PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

REVIEW PROCESS

The Department of English prepared a self-study following program review guidelines. A two-person external review team reviewed the self-study document, visited the campus in late January 2002, interviewed unit personnel and university administrators, and submitted a written report. The Program Review Committee (PRC) read the self-study and the external review report and a committee representative met with Department faculty. This document includes summaries of the self-study and external review reports, as well as the PRC's findings and recommendations.

An over-all Department self-study sets forth a number of broad conclusions and recommendations. It is followed by self-studies of Departmental programs: Rhetoric and Writing, Literature, Integrated Language Arts (ILA), Scientific and Technical Communication (S&TC), English as a Second Language (ESL), and Creative Writing. The General Studies Writing Program (GSW) underwent self-study in 2000-01 separately, to coordinate with the program review of General Education. The following summary of the self-study is based on the format of, and draws principally from, the over-all self-study.

SUMMARY OF THE SELF-STUDY

Mission and History

The Department's 1994 "Mission Statement" sets forth the following:

This is a department of English studies, so its goals focus on the study and teaching of literature (particularly written in English) and literary theory and criticism, of linguistics and the English language, and of writing. Admittedly, this Literature/Language/Writing formulation is artificially neat; the membranes separating "literature," "language," and "writing" leak badly and often break down, as do those separating "English studies" from broad intellectual, cultural, communications, and literacy studies of which they are a part. Still, literature, language, and writing provide a convenient way for people to view the mission of the English Department.

... Through a broad range of general education courses and a rich selection of more specialized curricula (majors and minors) ... the Department of English
vitally contributes to BGSU's commitment to a meaningful and useful liberal education and provides the intellectual foundation for students' postgraduate or professional careers. Through programs of advanced study at the masters and doctoral levels, the Department of English provides opportunities for specialized disciplinary inquiry and professional training, and an environment that challenges students to question old knowledge and seek new syntheses.

This Departmental mission advances the University "Vision" Statement of 1996 with its commitment to offering "distinctive undergraduate programs, focused master's . . . degrees and a select number of nationally recognized doctoral programs."

Through a broad range of distinctive programs, the Department advances four broad student learning outcomes: the effective use of writing to explore subject matter and to communicate; an understanding of subject matter in relation to broader historical and or cultural contexts; connections between theory and practice; and creative and/or critical thinking.

The Department traces its origins to the founding of BGSU in 1914. It was among the first majors when the College of Liberal Arts was established in 1929, among the first M.A. programs when they were established in 1935, and the first department to offer the Ph.D. when the Board of Trustees authorized doctoral programs in 1960. It has evolved toward its present emphasis on English studies, a reflection of the movement beyond the early concentration on literature toward greater emphasis on technical communication, rhetoric and composition, and teaching English as a second language.

During the past decade, the Department faced a number of problems resulting from the non-replacement of retiring faculty, the ending of the state subsidy for the Ph.D. in literature, and changes in the requirements for high school English teachers.

The Department

Overview. The Department is complex and diverse with some 13 programs. It is comprised of 30 tenured and probationary faculty (actually 24.0 FTE), 5 lecturers, 36 other full-time instructors, 5 full-time and 2 part-time supporting classified staff, 1 administrative staff member, 18 part-time instructional staff, and 67 graduate assistants. It has 5 other graduate students, 424 undergraduate majors, 50 undergraduate minors, and a recent annual enrollment of 2,600 FTE students enrolled in 39,000 semesters hours of instruction. Department administration is provided by the Chair, Assistant Chair, Coordinator of Graduate Studies, Director of General Studies Writing (GSW), several program directors, and several individuals who provide academic and career advising for undergraduates. The Creative Writing Program is semi-autonomous with a separate operating budget administered by a program director, who is appointed by the Department Chair. For purposes of this self-study, the Department is described in the two broad categories of Undergraduate Education and Graduate Programs.
Undergraduate Education: General Education. The Department offers programs in General Education—GSW, General Studies Literature (GSL), and Great Ideas. The GSW review of 2000-01 brought welcomed recommendations for increased support and for closer interaction between the GSW and the Rhetoric and Writing Ph.D. program. GSL consists primarily of English 150 and 200, the latter of which has suffered a sharp decline in enrollment in recent years; the Department has taken steps to bring 200 in line with General Education Program guidelines. Great Ideas (A&S 250) is an interdisciplinary course, which the English Department is now responsible for staffing and coordinating.

Undergraduate Education: Major-Minor. The Department offers the BA English Major (Literature), BS Integrated Language Arts in conjunction with the College of Education, BA & BS in Technical Communication, BFA in Creative Writing, and minors in English Literature, Scientific and Technical Communication, and Creative Writing.

Undergraduate Education: College and University Support Programs. The Department provides: ESL instruction for international undergraduate students; Children's/Adolescent Literature, which serves Elementary Education and middle school/secondary schools ILA programs; Technical Writing, which is required in several programs; and service to other non-department programs including Women's Studies, American Culture Studies, Theatre, Film Studies, Chapman Residential Community, and the Honors Program. The Children's/Adolescent Literature has expanded from two 300-level courses to a third in order to meet new Language Arts requirements; the Department has had difficulty meeting demand for these courses.

Graduate Programs. The Department offers the Ph.D. in Rhetoric and Writing, MFA in Creative Writing, M.A. in English, M.A. in Technical Writing, M.A. in Teaching English as Second Language (TESL), and ESL instruction for international students.

Faculty Resources

The Department has experienced important changes in recent years, notably an increase in the number of full-time faculty and a reduction of part-time faculty. The number of tenured/probationary faculty available for Department teaching/service, however, has declined as a result of retirements and outside assignments; this situation will be alleviated in part by three tenure-line appointments for 2002-03. The drop in tenure-line faculty accounts for the reliance on non-tenure line faculty for lower division undergraduate teaching, limits program development and advising, and reduces the merit pool. The increase in full-time non-tenured faculty has reduced the reliance on part-time faculty and strengthened GSW; the renewable three-year appointments permit retention of effective undergraduate teachers. The Department's gender and ethnic profile has changed dramatically in the last ten years. In 1993, the full-time faculty was evenly split between the genders, but tenure-line appointments were two-thirds male. Today the proportion is two-to-one female-to-male among both all full-time faculty and tenure-line faculty. Change has been less evident in ethnic diversity, with about 90% of all full-time faculty being white. The faculty are committed to being effective teacher-scholars.
Graduate Assistant Resources

Graduate assistants are principally involved in teaching and administrative assignments. There are 67 graduate assistants in 2001-02, which is the lowest number in the past eight years, and reflects competitive disadvantages in recruitment. The decline in the number of graduate assistants has eliminated the use of any as research assistants.

Staff Resources

The Department has an office-manager, four full-time secretaries, and two part-time secretaries, who work as an effective unit.

Information Regarding Majors

Since 1994-95, the number of undergraduate English majors has increased by about one hundred students, reaching 424 in 2000-01, although this is likely attributable to the replacement of the English Education program by Integrated Language Arts, which meant the absorption of students who were formerly Speech, Journalism, and Theatre education majors. The number of BA English literature majors have dropped 20% in the last seven years and the number of minors has decreased. Over the same period, the total number of students enrolled in English graduate programs has decreased from 132 to 82, which reflects a substantial reduction in the backlog of unfinished students, the loss of the Ph.D. in literature (felt not only directly in terms of students in that area, but indirectly through the unfavorable publicity attendant to the OBOR program review), insufficient resources for recruitment, and the economic upswing of the late 1990s. A drop in the number of applicants and the high rate of applicants matriculating indicate that the Department is not attracting the quality of graduate students that it would like. Retention of graduate students and completion of degrees, however, have been good.

Instructional Service Provided to Other Areas of the University

The Department provides teaching and administrative resources to various interdepartmental and University programs, including: Continuing Education; Chapman Learning Community; Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology; American Culture Studies; Honors Program; Institute for the Study of Culture and Society; ESL Instructional Program; Great Ideas; Women's Studies; and Film Studies.

Facilities and Equipment

East Hall, to which the Department moved in 1997, provides office space for staff and faculty, two regular classrooms, three seminar rooms, two computer classrooms, and a graduate student computer work room. Most computer equipment for office use and for tenure-line faculty is adequate. Computers for full-time instructors are inadequate and the technical writing classroom is ill-equipped.
Information Resources and Services

Software available on the University net meets most of the Department’s needs.

Financial Resources

GA stipends at other English departments in comparable universities in Ohio underline a comparative disadvantage in recruitment. This has lessened at the Ph.D. level due to a recent increase in stipends, but the disparity at the M.A. level remains considerable. While the disadvantage has been in stipends more than in loads, the Department welcomes the recent measures by the Graduate College and the College of Arts and Sciences to reduce teaching loads for first-year M.A. and Ph.D. students.

Self-Evaluation of Programs

The separate self-studies make clear that the Department provides a wide range of programs that serve the needs of students, serve a number of distinctive niches of academic interest, and contribute to a wide range of interdisciplinary efforts and emphases. Its programs include several (Creative Writing, Technical Writing, Rhetoric and Writing) with strong national reputations, and among its faculty are many with strong records of scholarly productivity, teaching, and service. At the same time, the self-studies underline a vitality that is evident, for instance, in curricular revision of the Literature M.A., the modifications in the preliminary exam process in the Rhetoric and Writing Ph.D., and Creative Writing’s attention to its disadvantages in recruitment. The principal concern of the Department is inadequate faculty resources resulting from the reduction in FTE tenured and probationary faculty. Inadequate operating funds and graduate assistant stipends are also matters of concern in all areas of the Department.

Unit Planning

Planning for the next seven years focuses on three broad areas: Program Effectiveness and Growth; Faculty Strength and Development; and Student Development and Success. Each of these is divided into General Department Goals, Goals Specific to Major Programs; and Goals Specific to Department Sponsored University Programs. There is, of course, overlap among these goals; and movement toward achieving some of them has begun.

**General Department Goals: Program Effectiveness and Growth.**

- An improved and expanded website which will be instrumental in recruitment.
- The maintenance of reassigned time to support program directorships.
- Secure funding for detailed graduate program advertisement in Peterson's Guide.

**General Department Goals: Faculty Strength and Success.**

- Strengthen programs by replacement of tenured and probationary faculty losses due to retirement and administrative assignments outside the Department and by the addition of faculty in areas of growth. Sufficient tenure-line positions have been
authorized for English Education and S&TC, but shortages remain in Literature, Rhetoric and Writing, and TESL/Linguistics.

• Reduction of burn-out among full-time non-tenure-line faculty by
• increasing number of lectureships and reducing teaching loads of instructors and lecturers.
• improvement of working conditions for part-time instructors through some form of proportional benefits.

**General Department Goals: Student Strength and Success.**

• Development of screening systems for admission to various majors.
• Improvement of the quality of graduate students by stronger recruitment and retention efforts and increased stipends.
• Assignment of GA's in more flexible ways that will enhance their professional development and provide administrative help to the Department.
• Development of curricular changes (with additional faculty resources) to meet increased demands resulting from the new ILA program and growth in Elementary Education.

Each of the Department's programs elaborates on these general objectives, some of which are in the process of being addressed:

**Rhetoric and Writing.**

• Promote program effectiveness and growth by exploring ways to utilize technology in the writing courses, providing leadership in the writing-across-the-curriculum initiatives, forging closer connections with the GSW program, encouraging involvement of emeritus faculty, increasing compensation of the program's assistant, establishing a post-doctoral fellowship, and annual review of the program.
• Promote faculty strength and development by improving the climate for research through teaching loads comparable to other doctoral programs, and gaining additional probationary, visiting professor, and senior faculty lines.
• Promote student strength and success by establishing a more formal colloquium program, expanding the range of internships and other experiences for Ph.D. students, providing training in the use of technology in writing courses, refining and regularizing use of the Goals Based Assessment Form, increasing the number of teaching and research assistantships, and expanding student recruitment.

**Literature.**

• Revision of the M.A. Plan I in ways that draw upon the University's interdisciplinary strengths would lead to a unique program.
• Improvement of research reputation, external sponsorship, and relations with international constituents.
• Restoration of strength in Literature through additional tenure-line appointments.
• Monitor newly implemented BA program.
**Creative Writing.**

- Maintain national stature of BFA and MFA programs by expanding recruitment, increasing support for Prairie Margins and Visiting Writers series, and promotion of the Mid-American Review.
- Improve reputation, external sponsorship, and relationships with constituents through the Open Writing Workshop Series.
- Re-establish the Distinguished Visiting Writer position, an annual one-semester position, and establish, in conjunction with American Culture Studies and Ethnic Studies, the James Baldwin Writer in Residence as a one-year visiting position.
- Improve the publishing profile of MFA students and involve graduate students in the editorial process of Mid-American Review and continue to involve undergraduates in the production of Prairie Margins.

**Scientific and Technical Communication.**

- Achieve greater community and regional presence by establishing partnerships with external organizations and an Advisory Board drawn from business/industry and academia, and developing an S&TC student-produced magazine.
- Improve research reputation, external sponsorship, and relations with constituents by making programs more international, seeking interaction with programs in China and Eastern Europe, and by improving hardware/software and other technologies.
- Ensure that graduate programs are competitive by improved recruiting through a sustainable, interactive website.
- Fill two positions for which searches are currently authorized.
- Develop online courses leading to an online degree at the graduate level.
- Establish Comprehensive Resource Faculty for S&TC students.

**Secondary Education/Integrated Language Arts.**

- Promote cross-departmental and cross-divisional cooperation and collaboration through strengthening English presence in ILA program and establishing an interdisciplinary ILA committee.
- Achieve greater community and regional presence by revising the M.A. Plan II and targeting it toward middle and secondary teachers.
- Improve teacher training by seeking curricular revisions, increased staffing, and revisions in the methods course.
- Examine ILA program in terms of NCATE Review.
- Seek to integrate program requirements with qualifying test.

**Teaching English as a Second Language.**

- Establish cognate program in College of Education.
- Restore faculty strength by adding faculty member in TESL/Linguistics.
- Expand Intensive English Program.
- Develop an International Teaching Assistant Program in cooperation with the Communication Disorders Department

**Summary of the External Reviewers Report**
The two-member external review team observed that the Department is typical of English departments at public institutions in that it is large and complex, and that many of the Department's programs enjoy national recognition. It has hired some excellent new faculty. It is housed in a well-designed new building. The Department, however, has faced serious challenges resulting from the retirement of a number of distinguished faculty, the reorganization of English Education, the state's elimination of funding for the doctoral program in literature, the creation of several programs that risk fragmentation and loss of shared enterprise, and the reassignment of a number of faculty to various administrative positions.

**External Report Recommendations**

**Literature.**

- That the Literature faculty be precise about the positions they seek, specifying projected contributions of new hires.
  The Literature faculty seem to be anticipating traditional literary periods in prospective hiring, but historical coverage is not emphasized in the present undergraduate program or the planned M.A. program. Literature would benefit from faculty whose training would enable them to contribute to GEL and other aspects of the curriculum. The administration needs to recognize the depletion of faculty resources in literature. The releases for internal administration and administrative assignments outside the Department seem to be justified.

- That the Literature faculty become more involved in General Education Literature courses especially through teaching in the program and participation in the professional development of its staff.
  The tenure-line Literature faculty seem disconnected from the General Education Literature program, but they have much to contribute to general education and to the attraction of English majors through the General Education courses. The most feasible way of incorporating the Literature faculty may be to develop large General Education lecture courses and to assign them to tenure-line faculty who excel at teaching. Non-tenure line Literature faculty would benefit from closer interaction with their tenure-line colleagues.

- That the Literature faculty plan a new M.A. that has a distinct identity, consulting with the Graduate College and collaborating with the Rhetoric and Writing faculty in its development. This might be called Literature, Rhetoric, and Culture or Literature, Writing, and Culture.
  The plan for a distinct "niche" M.A. makes sense to the external team. The Graduate Dean has considerable experience that ought to be utilized in the planning. The Literature faculty has given emphasis to culture studies in their planning, but ought not overlook their colleagues in Rhetoric and Writing and other programs, many of whom have experience with culture studies, but who can also broaden the M.A.. Since M.A. programs are typically "feeders" to the Ph.D., the redesigned MA in Literature ought to integrate rhetoric and writing.
• That the Literature faculty in three or four years evaluate the new requirements for the undergraduate major. Review is always timely, but especially so in this case since the revised major has yet to reverse the decline in majors.

Rhetoric and Writing.
• That the Rhetoric and Writing faculty explicitly define their mission as rhetoric and culture studies, not just teaching of writing. Rhetoric and Writing faculty identify the teaching of writing as their focus, and the attention to writing pedagogy is one of the program's strength. Yet in their scholarship and teaching, most Rhetoric and Writing faculty are concerned with broader issues of rhetoric and culture studies. This ought to become an official part of their mission.

• That the Rhetoric and Writing faculty become more conspicuously involved in the GSW Program, especially through rotating the directorship and contributing to the staff's professional development. The Rhetoric and Writing faculty's commitment to GSW is not as productive and visible as it could be. It is unusual for a director of GSW to serve for as long as thirteen years. The plan to rotate the directorship every four years ought to be implemented. GSW faculty would welcome professional development workshops offered by the Rhetoric and Writing faculty.

• That the teaching load of Rhetoric and Writing faculty be reduced from five to four courses, consistent with the loads in other doctoral programs. Compared with other programs at Bowling Green and around the country, the five-course load is high and the reduction to four courses would enable the faculty to be more productive.

General Studies Writing.
• That General Studies Writing experiment with incorporating graduate students from other departments into its staff. This step would increase GSW visibility, enhance the composition program generally, and help to build a Writing Across the Curriculum program.

• That the GSW Director consider ways of granting more autonomy to experienced lecturers, instructors, and part-time faculty. The need for consistency is important, but experienced faculty ought to be given greater latitude in assigning texts and planning syllabi.

Writing Across the Curriculum.
• That the University move toward a Writing Across the Curriculum program, not only by encouraging GSW to use graduate students from other departments but also by gathering data about writing tasks in other departments. Writing Across the Curriculum, however worthy a goal, will fail without careful planning. Consultation with appropriate departments and information on writing tasks
assigned in other departments need to be undertaken before a formal apparatus is established.

**Lecturers, Instructors, and Part-Time Faculty.**
- That the Department work toward securing semester-long professional leaves for non-tenure stream faculty. Faculty in both GSW and General Education Literature have endured heavy teaching loads for several years and run a risk of burn out. The Department should provide periodic leaves that might be used to pursue professional growth. This will be difficult to negotiate, but is necessary for the vitality of the faculty.

**Integrated Language Arts.**
- That the ILA program be returned to English and that every attempt be made to persuade the State to permit a focus on rigorous disciplinary training for certification. The current ILA program is unworkable, and correction will necessitate making representations to the State on the shortcomings of the concept of "language arts" and coordination with the College of Education and Human Development. The Department itself must determine whether it has the resources and the interest to meet the responsibility for this program.

**Creative Writing.**
- That the Creative Writing Program secretary be restored to full-time and a line be added for visiting faculty, and that program initiatives be supported including recruitment and the Mid America Review. Creative Writing has met its recent challenges effectively, including the recruitment of dynamic new faculty, a more selective undergraduate program, and taking steps to forge students into the community. The faculty are highly productive and the MFA is known and recruits nationally. Grants have been raised and outreach programs initiated. The program presents well-considered requests, deserving of serious consideration.

**Scientific and Technical Communication.**
- That current recruiting in Scientific and Technical Communication be completed and the instructional computing facility be substantially improved. A small, collegially-run program, which is recognized off campus for its quality, Scientific and Technical Communication functions as something of an enclave within the Department and its greater interaction with other programs ought to be encouraged. The current recruitment of two faculty lines will enable the program to remain strong. Steps appear to be underway to remedy the woeful inadequacy of the computer-aided instructional facility. The campus process for allocating computing resources may need to be reviewed and made more transparent.

**Teaching of English as Second Language/English as a Second Language.**
- That an additional faculty member in TESL/ESL be hired, that expertise of TESL faculty be drawn on to address ESL issues in secondary teacher preparation and in GSW, and that campus wide support be provided so that ESL can fulfill its responsibilities and possibly develop as a revenue center.
These are separate programs, but they interact and should be viewed in a holistic way. Since both serve campus-wide needs and international recruitment, it seems reasonable that they should draw from University, not just Departmental, resources. ESL must cope with assessment, placement, and training for international teaching assistants, and there seems potential for ESL to be developed as a revenue center since students are charged for courses. TESL appears to be run in a tight and collegial way, and its interest in working with the College of Education ought to be pursued. Cooperation among TESL, Rhetoric and Writing, and GSW would seem to be appropriate since ESL issues are part of freshman writing and are pedagogical in nature. There seems to be a persuasive case for modest additional resources for these programs.

External Report Conclusion

Greater interaction will bring curricular and intellectual benefits. The Department needs to meet more frequently and faculty need to be attentive to the perspective of wider Departmental needs, rather than just those of their units. The Chair appears to be doing an excellent job, but his task should not be the brokering of limited resources among units that are only loosely connected and are, in some instances, suspicious of one another. The Department will be best served when it speaks to the administration with a clear and coherent message; that can result only from intensive discussion of objectives and priorities. The diversity of programs presents a challenge to the Department's governance, but all of them are important and none should be abandoned.

The Department should schedule at least three meetings each term and attendance ought to be a high priority for all faculty. The meetings might begin each year with summaries of developments in individual programs including how each fits into the overall objectives of the Department. The Department needs to assess its role in the College and University, carefully considering its priorities and opportunities, and weighing those in light of the resources presently available. The administration will respond more favorably to a Department that has a sense of direction and offers well-conceived initiatives rather than one that is preoccupied with what it cannot do and asks for more resources without explicit justifications. These will be difficult conversations, but the quality of the faculty suggests that it can define a common purpose for the Department

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE FINDINGS

1. Mission. The Department offers a wide range of programs that serve the needs of students in general education and various majors in other departments, as well as its own baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral degree programs. This broad mission is not unusual among English departments, but it does place a strain on Department resources and creates a Departmental network of loosely-knit programs. The PRC finds that the current mission statement of the Department is too broad and inclusive to be of utility in guiding decisions and priorities in the Department. Many of the findings and recommendations to follow will depend critically on aspects of the mission of the Department that are not currently detailed or prioritized.
A more focused mission statement would help the Department find ways to integrate its faculty resources and programs more effectively. The individual unit self-studies are notable for their occasional, at times perfunctory, references to other units and the over-all mission of the Department. The most obvious places for integration are for the Literature faculty to become more involved in General Education Literature and ILA courses and leading professional development and for the Rhetoric and Writing faculty to become more involved in GSW.

While the Department may have a greater a degree of integration than appears in the self-study and was evident to the external reviewers, the PRC agrees with the reviewers that faculty ought to be encouraged to define their roles in Departmental terms, for which a revised mission statement is needed. An effective mission statement would address the following concerns:

- At the graduate level, emphasis on areas of strength, including commitment to achieve national recognition in these areas (see Finding 2).
- Creation of opportunities for collaboration and integration across areas within the Department, as described above.
- Coherence of programs and curricula around specific themes or areas, rather than collection under a common “umbrella.”
- Flexibility to allow innovation, interdisciplinarity, and response to developing trends.
- The expectation that individual faculty and the several programs are guided in their choices and planning by the contribution of the parts to the Departmental enterprise.

A department as large and diverse as English will always involve a degree of brokering among programs and a superficial sense of unity is in no sense desirable, but the PRC endorses the external reviewers’ call for ongoing Department meetings to encourage discussion on this vital matter.

2. Graduate Programs. The Department’s graduate programs are diverse, enabling it to serve a number of constituencies, and have earned national recognition, notably in Rhetoric and Writing and Creative Writing.

The Literature faculty’s plans for a revised M.A. raise a number of unresolved questions. The PRC believes that a successful program must reflect the Literature faculty’s collective sense of how it can best serve the needs of graduate students and which other Departmental or external units promise the most effective collaboration. For instance, consideration should be given to the fact that M.A. students may have general interests and may not plan to pursue a doctorate, so the “feeder” concern in any modified M.A. ought to be weighed. Although the concept of a “niche” M.A. program might be worth consideration, it is unknown whether such a program would attract high quality graduate students. The PRC, as it views the already close ties between Literature and American Culture Studies, sees excellent opportunities for the Literature faculty to participate in the ACS graduate program. Since Literature faculty are already playing an important role in ACS, curricular and staffing efficiency would seem to be enhanced
through such integration. The Literature faculty also have opportunities to participate in the Rhetoric and Writing Ph.D. program and in the Creative Writing MFA program.

The PRC finds that the Department ought to develop its graduate program by building on existing strengths. Rhetoric and Writing, as a highly-regarded “niche” Ph.D. program, and Creative Writing, as a notably high quality MFA program, clearly should remain the centerpieces of the graduate program. These are the areas which should be targeted for visiting faculty appointments and for other initiatives that will enhance visibility. The PRC believes that the Department must consider whether it has the resources to offer quality graduate programs as well in Literature, Technical and Scientific Writing, and Teaching English as a Second Language. Greater collaboration among units within the Department may be one way of addressing this issue; reducing the number of graduate concentrations is another. Based on its observations, the PRC is inclined to believe that the Department would be well-served by limiting its graduate programs to the two areas of strength and one additional area which can be developed into a comparable area of strength.

3. Position Requests. The dramatic transformation of the nature of the faculty over the past decade has reduced reliance on part-time faculty, created a gender profile more representative of national proportions, and brought to the University a number of promising tenure-line faculty. A decrease in the number of tenure-line faculty engaged in full-time work in the Department as a consequence of retirements and external administrative and curricular assignments, however, has increased reliance on non-tenure line faculty for lower division undergraduate teaching and has led to requests for additional tenure-line positions in several units. The heavy loads of full-time non-tenure-line faculty risks their “burn-out”, a problem that the Department would like to address through leaves, reduced loads, or other means.

The PRC finds that the Department needs to address its requests for tenure-line positions in a systematic and thorough manner. It appears that the recently added faculty in Creative Writing and the currently authorized searches in Scientific and Technical Communication and English Education address the Department’s most pressing shortages, but the Department anticipates requests for additional tenure-line positions in Rhetoric and Writing, Literature, TESL/Linguistics, and Creative Writing. The Department can make the most persuasive case for its position requests by basing them on programmatic development and priorities, rather than just seeking to replace faculty lost by retirement or external assignments. This is especially necessary in the Literature position, which must be related to the plans for the faculty to participate in existing graduate programs (see finding 2). The PRC agrees with the external reviewers that, “An administration is more likely to provide support to a well-conceived initiative than to a department that speaks mainly of what it cannot do and simply asks that losses be made up without an explicit and focused rationale showing clearly what new resources will accomplish.”

4. Prioritize Initiatives. A range of planned initiatives reflect recognition of the need to enhance the Department’s visibility among prospective graduate students, among
groups within the region and community, and in the discipline generally. This concern is evident in the following plans: an improved and expanded website; additional graduate program advertising; expanded internship and editorial opportunities for graduate students; development of S&TC with groups in the region and with the University’s overseas programs; Secondary Education/ILA’s plans to strengthen the Department’s role in ILA and to revise the M.A. for middle/secondary teachers; TESL’s plans for involvement in the College of Education and Human Development and to expand the Intensive English Program; and a number of prospective appointments (senior faculty in Rhetoric and Writing, visiting professorships in Rhetoric and Writing and Creative Writing, the joint James Baldwin Writer in Residence, and the postdoctoral fellowship in Rhetoric and Writing). These wide-ranging plans reflect the vitality of the faculty and the opportunities available for the Department to enhance its stature and to contribute further to the formal and informal education of many groups.

The various initiatives directed toward enhancing visibility are all appropriate, but when viewed in the aggregate, they also seem to be too much a “shopping list” growing out of the several individual reports. Nearly all of the initiatives involve cost. While it might be generally agreed that the most compelling need in this area is to improve the website as a first-step in graduate recruitment, it seems that the others ought to be considered by the Department as a whole. It is inconceivable, for instance, that even with external funding (which itself requires funds to secure) all of the projected visiting appointments are attainable. It is also difficult to conceive that unless there is a significant increase in the number of graduate assistants, the Department could afford to shift the responsibilities of many of them into new assignments. The PRC suggests that the Department determine priorities in this area, and concentrate its resources on those initiatives that appear to be the most promising.

5. Integrated Language Arts. The reduced responsibility of the English Department in the Integrated Language Arts program has led to a number of problems, which require the attention of the cooperating departments, the College of Education and Human Development, and the College of Arts and Sciences.

The PRC shares the concerns of the Department and the external reviewers about the problems with the changes in Integrated Language Arts, and agrees with the reviewers that divorcing “responsibility from authority” has created an “unworkable” operation. Even as the reviewers recommended return of control to English, they cautioned that this could be a drain on Department resources, so the Department collectively needs to determine exactly what role it can most effectively play in the ILA program. The PRC is encouraged by word that English is consulting with other ILA units in Arts and Sciences and agrees that intercollegiate agreements need to be reached in an expedient manner, lest the current problems adversely affect students. It is essential, however, that the Department as a whole reach agreement on what resources it is prepared to commit to this program, a decision which, in turn, depends on ascertaining how important ILA is to the over-all objectives of the Department. The PRC finds that the external reviewers’ confidence about persuading the state to change relevant policy is
unwarranted. In contrast, the PRC finds that the Department should concentrate on determining how its literature courses can best serve ILA students.

6. Reassignment Policy. The Department plays a prominent role in various programs throughout the University. It contributes significant faculty resources to a number of administrative and curricular positions on campus. These administrative appointments include: Continuing Education; Chapman Learning Community; the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology; Honors Program; Institute for the Study of Culture and Society; Great Ideas; and ESL Instructional Program. In addition, its faculty teach in American Culture Studies, Film Studies, Great Ideas, and the Chapman Learning Community. A number of these external assignments are closely related to English (i.e., the ACS and ESL programs), and many of the others reflect the wide-ranging interests and talents of Department faculty.

The contribution of faculty resources to a wide-range of administrative and curricular positions external to the Department, however admirable in terms of supporting Department and University interests, creates problems that the Department must address. At present, three faculty have 100% external administrative assignments, one has 80%, another has 60%, and two have 20%. Instructional assignments outside the Department are also considerable. No department can lose such a high percentage of its faculty without suffering in terms of instruction, service, and research. Strains on the Department faculty are in large part a consequence of the loss of so many tenure-line faculty to external assignments. Part-time faculty as replacements inherently fill only a fraction of the work and contributions of a tenure-line faculty member. Requesting new tenure-line positions on the grounds of administrative replacement runs into the problem of duplication whenever the faculty returns from administrative assignment. The Department must confront this problem through the development of guidelines on the number or percent of faculty it will release from Departmental duties. Having such a policy will enable the Department to respond fairly and consistently to requests for administrative assignments.

7. Doctoral Teaching Loads. The Department plans to implement reduced teaching loads for Rhetoric and Writing faculty (two courses per semester), which will be comparable to that of faculty in other doctoral departments, an objective the external reviewers suggested and the PRC strongly endorses. The PRC, however, offers two suggestions: first, the reduced loads ought to be based on records of productivity and clearly-stated research plans, not just an “entitlement” of the Rhetoric and Writing faculty (such conditions are commonly established in teaching load policies of doctoral programs at the University); second, the Department should allow for a limited number of additional 2-2 loads on a competitive and rotating basis for selected faculty in other programs (thus encouraging involvement with graduate students and research/creative work throughout the Department and reducing a sense of an exclusive privilege for Rhetoric and Writing Faculty).

8. Expanded Roles for Literature Faculty. The PRC recognizes that the recommendations in this report may present the greatest challenges for the Literature
faculty. Our recommendations are shaped by the understanding that it will not be possible to recover the centrality previously enjoyed by the Literature program. Equally, we understand that it is of vital importance to engage the Literature faculty in visible and productive roles that make full use of their energies, capacities, and imaginations. Thus, we urge the faculty of the Department, and the Literature faculty in particular, to reinvent the role they play in the Department. Central to this role is the participation of the Literature faculty in existing graduate programs, other than an M.A. Literature program (Rhetoric and Writing, ACS, and Creative Writing), as described in item 2. In addition, greater involvement of Literature faculty in the General Education Literature and ILA programs ought to be a high priority, for any number of reasons (including the recruitment of majors). Their role here, in addition to teaching, could be in curricular redesign and development programs for graduate assistants, instructors, and other faculty. As the external reviewers suggest, talented lecturers could make a significant contribution to the General Education Literature program, but particularly if they were trained and guided by an experienced senior faculty. It is unreasonable to expect a significant increase in Literature faculty, so the Department should explore the utilization of large lecture classes with break-out groups.

9. Writing Across the Curriculum. A Writing Across the Curriculum program appears to be generally accepted as a worthwhile goal, but the external reviewers urge that it be pursued cautiously with attention to the necessity for careful preparation and consultation with other departments. Moreover, the responsibility of the Department for this initiative seems compromised by the emphasis given to it in the GSW review.

The projected Writing Across the Curriculum program needs to be based on a firm understanding of the roles of the Rhetoric and Writing faculty and the GSW faculty. The issues of responsibility and organization must precede the collection of data; discussions with other departments are an important preliminary step prior to the appointment of a Director. This discussion should take into account the Department’s efforts in this area in the early 1990s, the recent WAC initiatives of Rhetoric and Writing faculty, and the ways that Rhetoric and Writing faculty can work with GSW faculty. In sum, the implementation of the recommendations of the GSW review in this area need to recognize and draw upon the contributions of the Rhetoric and Writing faculty.

10. General Studies Writing. The relationship of the Rhetoric and Writing faculty to the GSW program is an especially sensitive issue. On the surface, the call of the external reviewers for more conspicuous involvement by the Rhetoric and Writing faculty seems reasonable, but that group maintains that it has a record of strong professional commitment to first-year writing and that its role in GSW has been limited by the depletion of its ranks, the research expectations of faculty in a doctoral program, and lack of authority over GSW.

The separate program review of GSW has added an additional dimension to these internal problems. Actions resulting from that review will provide for greater GSW autonomy within the Department and the appointment of a Director by the Dean (with input from the Department) for four-year terms. It remains to be worked out what role the
Rhetoric and Writing faculty will play in the program; all parties (including the faculty, the Chair, both program reviews, and the dean) agree that there should be formal opportunities for faculty participation in and involvement with the GSW program. However, the PRC finds that there are limits on that participation and involvement. The PRC understands that the question of the term of the GSW Director has been resolved (four year terms, with reappointment possible). Furthermore, the GSW program needs a degree of autonomy that would be inconsistent with awarding Rhetoric and Writing faculty “authority over” the GSW program.

11. Assessment. The PRC finds that, although assessment is being addressed, it is de-emphasized in the self-study.

**Program Review Committee Recommendations**

Based on reviews of the self-study and external review documents, and consistent with the major findings that resulted from these reviews, the PRC makes the following recommendations. For detail about the rationalization of each recommendation, see the finding with the corresponding number, just above.

1) *Mission.* The Department should revise its mission statement, and present the statement to the Dean of Arts & Sciences for his approval by the end of fall semester, 2002. The revised mission statement should have greater specificity than the current one, and should provide more coherence for the Department’s programs than is currently evident. Recommendations to follow on graduate programs, position requests, and priorities, will all be informed by and dependent on the revised mission.

2) *Graduate Programs.* The Department ought to develop its graduate program by building on existing strengths.
   a) Rhetoric and Writing, as a highly-regarded “niche” Ph.D. program, and Creative Writing, as a notably high quality MFA program, clearly should remain the centerpieces of the graduate program.
   b) The PRC believes that the Department must determine how its resources can most effectively be used to develop its graduate program beyond the existing areas of strength.
   c) Rather than having a separate, and what would seem to be a potentially overlapping, if not competing, M.A. program with ACS, the PRC recommends that the Literature faculty look to other existing graduate programs in which they could participate. These would include the possibilities of integration with ACS, a coordinated program with Creative Writing, or (as the external reviewers suggest) a coordinated program with Rhetoric and Writing.
   d) In order to come to a decision about the continuation or modification of graduate programs, the faculty should undertake a review of its graduate programs, including consultation with the Dean of Arts & Sciences and the Dean of the Graduate College, to be completed by the end of the fall semester, 2002. Agreement should be reached in the form of a written document, shared with the deans, by March 15, 2003.
3) **Position Requests.** For all future position requests, the Department must build a rationale for positions on the basis of programmatic development and priorities, rather than seek to replace faculty lost by retirement or external assignments. Position requests should be justified in terms of the revised mission.

4) **Prioritize Initiatives.** The PRC recommends that the Department prioritize the many initiatives introduced in the separate parts of the self-study, and concentrate its resources on those that appear to be the most promising. The Department as a whole should contribute to the prioritization, and should be guided in this activity by the revised mission.

5) **Integrated Language Arts.** It is essential that the Department as a whole commit to offering the literature courses necessary for the success of the ILA students.

6) **Reassignment Policy.** The Department should develop a policy establishing guidelines for the number or percent of faculty it will release from Departmental assignments. In the short term, it should deny any additional requests for release to assume administrative positions and encourage faculty presently in administrative positions to return full-time to the Department when their appointments end. This is an urgent matter as it affects the quality of the Department’s programs. The longer-term policy should include provisions for negotiation with the dean whenever the policy limits a faculty member’s ability to accept responsibilities outside the Department that they wish to pursue. Guidelines governing releases for external assignments should be agreed upon by the faculty by November 1, 2002.

7) **Doctoral teaching loads.** The Department should develop a plan to institute 2-2 teaching loads for Rhetoric and Writing faculty.
   a) The default teaching load should be 3-3; the policy should allow faculty to justify reduced loads on the basis of involvement with doctoral students, records of productivity, and clearly-stated research/creative work plans.
   b) The Department should allow a limited number of additional 2-2 loads on a competitive and rotating basis for selected faculty in other programs, on the same criteria of involvement with doctoral students and productivity in research/creative work. A revised teaching load policy, giving consideration to these concerns, ought to be established by the faculty by the end of the fall semester, 2002.

8) **Expanded roles for Literature faculty.** The Department should work with Literature faculty to redesign and expand their roles in the Department. This could include:
   a) greater involvement in the General Education Literature and ILA programs,
   b) leadership in designing large lecture courses with breakout sections,
   c) creation of training/development programs for GA’s, instructors, and faculty who will teach in this program,
   d) participation in existing graduate programs (see recommendation 2C).
9) *Writing Across the Curriculum*. The PRC strongly supports, as it did in the review of the GSW program, the development of a Writing Across the Curriculum program.
   a) A study should be conducted regarding the writing needs of programs throughout the University, as recommended by the external reviewers.
   b) Rhetoric and Writing faculty have considerable expertise and interest in such a program and should be involved in its design.
   c) The administrative organization of this program should be decided upon by the Dean of Arts & Sciences, with consultation from the Rhetoric and Writing faculty and the Department Chair, and informed by the study referred to in a).

10) *General Studies Writing*. The Rhetoric and Writing faculty should develop a proposal detailing its objectives with regard to GSW and the ways that it would prefer to contribute to GSW, within the limitations described in the Findings. The faculty should present their proposal first to the Chair, and then to the Dean of Arts & Sciences, for their approval by the end of fall semester, 2002.

11) *Assessment*. The Department should continue to develop its assessment efforts, taking care to match learning outcomes and assessment procedures to changes in the curriculum or programs that may come about. It should also use results of assessment to inform changes in curriculum and pedagogy.

*The Department of English should report annually to the Dean of Arts & Sciences, with a copy to the Provost, on the implementation of these recommendations.*