place. There are four main outcomes identified: 1) general education to university population through First Year Writing Program and Writing Center (Student Learning Outcomes); 2) faculty engagement in scholarly activities such as research and conferences; 3) enriching the intellectual and cultural life of the university, community and state; and 4) maintaining a transparent system of governance. There are specific methods of measuring progress for each of the four outcomes. These means of measurement are listed under the main outcome headings below:

1) Student Learning Outcomes - General education
   
a. First Year Writing Program (FYWP)
   
b. Writing Center

2) Faculty involvement in scholarly activities
   
a. Publications and presentations
   
b. Grant submissions
   
c. Dialog with assessment agencies

3) Enriching intellectual and cultural life
   
a. Public events and attendance
   
b. Outreach and service learning projects
   
c. Participation in event tracking

4) Maintaining transparent governance
   
a. Review and update Departmental Handbook
   
b. Clear methods of hiring and retention
   
c. Discussion of review process assessment

These four outcomes combine student learning with departmental outputs. In other words departmental activity is assumed to enhance student learning. While this is reasonable on the surface, the outside reviewer observed that including both student
learning and departmental productivity in the assessment is confusing. The Department should clarify how faculty activity feeds back onto student learning outcomes. The Committee concurs with the outsider reviewer that assessment of student learning methods should be distinct from assessment of faculty instruction. This is not meant to imply that assessment of learning should be undervalued.

The issue of student learning as part of the assessment process is also taken up by Robert Smallwood (Assistant to the Provost for Assessment) in his December, 2011 and November, 2013 critiques of the department’s 2011-12 and 2012-2013 assessment plans. He notes there is room for improvement in assessing student learning. In particular, Smallwood opines that the plan needs to be clearer in terms of “what performance outcome will be observed that will confirm the achievement of the outcome.” In other words, student learning assessment metrics could be clarified and improved. Another weakness pointed out by Smallwood is the lack of attention to the three common program outcomes. He identifies strengths in the plan as well, including quality record keeping and activity tracking. He points to the benefits of assessing student learning via student portfolios, and praises the Disciplinary Knowledge Survey and the awards and recognition garnered by students as strong indicators of student learning.

The outsider reviewer also pointed out shortcomings and strengths in her evaluation. She writes that student learning assessment strategies could be enhanced. She concurs with Smallwood that metrics (e.g., success) could be more specific and precise to be able to inform an assessment of student learning. The Program Review Committee concurs with the outsider reviewer that empirical evidence of student learning could be improved.

Assessing student learning is understood to be more than simply assuming a high grade is evidence of learning, because students do not enter a course with the same baseline knowledge. For example, a student earning an ‘A’ might not have learned as much as a student earning a ‘B’ if the former came in with higher writing proficiency skills. To more accurately gauge student learning, pre-tests and post-tests can be used at the beginning and ending of the semester respectively. Obviously such a procedure would be labor-intensive as it would require considerable time spent comparing pre and post-test writing. Another option would be to do a pre-test and then compare it to the final paper. A third option would be to assess writing quality over time rather than conduct separate pre and post-tests. It should be noted that such a system of monitoring progress is alluded to in the Department’s Detailed Assessment Report. Mention is made of monitoring progress from the start to the end of the semester.

Beyond the General Education/Student Learning Outcomes, the Department recognizes three important departmental outcomes. Certainly an engaged faculty will enhance the student learning experience as such faculty will be networking and publishing on current topics. The expectation is that this will trickle-down to the classroom. Enriching the cultural and intellectual lives of the community also translates to successful student learning but this link is less clear than the previous two. While transparent governance is a
worthy and necessary goal, the connections from this endeavor and student learning are also unclear.

**Overall these four outcomes provide a comprehensive tool for assessing the department.**

**The connection between assessing student learning and assessing department activities should be clearer.**

**Tenure and Promotion Guidelines**

The English Department’s tenure and promotion guidelines appear to be fair, clear, and comparable to those at other High Research universities. The Department reasonably expects only limited service of non-tenured faculty, but excellence in undergraduate and graduate teaching. The guidelines call for outstanding and sustained scholarly productivity and the favorable reviews of a minimum of four outside experts.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the Department provides three routes to demonstrating excellence in scholarship: 1) publish a book with a well-regarded, peer-reviewed press (in “some cases,” this major work may be “other than a book”); 2) submit a completed book manuscript to a well-regarded press; 3) publish peer-reviewed journal articles AND produce a prepublishing prospectus for a book. In short, the guidelines tend to privilege a book but do provide for alternatives (articles, digital projects, and so on). Though such flexibility can potentially lead to confusion on the part of non-tenured faculty, the Committee shares the external reviewer’s view that it is appropriate to allow for alternative routes to tenure. Flexibility is good as long as it is real; as long, that is, as people are getting tenure without books. That said, some of the non-tenured professors seemed to think a book the safest route to take.

With such flexibility in the tenure guidelines, it is all the more crucial to provide what the outside reviewer called “detailed and candid” as well as consistent advice to non-tenured faculty every year. The English Department endeavors to do this—a 2012 amendment to the Department’s governance document mandated that the Retention Review Committee, composed of six tenured faculty members, meet with all probationary faculty on an annual basis. Most, though not all, of the non-tenured professors appear to feel that there is reasonable and transparent mentoring along the path toward tenure.

The standards for promotion to Professor are likewise appropriate. In building a national or international reputation, candidates must have published two well-regarded books (one since promotion to Associate), or one important book and a “substantial body of articles or creative works.”

Should the university seek or achieve Very High Research status, the Committee agrees with the outside reviewer that the tenure standards should be amended to include the unequivocal expectation of a book (published or accepted for publication by the time of application). But this change should be accompanied by increased protection of junior
faculty’s time, by limiting new teaching preparations and/or providing pre-tenure leave.

4. **Strengths**

Strengths of the department and its degree programs (numbered list in rank order).

The strengths of the Department are discussed in more detail in the above sections on “Quality” and “Distinguishing Characteristics.”

1) **The faculty.** Tenure and tenure-track faculty members have worked hard since the last report to create a positive work environment marked by an air of collegiality. The “unnecessary internal hierarchies” referenced in the last 8-year report seem to have dissipated. Faculty members have been forced to make changes in their work life to accommodate the growing demands on their time due to a substantial increase in student enrollment over the last 8 years. Their publication records are solid. They have implemented some creative solutions to dealing with the enrollment growth. They take teaching seriously and seem to have very positive relationships with their graduate students.

2) **Support staff.** The office support staff has gone beyond the call of duty in responding to the enrollment growth challenges.

3) **Instructors.** The FTTIs and PTTIs carry the lion’s share of instruction at the 100 and 200-level. They are committed to student learning and are an integral part of the success of the University, College, and Department during the period of student enrollment growth.

4) **Creative Writing and Strode Programs.** The Creative Writing program and the Strode Program are considered the premier programs in the Department because of their national reputation, the strength of their faculty scholars, the ability to recruit graduate students nationally and internationally, and the considerable resources both have in terms of endowments.

5. **Recommendations**
Recommendations to Improve the Department and its Degree Programs (numbered list in rank order).

A. Low-Cost or No-Cost (in rank order)

1. Develop a Departmental vision and long-term strategic plan

English Departments, by their very nature, are complex entities. The different programs comprising an English Department should expect to have some autonomy in making decisions about specific goals, admissions, enrollment management, scholarship and fellowship recipients, curriculum offerings, course rotation, GTA assignments, etc. However, one would expect to see the various programs operating under a collective departmental vision. No such departmental vision with a clear set of departmental priorities seems to exist in the English Department. When the Program Review Committee asked in its discussions with the various sub-groups such questions as “what is the Department’s area of excellence? To what does it aspire? Where do you want the Department to be in 2020”, the responses were vague and inconsistent. The PTTIs and FTTIs seemed to be the most removed from any understanding of departmental goals, vision, or priorities, but even those with a deeper stake in the Department harbored diverse ambitions. It was not clear to the Program Review Committee if this lack of a coherent departmental vision was a result of a long standing tendency in the English Department to operate as several mini-departments or whether it was the result of a Department that hasn’t had the time to discuss vision, priorities, and strategic plans because it has been trying to survive tremendous growth-related pressures.

2. Develop a plan (with input from a core group of FTTIs) for integrating FTTIs into the overall departmental culture of research, teaching, and service.

FTTIs are a vital part of the English Department. Many of them have been teaching in the Department for years. Yet FTTIs are not fully integrated within the Department. They are allowed to send representatives to faculty meetings, but they have no vote on matters of teaching, curriculum, and evaluation. Many of them are published scholars, but they express confusion about how their research and scholarship are evaluated for retention purposes. (The FAR does not allow FTTIs to record scholarship). No one person or unit has responsibility for overseeing the quality of their teaching; thus, they lack clarity about how they are retained or how to improve their teaching. A frank discussion of how instructors should be included in the
everyday life of the department is clearly warranted.

3. Create a policy on enrollment caps for the various courses in the Department.

One of the main sources of contention among the various programs in the Department is the issue of enrollment caps. There is the perception, among some, that unequal work-loads exist in the Department because of these differing caps. The outside consultant suggested three different caps. The Program Review Committee encourages the Department to takes these suggestions as a beginning discussion to develop caps based on a logic agreed upon by all.

4. With the Dean of Arts & Sciences and the Provost, discuss the future of the First Year Writing Program with special emphasis on its continued presence in the English Department.

As stated multiple times in this report and the outside reviewer’s report, the First Year Writing Program has enormous responsibilities with far too few staff members. The outside reviewer informed the Program Committee that many universities of comparable size and rank have a separate, autonomous unit devoted specifically to the first year writing program. The Program Review Committee does not have the expertise to offer any specific prescriptions on this matter, but does recommend that the Department undertake a serious discussion about the First Year Writing Program, the allocation of resources to it, the role of tenured and tenure-track faculty in its everyday decision making, and its future role within the Department as a whole.

5. Update the departmental website.

The College of Arts & Sciences is receptive to working with departments to update their websites, either using the UA template (see, for example, American Studies) or a customized website (see, for example, Chemistry). The English Department is due an update.

B. Requiring New Funds or Reallocation of Existing Funds

1. In accordance with developing a departmental vision, hire more tenure-track faculty.
The departmental faculty/instructor ratio is not in line with what one expects from a High Research public university. The Committee concurs with the outside reviewer that

“a department that teaches 506 sections of English a year (and growing) and provides 114 GTAs to help cover the demand cannot do it at an acceptable university-level with 34 TT faculty without draining the strength of the Department in other areas. It should be an administrative priority to improve the balance between permanent and temporary faculty to preserve the integrity of the academic programs.” (Linda Pratt, report, 12/2013)

2. **Create a new position of Coordinator of Instructors.**

Currently the supervision and guidance of the FTTIs and PTTIs falls on the Department Chair. The Department Chair has too many other responsibilities to make instructors a priority. The First Year Writing Program does not currently undertake the guidance, observation, and evaluation of instructors, nor do they have the resources to do so. However, full-time and part-time instructors are providing the bulk of teaching at the lower division. A new position entirely committed to the coordination, supervision, integration, and evaluation of instructors is sorely needed.

3. **Hire an additional staff person.**

The English Department is clearly under-staffed and over-worked. Faculty, administrators, and staff reported to the Committee that it was typical for the staff to work nights and weekends to get their jobs done. The Committee concurs with the outside reviewer that at least one additional staff is needed to “alleviate some of the work pressure in the department office.”

4. **Increase faculty salaries and GTA stipends to be in line with A & S’s aspirational institutions.**

According to discussions with faculty and administrators, salaries and GTA stipends are not competitive with similarly ranked institutions and, as such, often prevent the Department from attracting the best faculty and students. The outsider reviewer notes that faculty salaries and GTA stipends are “clearly lower than at the Very High Research institutions on the aspirational list.” We concur with the outside reviewer that salary and stipend adjustments need to be made to be competitive in attracting the “best and the brightest” faculty and graduate students.
5. **Increase travel and research support for faculty, instructors, and students.**

Tenured/Tenure-track faculty, instructors, and students repeatedly expressed concern about the lack of adequate resources to travel to professional conferences to present scholarly papers or to conduct research. To be on par with aspirational institutions, commitment to travel and research must be a priority of the Department, College, and University.

6. **Allocate adequate work space and resources for PTTIs and FTTIs.**

With the proliferation of contract instructors, access to office space, computers, printers, and basic office supplies has been limited. A Coordinator of Instructors (see #2 above) could help ensure that instructors have the necessary supplies to provide a quality learning experience for their students.
ACTION PLAN
Committee Recommendation A.1

(low-cost)

*Develop a Departmental vision and long-term strategic plan.*

_English Departments, by their very nature, are complex entities._

The different programs comprising an English Department should expect to have some autonomy in making decisions about specific goals, admissions, enrollment management, scholarship and fellowship recipients, curriculum offerings, course rotation, GTA assignments, etc. However, one would expect to see the various programs operating under a collective departmental vision. No such departmental vision with a clear set of departmental priorities seems to exist in the English Department. When the Program Review Committee asked in its discussions with the various sub-groups such questions as “what is the Department’s area of excellence? To what does it aspire? Where do you want the Department to be in 2020”, the responses were vague and inconsistent. The PTTIs and FTTIs seemed to be the most removed from any understanding of departmental goals, vision, or priorities, but even those with a deeper stake in the Department harbored diverse ambitions. It was not clear to the Program Review Committee if this lack of a coherent departmental vision was a result of a long standing tendency in the English Department to operate as several mini-departments or whether it was the result of a Department that hasn’t had the time to discuss vision, priorities, and strategic plans because it has been trying to survive tremendous growth-related pressures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>by 5/14: Executive Committee creates framework to begin conversation at August 2014 faculty retreat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 12/14: Ad Hoc Committee created at retreat reports on models of English Departments with collective departmental vision and presents first draft of vision and long-term strategic plan to faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 5/15: Final version completed by Department for Annual Review meeting with hiring priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 5/16: Hiring priorities guided by Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 5/17: Hiring priorities guided by Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
<th>see above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>see above and separate “timeline” chart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

1. Response to this recommendation can be combined with Consultant A.1 below.
2. Examples will be sought through the Association of Departments of English and elsewhere of English Departments that can serve as models for operating under a collective departmental vision.
3. We need to have representation from all programs involved in this discussion. The Executive Committee is a start, since it does have such representation. We also need involvement of all constituencies in the Department: professors, CLTF, instructors, staff,
Committee Recommendation A.2

(low-cost)
Develop a plan (with input from a core group of FTTIs) for integrating FTTIs into the overall departmental culture of research, teaching, and service.

FTTIs are a vital part of the English Department. Many of them have been teaching in the Department for years. Yet FTTIs are not fully integrated within the Department. They are allowed to send representatives to faculty meetings, but they have no vote on matters of teaching, curriculum, and evaluation. Many of them are published scholars, but they express confusion about how their research and scholarship are evaluated for retention purposes. (The FAR does not allow FTTIs to record scholarship). No one person or unit has responsibility for overseeing the quality of their teaching; thus, they lack clarity about how they are retained or how to improve their teaching. A frank discussion of how instructors should be included in the everyday life of the department is clearly warranted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by 5/14: Chair forms Ad Hoc Exploratory Committee from volunteers among FTTIs, professors, and CLTF to work on this rec and also the Coordinator of Instructors below at B.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 12/14: Draft proposal submitted by committee to faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 5/15: Draft proposal modified in relation to Coordinator of Instructors proposal (Com. B.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 12/15: New policy for Governance Document approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 5/16: Implementation of policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 12/16: Monitoring of policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 5/17: Monitoring of policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
<th>see above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Timeline to Completion | see above and separate “timeline” chart |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Since the last program review the Department has created multi-year contracts for FTTIs with possibility for multiple reappointments. This arrangement also included the creation of the Instructor Review Committee, to evaluate FTTIs in their third contract year. Since 2009 the Department has also worked with FTTIs to design appropriate mutually beneficial service opportunities, and the Chair has met with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

graduate students, undergraduate students.

(4) We should think not just in terms of common foci for research (as in the 2012 retreat discussion), but also in terms of common goals in other areas that we are already pursuing (e.g., professionalization of GTAs).

(5) A.1 is obviously linked to A.2 directly below in terms of the composition of the workforce of the department.
Committee Recommendation A.3

(low-cost)

Create a policy on enrollment caps for the various courses in the Department. One of the main sources of contention among the various programs in the Department is the issue of enrollment caps. There is the perception, among some, that unequal work-loads exist in the Department because of these differing caps. The outside consultant suggested three different caps. The Program Review Committee encourages the Department to take these suggestions as a beginning discussion to develop caps based on a logic agreed upon by all.

| Action(s)                              | Deliberations on course caps will follow conversations in A.1 above |
|                                       | by 12/15: Executive Committee works with spreadsheet created by Professor McNaughton to evaluate need for new policy |
|                                       | by 5/16: New policy, if any, presented to faculty |
|                                       | by 12/16: Any changes in enrollment caps are in place |
|                                       | by 5/17: Monitoring of effects of any change |

| Responsible Person(s) | see above |
| Timeline to Completion | see above and separate “timeline” chart |
| Comments | Combine with Consultant’s A.9 below: |
Committee Recommendation A.4

(low-cost)
With the Dean of Arts & Sciences and the Provost, discuss the future of the First Year Writing Program with special emphasis on its continued presence in the English Department. As stated multiple times in this report and the outside reviewer’s report, the First Year Writing Program has enormous responsibilities with far too few staff members. The outside reviewer informed the Program Committee that many universities of comparable size and rank have a separate, autonomous unit devoted specifically to the first year writing program. The Program Review Committee does not have the expertise to offer any specific prescriptions on this matter, but does recommend that the Department undertake a serious discussion about the First Year Writing Program, the allocation of resources to it, the role of tenured and tenure-track faculty in its everyday decision making, and its future role within the Department as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>by 5/14: Current and future chairs discuss visions of future of FWP with Writing Program Administrator of FWP and CRES faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 12/14: Chair and Executive Committee create plan for future of FWP (with input from outside consultant with FWP expertise?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 5/15: Chair arranges meeting with A&amp;S dean and Provost to discuss plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 12/15: Plan approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 5/16: Logistical considerations sorted out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 12/16: Plan is in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 5/17: Monitoring of new plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
<th>see above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>see above and separate “timeline” chart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comments | (1) Combine with Consultant Recommendation B.1. (2) We might want to bring in a consultant specifically from an aspirational FWP to make recommendations for us. |

Committee Recommendation A.5

(low-cost)
Update the departmental website. The College of Arts & Sciences is receptive to working with departments to update their websites, either using the UA template (see, for example, American Studies) or a customized website (see, for example, Chemistry). The English Department is due an update.
Action(s)

by 5/14: Chair gathers more detailed feedback from review committee; Technology Committee clarifies website policies and reviews other websites

by 12/14: Technology Committee makes recommendation for any updates

by 5/15: Update of website

by 12/15: Review of website by Technology Committee for tweaking

by 5/16: Review of website by Technology Committee for tweaking

by 12/16: Review of website by Technology Committee for tweaking

by 5/17: Review of website by Technology Committee for tweaking

Responsible Person(s)
see above

Timeline to Completion
see above and separate “timeline” chart

Comments
We recently went to a lot of trouble and expense to customize our website and it is not clear to us from the comments why the Committee thinks that ours is due an update

Committee Recommendation B.1
(high-cost)

_In accordance with developing a departmental vision, hire more tenure-track faculty. The departmental faculty/instructor ratio is not in line with what one expects from a High Research public university. The Committee concurs with the outside reviewer that_

_a department that teaches 506 sections of English a year (and growing) and provides 114 GTAs to help cover the demand cannot do it at an acceptable university-level with 34 TT faculty without draining the strength of the Department in other areas. It should be an administrative priority to improve the balance between permanent and temporary faculty to preserve the integrity of the academic programs. “ (Linda Pratt, report, 12/2013)_

Action(s)

by 5/14: Ad Hoc Committee gathers data from OIRA to present to dean. It is included in comment (3) below.

by 12/14: Searches

by 5/15: Make any hires; Continue to present data to dean
by 12/15: Searches
by 5/16: Make any hires; Continue to present data to dean
by 12/16: Searches
by 5/17: Make any hires; Continue to present data to dean

Responsible Person(s) see above
Timeline to Completion see above and also “timeline” chart

Comments
(1) Combine with Consultant B.2 recommendation
(2) Over the past several years we have presented data to the dean concerning how many TT faculty we need to ensure that no English major would graduate without having been taught by a professor
(3) Data from Ad Hoc Committee:
While decisions about the allocation of significant resources, such as the expansion of the tenure-track faculty in English, are made by the Dean and are subject to larger financial constraints, we are pleased to see the reviewer’s recommendation. It reflects the pervasive and growing sense within the department that we cannot adequately meet the needs of our students, and particularly our majors, at our present size.

The numbers for the past ten years paint a stark picture: since 2004 the total number of tenure track faculty has fluctuated in size within a narrow range, leaving us this year with a net gain of six tenure track faculty.* The number of instructors (including both FTTI and PTTI), on the other hand, has grown by forty-one. This clearly answers the question of how the department has handled the simultaneous explosion in credit-hour production (a net increase, since 2004, of 10,902 hours).

Our goal is to ensure that, at a minimum, all upper-division courses are taught by tenure-track faculty. We cannot, at our present size, staff all of these courses, let alone a substantial portion of our 200-level classes. To our dismay this means that contact between English majors and our tenure track faculty is not necessarily central to the experience of being a major in our department. An uninformed student might miss it entirely if he or she doesn’t seek it out.

This is true despite the substantial efforts the department has made in the last ten years to insure the rigor of the major and to maximize the efficiency with which we use tenure-track faculty’s instructional time. To these ends we have initiated a senior honors thesis program, instituted procedures to provide full, yearly reviews of the instructors who teach in our department, and established a series of large-lecture sections of our 200-level surveys. The large-lecture initiative has resulted in an additional 3,600 student credit hours taught by tenure track faculty each year. However, each of these programs also entails significant administrative responsibilities on the part
of the faculty. While the cheaper labor of instructors has allowed the department to handle the growth in student enrollment over the last ten years, it has also cost the department and the university with respect to our program’s prestige and ability to offer the kind of individual attention that is the hallmark of an effective English department.

*All numbers come from reports from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, received on February 11, 2014.

Committee Recommendation B.2

*(high-cost)*

Create a new position of Coordinator of Instructors. Currently the supervision and guidance of the FTTIs and PTTIs falls on the Department Chair. The Department Chair has too many other responsibilities to make instructors a priority. The First Year Writing Program does not currently undertake the guidance, observation, and evaluation of instructors, nor do they have the resources to do so. However, full-time and part-time instructors are providing the bulk of teaching at the lower division. A new position entirely committed to the coordination, supervision, integration, and evaluation of instructors is sorely needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>by 5/14: see A.2 above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 12/14: Ad Hoc Committee explores models in other universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 5/15: Ad Hoc Committee presents recommendations to faculty; if plan is approved other approvals are secured—for hiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 12/15: Coordinator of Instructors is in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 5/16: ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 12/16: Executive Committee reviews progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
<th>see above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>see above and also “timeline” chart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(1) Combine with A.2 above
(2) The Review Committee was apparently unaware of the Instructor Review Committee or the annual FAR meetings with the chair. Some of the service activities that instructors have created (e.g., Lit Salon, Mentoring Program, FITE Club BBL shell) provide
guidance within the group. It may be time to revisit the Instructor Review Committee’s role and charge. Whereas now we have two “instructor liaisons” who attend faculty meetings and meet every other week with the chair, perhaps we need an advocate for the instructors among the faculty.

Committee Recommendation B.3
(high-cost)

_Hire an additional staff person._ The English Department is clearly understaffed and over-worked. Faculty, administrators, and staff reported to the Committee that it was typical for the staff to work nights and weekends to get their jobs done. The Committee concurs with the outside reviewer that at least one additional staff is needed to “alleviate some of the work pressure in the department office.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>by 5/14: Chair and staff write job descriptions for two positions for hiring requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 12/14: new staff member(s) hired and learning job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 5/15: if only one new position in place, chair asks for second position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 12/15: second new staff member hired and learning job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>see above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>see above and also separate “timeline” chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>This was recommended at our last program review 8 years ago, and since then our enrollment and number of instructors has increased dramatically. We have been asking for additional staff each year for the past several years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Recommendation B.4
(high-cost)

_Increase faculty salaries and GTA stipends to be in line with A & S’s aspirational institutions._

According to discussions with faculty and administrators, salaries and GTA stipends are not competitive with similarly ranked institutions and, as such, often prevent the Department from attracting the best faculty and students. The outsider reviewer notes that faculty salaries and GTA stipends are “clearly lower than at the Very High Research institutions on the aspirational list.” We concur with the outside reviewer that salary and stipend adjustments need to be made to be competitive in attracting the “best
and the brightest" faculty and graduate students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>by 5/14: Chair contacts counterparts at aspirational institutions to get available data to present to dean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 12/14: Data from aspirational peers checked by chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 5/15: Updated data presented to dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 12/15: Data from aspirational peers checked by chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 5/16: Updated data presented to dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 12/16: Data from aspirational peers checked by chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 5/17: Updated data presented to dean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
<th>see above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>see above and also separate “timeline” chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>The Association of Departments of English of the MLA does not have this data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Recommendation B.5

(high-cost)

Increase travel and research support for faculty, instructors, and students. Tenured/Tenure-track faculty, instructors, and students repeatedly expressed concern about the lack of adequate resources to travel to professional conferences to present scholarly papers or to conduct research. To be on par with aspirational institutions, commitment to travel and research must be a priority of the Department, College, and University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>by 5/14: While gathering data in B.4 above, chair gathers this data as well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 12/14: Chair invites VP for Research to faculty mtg. to discuss our needs; Executive Committee makes recommendation based on data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 5/15: Chair presents recommendations to dean and implements where possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
<th>see above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>see above and also separate “timeline” chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>The official travel budget allocation per professor has not changed since 1831.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Recommendation B.6

(high-cost)

Allocate adequate work space and resources for PTTIs and FTTIs. With the proliferation of contract instructors, access to office space, computers, printers, and basic office supplies has been limited. A Coordinator of Instructors (see #2 above) could help ensure that instructors have the necessary supplies to provide a quality learning experience for their students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by 5/14: Chair gathers information from instructor liaisons to clarify what is meant by this item (apart from Biology Bldg issues)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 12/14: Chair makes any adjustments that are possible within our current constraints, involving the Space and Facilities Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 5/15: Chair continues to ask for additional space from dean that is appropriate to our needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15: Chair makes any adjustments that are possible within our current constraints, involving the S&amp;F Com.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/16: Chair continues to ask for additional space from dean that is appropriate to our needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16: Chair makes any adjustments that are possible within our current constraints, involving the S&amp;F Com.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
<th>see above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>see above and also separate “timeline” chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>The work space issue is out of the control of the department. We would welcome a better facility with appropriate office space for our instructors. We were recently given the last space controlled by the dean to use for office space for FTTIs. We have recently increased the number of printers for departmental use, and the number of computers for FTTIs in particular. It is unclear what is meant by the claim that access to “basic office supplies has been limited.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultant Recommendation A.1

(low-cost)

The Department needs to create a plan for the Department as a whole instead of a plan for each of the various subdivisions. This will require some extended discussion about what the identity of the
Department is, or could be, and how it wants to be known. The budgetary realities require that academic planning makes choices of what to do more of and what to do less of what to do first and what must wait. The plan must decide which areas will have priority over others based on what is best and possible to accomplish for the department to reach is collective goals. The plan should extend over at least three years. To build programs instead of competing internally to maintain the status quo may require phasing in resources to the same priorities over a period of a few years. Focusing on a new priority every year or revising the plan with each retirement or departure guarantees that nothing much will change. Each request for funding should have a clear rationale based on how it addresses the plan to build a better department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Combine with Committee’s A.1 above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultant Recommendation A.2**

(*low-cost*)

The Department has an unusually large number of endowments from various sources, but apparently is not benefiting from these resources as fully as may be possible. In consultation with the Dean, the Department needs to develop a full and open understanding of how these funds may be used. Once you know the range of flexibility in each fund, you can better develop a plan for how best to invest these funds to further the departmental plan. If any of the endowment agreements limits its usefulness, work with the dean to change the agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>by 5/14: Chair, administrative specialist, directors of CW and Strode, new person in dean's office meet to begin discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 12/14: The same group makes recommendations to Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by 5/15: Plan implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>see above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>see above and also separate “timeline” chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>The consultant appears to have misunderstood the admittedly utterly confusing spreadsheet format that presents accumulation at a particular point in the middle of the year but does not reveal how we typically spend our funds down (e.g., for undergraduate awards, graduate stipends, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultant Recommendation A.3**

(*low-cost*)

2013-2014 Program Review Page 298 of 311
Increase the prestige of the MFA by limiting admissions and making them more select.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Response from CW faculty: Dr. Pratt’s recommendation for the MFA program to limit admission represents a misunderstanding of our conversation. UA’s MFA program is currently ranked 18th in the nation. We identified our areas of weakness as (1) heavy teaching load (2/2) for our graduate students and (2) teacher:student ratio higher than most other MFA programs of our ilk. Our program is already highly selective, and the Dean of the Graduate school has if anything encouraged graduate programs such as ours to increase in size. We view the consultant’s recommendation as out of step with the goals of the university and our program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultant Recommendation A.4

*(low-cost)*

The Department should look for ways to reflect more of the range of the discipline in its curriculum and to ease the demand for survey courses and large lectures to meet college or campus requirements. Revising the College requirement of two sections of literature survey to allow a number of other literature courses to meet the required hours could open up the curriculum.

| Action(s)                              | by 5/14: Executive Committee creates Ad Hoc Committee to clarify possibilities  
|                                       | by 12/14: Ad Hoc Committee reports to faculty  
|                                       | by 5/15: Department engages with Core Curriculum Oversight Committee to discuss possibilities  
|                                       | by 12/15: Faculty considers possible changes  
|                                       | by 5/16: Faculty approves any changes and submits for required institutional approval  
|                                       | by 12/16: Implementation of any changes  
|                                       | by 5/17: Monitoring  
| Responsible Person(s) | see above |
| Timeline to Completion | see above and also separate “timeline” chart |
| Comments | Fulfillment of this recommendation falls beyond the immediate purview of the Department, as the suggested changes involve the adjustment of the university’s core curriculum. This recommendation should therefore become part of a larger discussion |
between the Department and the Core Curriculum Oversight Committee.

## Consultant Recommendation A.5

*(low-cost)*

**Explore the possibility of a Writing Across the Curriculum program which approved courses in other departments that could satisfy three of the six hours of required composition.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
<th>Timeline to Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by 5/14: in conjunction with Committee A.4 re future of FWP, Executive Committee considers whether we want to bring in an outside consultant</td>
<td>see above</td>
<td>see above and also separate “timeline” chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 12/14: Consultant visit (if deemed desirable) and report to faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 5/15: Chair arranges meeting with A&amp;S dean and provost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 12/15:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While we agree with the sense of the program reviewer that a Writing-Across-the-Curriculum (WAC) program could be a valuable resource for the university and our students, in the view of our writing program and composition faculty, this suggestion would not be a low-cost undertaking, nor would it relieve the staffing burden for first-year composition. Most successful WAC programs are implemented under the directorship of a senior, tenured faculty member hired specifically to serve as Director of University Writing, a position that would be needed to direct and oversee the development of first-year writing courses taught across the curriculum rather than centered in the English Department. At Auburn University, for instance, this kind of program has been put in place as a QEP area of emphasis, with QEP-level funding—though their first-year writing program remains in their English Department, with a WAC approach to writing instruction in EN 102. Both our EN 101 and EN 102 courses at UA already take a WAC approach, using WAC-focused rhetoric texts and offering instruction in writing a variety of academic genre typically assigned in courses across the curriculum (summary, paraphrase, and quotation skills; response; critique; analysis; synthesis). In our view, the best approach that the department can take to ease the staffing burden of our general education requirements would be to continue developing our large-lecture courses at the 200-level level, a move that frees up more...
Consultant Recommendation A.6

*(low-cost)*

*Revise the CLFT policy to make sure that it better fits the function of lecturers and to remove such unneeded procedures as outside letters of review and an “up or out” policy for those who are not tenure eligible.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Wait for revision at level of Provost’s office; upon receipt of revised policy, revise Departmental policy to conform within a semester.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Chair and Executive Committee, CLTF Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>see above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Given that the CLTF policy is currently undergoing revision at the level of the Provost’s Office, the Department will wait until we receive the revised policy and then consider the recommendation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultant Recommendation A.7

*(low-cost)*

*Develop assessment rubrics for specific courses for use in measuring student learning.*

| Action(s)   | by 5/14: In conjunction with Consultant rec. A.4 above, Assessment Committee revises existing Disciplinary Knowledge Assessment Survey (DKAS).  
by 12/14: Assessment Committee develops draft assessment rubrics for gateway courses and capstone courses  
by 5/15: Assessment Committee presents rubrics for approval by faculty |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Assessment Committee, chaired by Assistant Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>see above and also separate “timeline” chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Consultant Recommendation A.8

*(low-cost)*

Develop an interdisciplinary Linguistics minor.

| Action(s) | by 5/14: Linguists complete proposal for interdisciplinary linguistics minor, in collaboration with linguists across campus
|           | by 12/14: Approval of participating departments secured
|           | by 5/15: College approval secured
|           | by 12/15: Launch of new minor

| Responsible Person(s) | see above
| Timeline to Completion | see above and also separate “timeline” chart
| Comments | |

Consultant Recommendation A.9

*(low-cost)*

The Department has seven different enrollment caps for different kinds of courses. The use of so many different rules for capping courses creates a perception of inequities in work load. The Department should settle on three: one for writing classes (15-20); one for graduate seminars (12); and one for all other courses (28-32). As much as possible given the different fields, faculty assignments each year should strive for a rough equity so that one faculty member is not regularly teaching 20 students per semester and another is teaching 65.

| Action(s) | See plan for Committee A.3 above.
| Responsible Person(s) | |
| Timeline to Completion | |
| Comments | |

Consultant Recommendation B.1

*(high-cost)*

The number of needs in the writing curriculum and in training GTAs to teach composition far exceeds the ability of four TT faculty members to meet. TT faculty trained in Composition and Rhetoric should
supervise First Year Writing and teach a required graduate-level seminar in Composition Theory and Practice to Ph.D. level TAs. At least two TT hires in Composition and Rhetoric should be authorized as soon as possible, and a long-range plan to meet the anticipated growth in enrollment should be developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Combine with Committee A.4 re FWP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultant Recommendation B.2**

*(high-cost)*

The balance in the Department between the TT faculty and all other instructional personnel must be improved. The Department needs more TT faculty to teach more of the undergraduate courses, and when the Department has worked out a priority-driven plan for building its programs and can justify its requests for new lines in terms of that plan, the Dean's office should give it a priority on new TT hires. A department that teaches 506 sections of English a year (and growing) and provides 114 GTAs to help cover the demand cannot do it at an acceptable university-level with 34 TT faculty without draining the strength of the Department in other areas. It should be an administrative priority to improve the balance between permanent and temporary faculty to preserve the integrity of the academic programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>See Committee B.1 and also recommendations re long-term plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultant Recommendation B.3**

*(high-cost)*

Faculty salaries and graduate stipends are clearly lower than at the Very High Research institutions on the Aspiration list, but it is not clear from the review materials how they compare with other High Research institutions. The Department or College should do a comparative study of salaries and stipends at peer institutions in locations with similar costs of living to see what kinds of adjustments need to be made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Combine with Committee B.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultant Recommendation B.4

(high-cost)

Like many other departments which would like to reduce the 2-2 teaching load of GTAs, the Department is probably locked into the economics of staffing freshman English by funding teaching assistantships. What might be in the realm of possibility is finding scholarships or other funds to provide a 2-1 load for one year for each GTA. Teaching assignments that require only one preparation also help to reduce the time spent in teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by 5/14: Chair recommends to Assistant Chair to prioritize teaching assignments of one prep where possible (and desired)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 12/14: Chair determines amount of funding needed for plan described in recommendation; Development Committee creates plan to raise funds for this purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 5/15: Development Committee implements plan and secures funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 12/15: Exec Com creates plan to implement the teaching reduction; DC continues to raise funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by 5/16: Chair implements plan as pilot; DC continues to raise funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsible Person(s) see above

Timeline to Completion see above and also separate “timeline: chart

Comments

Consultant Recommendation B.5

(high-cost)

The increase in enrollment at UA has increased the work load of a relatively small office staff. Non-TT instructors and GTAs generate more personnel paperwork than TT faculty, for one example, and the student traffic, scheduling, and advising demands on staff are heavy. One additional office staff is needed to alleviate some of the work pressure in the department office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Combine with Committee B.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Timeline for English Department Action Plan in Response to Program Review 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations by Internal Committee and by External Consultant</th>
<th>By May 2014 Spring Semester</th>
<th>By Dec. 2014 Fall Semester</th>
<th>By May 2015 Spring Semester</th>
<th>By Dec. 2015 Fall Semester</th>
<th>By May 2016 Spring Semester</th>
<th>By Dec. 2016 Fall Semester</th>
<th>By May 2017 — when third-year review must be done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee A.1 (see also Consultant A.1) Dept vision and long-term strategic plan</td>
<td>Exec Com creates framework to begin conversation at Aug. retreat</td>
<td>Ad Hoc Committee created at retreat reports on models of English Departments and presents first draft of vision and long-term strategic plan to faculty</td>
<td>Final version completed for Annual Review meeting with hiring priorities</td>
<td>Hiring priorities guided by Plan</td>
<td>Hiring priorities guided by Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee A.2 (see also Committee B.2) Integrating FTTIs into the department</td>
<td>Ad Hoc Exploratory Committee formed by chair from volunteers among FTTIs, professors, CLTF to work on both this rec and also the Coordinator of Instructors below at B.2</td>
<td>Draft proposal submitted to faculty</td>
<td>Draft proposal modified in relation to Coordinator of Instructors proposal (Com. B.2)</td>
<td>New policy for Governance Document approved</td>
<td>Implementati on of policy</td>
<td>Monitoring of policy</td>
<td>Monitoring of policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee A.3 (see also Consultant A.9) Enrollment caps</td>
<td>Deliberations on course caps will follow conversations in A.1 above</td>
<td>See A.1 above</td>
<td>See A.1 above</td>
<td>Exec Com works with spreadsheet to evaluate need for new policy</td>
<td>New policy, if any, presented to faculty</td>
<td>Any changes in enrollment caps are in place</td>
<td>Monitoring of effects of any change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee A.4 (see also Consultant B.1)</td>
<td>Committee A.5 Plan for future of FWP</td>
<td>Committee B.1 (see Consultant B.2)</td>
<td>Committee B.2 (see also A.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current and future chairs discuss visions of future of FWP with WPA and CRES faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hire more TT faculty to improve ratio</td>
<td>Creation of Coordinator of Instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair and Exec Com create plan for future of FWP with input from outside consultant with FWP experience?</td>
<td>Update departmental website</td>
<td>Chair gathers more detailed feedback from committee; Technology Committee clarifies website policies and reviews other websites</td>
<td>Combine with A.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair and Exec Com arrange meeting with A&amp;S dean and Provost to discuss plan</td>
<td>Technology Committee makes recommendation for any updates.</td>
<td>Ad Hoc Committee gathers data from OIRA to present to dean</td>
<td>Ad Hoc Committee explores models in other universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair and Exec Com arrange meeting with A&amp;S dean and Provost to discuss plan</td>
<td>Review of website by Technology Committee for tweaking</td>
<td>Make any hires; Continue to present data to dean</td>
<td>Make any approval recommendations to faculty; if plan is approved, other approvals secured—for hiring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistical considerations sorted out</td>
<td>Review of website by Technology Committee for tweaking</td>
<td>Review of website by Technology Committee for tweaking</td>
<td>Review of website by Technology Committee for tweaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan approved</td>
<td>Make any hires; Continue to present data to dean</td>
<td>Make any hires; Continue to present data to dean</td>
<td>Make any hires; Continue to present data to dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall of 2016 plan in place</td>
<td>Update of website</td>
<td>Review of website by Technology Committee for tweaking</td>
<td>Review of website by Technology Committee for tweaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for future of FWP</td>
<td>Review of website by Technology Committee for tweaking</td>
<td>Make any hires; Continue to present data to dean</td>
<td>Review of website by Technology Committee for tweaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring of new plan</td>
<td>Review of website by Technology Committee for tweaking</td>
<td>Make any hires; Continue to present data to dean</td>
<td>Make any approval recommendations to faculty; if plan is approved, other approvals secured—for hiring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee B.3</td>
<td>Chair and staff write job descriptions for two positions for hiring requests</td>
<td>new staff member (s) hired and learning job</td>
<td>if only one new position in place, chair asks for second position</td>
<td>second new staff member hired and learning job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee B.4</td>
<td>Chair contacts counterparts at aspirational institutions to get available data to present to dean</td>
<td>Data from aspirational peers checked by chair</td>
<td>Updated data presented to dean</td>
<td>Data from aspirational peers checked by chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee B.5</td>
<td>While gathering data in B.4 above, chair gathers this data as well</td>
<td>Chair invites VP for Research to faculty mtg. to discuss our needs; Exec Com makes recommendation based on data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee B.6</td>
<td>Chair gathers information from instructor liaisons to clarify what is meant by this item (apart from Biology Bldg)</td>
<td>Chair makes any adjustments that are possible within our current constraints, involving the Space and Facilities Committee</td>
<td>Chair continues to ask for additional space from dean that is appropriate to our needs</td>
<td>Chair continues to ask for additional space from dean that is appropriate to our needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair makes any adjustments that are possible within our current constraints, involving the Space and Facilities Committee</td>
<td>Chair continues to ask for additional space from dean that is appropriate to our needs</td>
<td>Chair makes any adjustments that are possible within our current constraints, involving the Space and Facilities Committee</td>
<td>Chair continues to ask for additional space from dean that is appropriate to our needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant A.1: Department needs to create a plan as a whole</td>
<td>Combine with Committee's A.1 above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant A.2: Create plan to use endowments better</td>
<td>Chair, administrative specialist, directors of CW and Strode, new person in dean's office meet to begin discussion.</td>
<td>The same group makes recommendations to Executive Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant A.3 Limit admissions to MFA</td>
<td>no action on this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant A.4 Revise UG curriculum</td>
<td>Exec Com creates Ad Hoc Committee to clarify possibilities.</td>
<td>Ad Hoc Committee reports to faculty.</td>
<td>Dept engages with Core Curriculum Oversight Committee to discuss possibilities.</td>
<td>Faculty considers possible changes.</td>
<td>Faculty approves any changes and submits for required institutional approvals.</td>
<td>Implementation of any changes</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant A.5 Explore Writing Across Curriculum</td>
<td>in conjunction with Committee A.4 re future of FWP, Exec Com consider whether we want to bring in an outside consultant</td>
<td>Consultant visit (if deemed desirable) and report to faculty</td>
<td>Chair arranges meeting with A&amp;S dean and provost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant A.6 Revise CLTF policy</td>
<td>wait for revision at level of Provost's office</td>
<td>upon receipt of revised policy, revise departmental policy appropriately</td>
<td>upon receipt of revised policy, revise departmental policy appropriately</td>
<td>upon receipt of revised policy, revise departmental policy appropriately</td>
<td>upon receipt of revised policy, revise departmental policy appropriately</td>
<td>upon receipt of revised policy, revise departmental policy appropriately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant A.7</td>
<td>In conjunction with Consultant rec. A.4 above, Assessment Committee revises existing DKAS</td>
<td>Assessment Committee develops draft assessment rubrics for gateway courses and capstone courses</td>
<td>Assessment Committee presents rubrics for approval by faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant A.8</td>
<td>Linguists complete proposal.</td>
<td>Approval of participating departments secured.</td>
<td>College approval secured</td>
<td>Launch of new minor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant A.9</td>
<td>See plan for Committee A.3 above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant B.1</td>
<td>Combine with Committee A.4 re FWP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant B.2</td>
<td>See Committee B.1 and also recs re long-term plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant B.3</td>
<td>Combine with Committee B.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant B.4</td>
<td>Chair recommends to Assistant Chair to prioritize teaching assignments of one prep where possible</td>
<td>Chair determines amount of funding needed for plan describes in rec; Development Committee creates plan to raise funds for this purpose.</td>
<td>Development Committee implements plan and secure funds</td>
<td>Exec Com creates plan to implement the teaching reduction; DC continues to raise funds</td>
<td>Chair implements plan as pilot; DC continues to raise funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant B.6</td>
<td>Combine with Committee B.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Consultant B.4 | Chair recommends to Assistant Chair to prioritize teaching assignments of one prep where possible | Chair determines amount of funding needed for plan describes in rec; Development Committee creates plan to raise funds for this purpose. | Development Committee implements plan and secure funds | Exec Com creates plan to implement the teaching reduction; DC continues to raise funds | Chair implements plan as pilot; DC continues to raise funds |  |
|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|  |
| Consultant B.6 | Combine with Committee B.3 |  |  |  |  |  |