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Section A: Historical Context

Georgia State College began offering Bachelor of Arts degrees in 1961. During the 1960s, the Department of English offered a single terminal degree, a B.A. with a major in English. In 1969, the institution changed its name to Georgia State University, and the English department began to offer its doctorate, conferring its first Ph.D. in 1974. In the late 1960s, the department began branching out from its roots in literature to offer courses in related fields. When John Burrison was hired in 1966, the English Department began its long association with the university’s interdisciplinary minor in Folklore. Since the early 1970s, the department has offered courses in creative writing, technical and professional writing, and linguistics and grammar. In 1983-84, the department formally instituted its undergraduate concentrations in Creative Writing and Advanced Composition and Rhetoric. The department instituted a concentration in Secondary English in 1999, offering courses to help prepare would-be teachers for certification.

With the hiring of new creative writing faculty in the 1980s, the department was able to offer a Master of Fine Arts (M.F.A.) in Creative Writing beginning in 1990, and its Ph.D. in Creative Writing beginning in 1995. Since 1992, the department has offered both an M.A. and Ph.D. in English with a concentration in Advanced Composition and Rhetoric, the only programs of their kind based in a historical approach to the subject.

Over the years the department’s faculty has waxed and waned, from 45 tenured and tenure-track faculty in 1973 down to 34 at the start of the previous self-study in 1990, and back up to 44 in FY 2004. In recent years the department has nearly phased out its use of part-time instructors, and currently employs 6 full-time lecturers and visiting instructors.

Our faculty have garnered numerous national awards, external grants, prizes, and endowed chairs for their research (See Appendix AA for a listing). At the same time, the department has supported the growth of fine teachers as well as scholars. From FY 2002-2004 we enrolled on average 619 undergraduate English majors and 230 graduate students per year. Several of our teachers have engaged in extensive pedagogical training beyond their degree, and a number have published in pedagogical journals.

The department’s growth under chairs Robert Sattelmeyer (chair from 1993-2002) and Matthew Roudané (2002-present) has enabled it to offer a remarkable array of programs and services, with outreach to the college, the university, and the public at large. Here are some examples of our full-service approach.

During the period of our self-study, Lynée Gaillet, the director of our Lower Division Studies, has built our freshman composition program into a nationally recognized model of Writing Program Administration, training and supervising instructors for over 380 sections of composition per year (described in Gaillet and Jeffrey T. Grabill, “Writing Program Design in the Metropolitan University: Toward Constructing Community Partnerships. WPA: Writing Program Administration 25.3 (2002): 61-78). She has also overseen the department’s transition away from the use of part-time instructors, and toward the use of full-time Lecturers and Visiting Instructors. The Lower Division
sponsors Freshman Learning Communities and annual teaching and professional development seminars for over one hundred Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs). Department faculty work closely with the Graduate English Association to hold seminars on teaching, presenting, and entering the job market. With the adoption of a recent pilot program in teaching composition with computers, the Lower Division’s new director, Marti Singer, is poised to grow the program further and help reshape the way GSU students interact with technology.

The department has housed two Service Centers, the Writing Across the Curriculum Program (WAC) and the Writing Studio, with outreach university-wide. WAC has helped to support faculty throughout the university in the teaching of writing. The WAC program has financially supported and trained over 60 full-time faculty members and at least 74 student Writing Consultants from 27 academic departments to improve student learning and writing in their disciplines. Its directors, first George Pullman, then succeeded by Mary Hocks, have been English faculty members. Likewise, the Writing Studio (begun as the Writing Clinic in 1978 and later known as the Writing Center) was directed during the period of our study by Marti Singer, then Beth Burmester, both English department faculty members. Writing Studio tutors work with over 5,500 students per year from across campus to improve their writing. The Studio is an institutional member of both the International Writing Centers Association (IWCA) and the Southeastern Writing Centers Association (SWCA), and holds subscriptions and complete archives to their publications: The Writing Lab Newsletter, The Writing Center Journal, and Southern Discourse. Additionally, the Writing Studio sponsors its own print and online publications for students and graduate student staff. For the reports of both of our Service Centers, see Appendix E.

English faculty have taught courses cross-listed in departments and programs including the Honors Program, Women’s Studies Institute, the Program in Jewish Studies, Religious Studies, and the African-American Studies Department. The founding director of Jewish Studies, Michael Galchinsky, is a member of the department. The department sponsors several international programs, including the British-American Studies program with Northumbria University, and exchange programs with Johannes Gutenberg University in Mainz, Potsdam University, and Venice University Ca’ Foscari. A formal exchange program with the Universidad de Malaga is in preparation, and others in Spain and South Africa are strong possibilities.

During the period of the self-study, the department’s outreach to the public has been extensive. The department is home to six periodicals, including the award-winning journal of fiction and poetry Five Points, the South Atlantic Review, Studies in the Literary Imagination, the Eudora Welty Newsletter, the Journal of Advanced Composition online archive, and the student periodical of creative writing, GSU Review. As the institutional home of the South Atlantic Modern Language Association (SAMLA), the GSU English department is notable as the hub of the southeastern region of our professional organization.
Other outreach programs include our annual speakers’ series. We sponsor an annual reading series that brings in excellent creative writers like Philip Levine and B. H. Fairchild; a Department of English Lecture Series that has sponsored significant scholars including Michael Berubé, Homi Bhabha, Stanley Fish, Paul Fussell, Sander Gilman, and Henry Glassie; and an annual lecture in New Readings of Significant Texts, in which a GSU faculty member reviews the classic arguments about a text commonly read in schools and illuminates new scholarly and cultural readings that may enrich our teaching of the text. Since spring, 2000, our Secondary English faculty, Pearl McHaney and Renée Schatteman, have coordinated a series of “Conversations Among Partners in Learning,” to provide a space twice per year where middle school teachers and high school teachers can meet to exchange ideas, coordinate instruction across levels, receive enhancement in content knowledge, and affirm teachers’ roles as professionals.

Section B: Current Context

The data about the department’s current context demonstrates that the department has grown rapidly over the past decade, has reached a solid plateau, and is now poised to grow in new areas.

Faculty Demographics

During this study’s three-year review period, FY 2002 – FY 2004, the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty (T/TT) increased slightly, from 41 to 44 (Table B-1A).

The percentage of female T/TT faculty was 48.8% in FY2002, and by FY2004 the ratio of female to male faculty achieved parity (22 female, 22 male). The proportion of women at the assistant professor rank decreased (50% to 41%), while the proportion at the associate professor rank increased by a nearly equal measure (from 35% to 45%). The proportion of women at the full professor rank decreased slightly (from 15% to 14%). The percentage of female full professors in relation to the faculty as a whole has remained steady at 7%, while the percentage of male full professors has increased from 17% to 20%. We expect these numbers to even out as more female associate professors come up for promotion.

Extrapolating from Table B-1B, the percentage of minority T/TT faculty increased slightly, from 12.2% in FY2002 to 13.6% in FY2004 (i.e., 1 faculty hire). The number of minorities at the assistant professor rank increased from 1 to 2. The number at associate professor decreased from 4 to 2, due to the promotion of one minority associate professor to full professor and the departure of another. The number of minority faculty at full professor thus rose from 0 to 1. The department is committed to strengthening its diversity profile by seeking to hire, promote, and tenure minority faculty. We have hired a new assistant professor in African-American literature as of FY 2005.

In line with the policy of the College of Arts and Sciences to hire non-tenure track (NTT) faculty in preference to part-time instructors (PTIs), the department’s visiting and PTI cohort decreased from 15 in FY2002 to 8 in FY2004, while the number of NTT faculty
increased from 0 in FY2002 to 4 in FY2004. As of the start of FY 2005, we have 43 T/TT (due to one retirement), 5 VIs, and 2 Lecturers, all full-time (see Appendix D: Current Faculty Roster).

If we look at faculty by concentration, we can see that all the concentrations have benefited from the department’s growth during the past decade. In the Literature Concentration, the various sections are now uniformly strong, and have indeed been strengthened by our hires during this period (Scott Lightsey, Elizabeth West, Christopher Kocela). The faculty has identified room for growth in the area of global, transnational, and multicultural literatures (to be addressed in Table I-1, Goal 1 below). The Creative Writing concentration, which boasts Georgia’s Poet Laureate, David Bottoms, has made three key hires in recent years (poet Beth Gyllys, fiction writer Sheri Joseph, and fiction writer Joshua Russell) along with publishing the celebrated journal, Five Points. The addition of a non-fiction prose writer, and funds for a higher profile reading series, will make this concentration one of the most competitive programs in the Southeast (see Table I-1, Goal 3). The Advanced Composition and Rhetoric concentration has perhaps grown the most during this period, adding 3 TT faculty (Beth Burmester, Baotong Gu, and Jennifer Bowie) and 7 NTT faculty. More than half (4 out of 7) of Rhetoric and Composition faculty members run large programs for the department and the university as a whole while continuing to publish scholarly articles, at the same rate as other English faculty, in nationally recognized peer reviewed journals and university press collections. With the addition of new faculty specializing in service learning and composition with computers, this concentration can help the department meet the needs of aspiring rhetoricians, composition specialists, professional writers, and technical writers, while continuing to play a key role in our service centers (Writing Across the Curriculum and the Writing Studio) and in the enhanced internship program we envision (see Table I-1, Goal 2, Goal 5). Finally, with the addition of Pearl McHaney and Renée Schatteman, the Secondary English concentration has played an increasingly significant role in the department’s outreach to secondary schools and its participation in teacher-preparation.

Faculty Research Productivity
Faculty research productivity during the review period was high, as measured by the university’s Office of Institutional Research (OIR) in its surveys of faculty, and by annual report data (Appendix K(1); Table B-2). In the OIR comparison of faculty survey findings, English department faculty rated themselves consistently higher than did GSU faculty as a whole in research productivity. For example, 64.3% of English faculty reported that they had served as the editor of a journal or on the editorial board of a journal in their field, compared with 48.6% of university faculty. Eighty percent reported serving as a referee or reviewer of one or more articles submitted to journals in their field, compared with 71.8% of university faculty (Appendix K(1), Table 7). The active research profile of our faculty is confirmed by the list of external and internal grants and prizes we have received (Section A above), indicating that our faculty members are competing well at the highest national levels. During the review period, English faculty leveraged an average of $175,156 per year in external funding, and $160,230 per year in internal funding. On average, 11% of our faculty published a book or edited volume each year, 77% of non-creative writing faculty published at least one refereed article or chapter.
per year, and our creative writing faculty published 4 pieces per writer per year. We published a total of 98 refereed articles, 61 creative works, and 13 books and edited volumes. We gave 328 conference presentations, and performed 215 other acts of scholarly research that included editing journals, writing reviews, publishing encyclopedia entries, developing computer software, and giving radio interviews (Table B-2). Faculty were aided by a well-considered College workload policy, and by departmental research enhancement support in the form of Summer Research Awards, funds for travel to conferences and archives, and, when possible, ad hoc subventions for permissions and other research-related needs.

On the other hand, there are currently a number of obstacles to achieving greater faculty research productivity. 76% of the faculty rated the University research office’s level of research support as average, substandard, or poor (3, 2, or 1 on a scale of 1=Poor to 5=Excellent—Appendix K(1), Table 10). In response to the Self-Study committee’s own survey questionnaire, faculty reported that the current number of professional leaves (2-3 per year) was fewer than the department’s active research faculty could usefully employ (4-5 per year). Also, many of our faculty members—particularly junior faculty and those in smaller fields—are increasingly affected by what Robert Scholes and Stephen Greenblatt, president and past president of the Modern Language Association, have referred to as the “crisis in scholarly publishing in the Humanities.” As the attached report by Scott Lightsey shows (Appendix V), economic pressures have caused scholarly publishers to become increasingly resistant to publishing monographs by first-time scholars or by scholars in smaller fields, and libraries are increasingly resistant to purchasing such books. The result is that gaining the publication credits required for tenure and promotion can be an increasingly daunting proposition for some English scholars. Responding to an English department request, Dean Blumenfeld, Associate Dean for the Humanities in the College of Arts and Sciences, has recently convened a committee to look into concerted college-wide and departmental responses to this issue. We address the obstacles to faculty research productivity in Table I-1, Goal 10.

Programs

Since the last self-study, the department has established a nationally-recognized Lower Division Studies program in which we train, mentor, and evaluate over 100 graduate teaching assistants each year, who are responsible for most of the university’s freshman composition courses (Engl 1101, 1102, and 1103) and a few sections of the departmental survey courses (Engl 2110, 2120, 2130, 2140). As demonstrated in the attached report by Lynée Gaillet, director of Lower Division Studies during the current review period, this program has developed a collaborative model of Writing Program Administration. The Teacher Preparation Program introduces students to composition theory, pedagogy, syllabus development, grade norming, editing and revision techniques. The GTAs are observed each year, and must submit a teaching portfolio as part of their evaluation. They participate in an initial orientation and periodic training workshops throughout the year (Appendix U: Lower Division Studies Report). The next step is to incorporate computers into the composition classroom. The English department has brought an initiative along these lines to UETS, IS&T, and the Provost, and although there are a number of security and computer sales and maintenance considerations, all parties seem
to agree that teaching composition with computers is a goal within reach (addressed in Table I-1, Goal 4 below).

The department offers an undergraduate B.A. in any of four concentrations (Literature, Creative Writing, Advanced Composition and Rhetoric, and Secondary English). It also houses the interdisciplinary Folklore minor, as well as the M.I.S. (Minor in Interdisciplinary Studies) in Jewish Studies. Table B-3 shows that the number of majors has grown by 12% during the review period, from 585 to 656, with a three-year average of 619 majors. We also run a small undergraduate internship program that enables approximately 5 students per semester to produce a written project with a local area business or non-profit agency.

At the graduate level, the department offers M.A., M.F.A., and Ph.D. degrees. The M.A. and Ph.D. programs have recently been revised by a Task Force on the Graduate Curriculum, led by Graduate Program director, Calvin Thomas. We expect the new program to help students streamline and focus their programs, provide them with a faculty committee earlier on in the process, and open up a greater variety of options for specialization.

In terms of enrollments, Table B-3 shows that the number of students in the M.A. program has decreased slightly from 117 to 106 during the review period. On average we have graduated 25 students from the M.A. program each year. On average, 21 students have been enrolled in the M.F.A. in Creative Writing each year, and we have graduated 3 per year. The number of students in the Ph.D. program has increased from 86 to 112, and we have graduated, on average, 8 per year.

The increase in the number of Ph.D. students may seem to be of some concern at a time when the job market for college and university professorships in English is very tight. But as Calvin Thomas shows in an attached report (Appendix X: Graduate Program Survey of Recent Alumni), our doctoral students are doing relatively well on several job markets. During the review period, 20 students received Ph.D.s. Of these, 17 are currently employed (85%), two (10%) are independent scholars, and one (5%) is looking for employment. Of those employed, 15 (88.2%) have secured teaching or administrative positions in 2- and 4-year colleges and universities. Two (or 11.8%) have secured teaching positions in high schools.

Some of our students arrive with expectations for their degrees other than securing college or university professorships (e.g., getting the advanced training that will enable them to raise their salaries at the high schools where they already teach). As we build our rhetoric and composition program, and our service learning and internship program, we expect that a higher proportion of our graduate students will seek employment outside of traditional 2- and 4-year colleges and universities, including non-profits, businesses, and government agencies. Five of the 91 PhDs and MAs who got their degree during the review period (5.5%) teach at high schools. The number may be higher when we track down the unaccounted-for M.A.s.
An area of greater concern is our doctoral students’ time to degree (Table B-5). Our Ph.D. students typically take 2-3 years longer to graduate than do students at our peer institutions. The reasons are clear: a) English graduate students perform extraordinary service for the university by staffing the vast majority of required composition courses, and our graduate students teach twice as much as graduate students at our peer institutions (2/2 instead of 1/1); b) our GTAs do more teaching even than other humanities graduate students at GSU (such as History), who typically teach 2/1; c) unlike all our peer institutions, we have not supplied our graduate students with medical benefits during this cycle, forcing them in many cases to find still more employment above and beyond their heavy teaching and course loads. We are glad that the Dean of the College has made the provision of at least rudimentary medical benefits to GTAs one of her priorities.

This economic situation has numerous negative results for recruiting, teaching, and learning. First, the current arrangement presents an unattractive face to prospective doctoral students, and impedes us from recruiting a higher quality of doctoral student. Since the university is attempting to improve its standing among research universities, this recruitment issue looms ever larger. Second, our graduate students are often overtaxed, which affects their performance in class, at the examination phase, and at the thesis or dissertation phase. Third, these teaching and stipend arrangements deprive graduate students of the time they need to professionalize themselves—by publishing articles, giving conference presentations, traveling to archives, and engaging in teaching development—to become attractive job candidates in a tight market. So it is quite a testimony to our students’ drive that despite these conditions they managed to publish 12 scholarly articles and 28 creative writing pieces, give 39 conference presentations, and receive two fellowships and 11 prizes during the review period (Table B-10).

Reducing the graduate students’ time to degree is not merely a moral and practical issue; it is a measure of the quality of our graduate program, as well as the quality of our university’s composition and literature survey programs. We address this issue at length in Table I-1, Goal 6 below.

Program Relevance
The department’s programs continue to be relevant to society’s needs because we train excellent critical thinkers and written and oral communicators through our composition program and our major programs, and we prepare undergraduate majors for a wide range of professions, including university, college, and high-school teaching, business, web design, law, government, and non-profit work. Our service centers help faculty and students to be better writers and teachers of writing. Most important, to the extent that we instill a broader appreciation for literature, culture, and the written word in all its forms, we help produce well-rounded citizens who are not only prepared for a career but, in a larger sense, for life.

We help ensure our continuing relevance by providing important services to our students, our profession, and the Atlanta community.
For our students, undergraduate academic advisement is always available, both by individual faculty members during their office hours, and by any of four designated academic advisors who hold office hours daily. (See Appendix L).

At the graduate level, academic advisement is also relatively strong, and has been strengthened by the recent Task Force on the Graduate Curriculum. The Graduate English Association (GEA) is active, planning a series of annual teaching seminars and a professional development fair. In Fall, 2003, the GEA also sponsored the well-attended, fifth annual “New Voices” conference to enable graduate students from around the country to deliver papers and partake in professional development.

We also provide career advisement and preparation, and expect to provide more in the next cycle (in line with students’ expectations, as documented by the surveys in Appendix K). The department does offer a number of internship opportunities in-house—staffing any of our five publications, working as a tutor or Visiting Instructor at the Writing Studio, working as a GLA or GRA—and we expect to increase the number of such opportunities in the next cycle (see the Department Publications Report, Appendix T, and Table I-1, Goals 12, 13, and 14). We also offer about five undergraduate internships in Atlanta-area businesses and non-profits each semester. We expect to broadly expand students’ opportunities for internships and service learning experiences outside of the department. As demonstrated in a report by Melissa McLeod, the self-study committee’s Graduate Research Assistant, the department does not do nearly as much in this area as our peers do (Internship/Service Learning Programs at Peer Institutions, Appendix Y). A stronger internship/service learning program can be a crucial asset to an English department situated in a rich, urban environment like Atlanta, and we intend in the next cycle to help students take greater advantage of local opportunities. We also expect to begin gathering annual survey data on how our graduates use their degrees, so that we can better advise and prepare them for a variety of careers (see Appendix X).

Our service centers, the Writing Across the Curriculum Program and the Writing Studio, already serve students and faculty throughout the campus community, as do our various reading and lecture series. In addition, the Writing Studio administers an e-mail referral network to provide community members a forum to advertise positions for internships, full-time positions, and freelance tutoring and editing jobs for graduate students and to allow graduate students to communicate with potential employers. The Writing Studio also advises area non-profits on tutoring strategies, GED programs, and other composition-related matters. (Also see the Service Center Reports for both WAC and WS in Appendix E)

Finally, the “Conversations Among Partners in Learning Series” sponsored by the Secondary English concentration, is a wonderful formal opportunities for outreach to the larger Atlanta community.

Faculty’s professional development needs are well served by relatively generous annual allowances for travel to archives or to deliver papers, and the department provides
research support in the form of a Works-in-Progress Colloquium (WIP) in which faculty exchange papers and give and receive constructive feedback. And we in turn serve the profession through working on professional organization committees, and through disseminating our research broadly (see C.Vs.).

Credit Hour Generation
Measured in terms of credit hours, the department is robust and is doing much better than might have been expected, considering that it has faced a number of unavoidable obstacles during the current period. Using Table B-4 as the basis for calculations, the department has generated, on average, 24,670 total hours for Core courses for each of the past three years; 2,593 hours for Lower Division courses; 9,374 hours for Upper Division courses; and 4,481 hours for Graduate courses.

Looking more closely, both the Lower Division and the Graduate Program saw increases in credit hour generation during the review period, while the Core saw a drop (from 24,588 total hours in FY2002 to 22,554 in FY2004), as did the Upper Division (from 9,201 hours in FY2002 to 8,717 hours in FY2004). The drop in credit hours had several causes beyond the department’s control. In FY2003, without consulting the English department, the Robinson College of Business began requiring its students to take its own Business Writing courses. Over night, the number of sections of Engl 3130 Business Writing decreased by two-thirds, from 56 sections in FY2002 to 16 in FY2004, a loss of some 2,355 credit hours to the department (Table D-1). This in itself accounts for most of the loss in credit hours by TT faculty from FY2002 to FY2003 (Table B-4). Second, during the recent budget downturn, many students have chosen to take composition at Georgia Perimeter College, which costs approximately one-third as much as GSU. Third, the rise in the freshman index at GSU, while generally a positive development, has had the effect of decreasing the number of students throughout the Core, including in freshman composition. The lingering effects of the conversion to the semester system, the moving up of admissions deadlines, and the siphoning effect of the increase in freshmen at UGA, may all also have contributed to the loss. The department does expect to regain some Business Writing sections once the Program in Internships and Service Learning is expanded as envisioned (see Table I-1, Goal 5 below).

As for the drop in Upper Division credit hours, the loss is mainly attributable to typical fluctuations and the uncertainties of instituting the NTT positions. Note that TT faculty actually increased Upper Division hours by 903.5 hours from FY2002 to FY2004. We expect these numbers to increase during the next cycle, as we begin to add more upper division courses to the curriculum. Comparison with peer institutions shows that our department offers far fewer (sometimes half) the number of courses per faculty than do our peers (Table B-6). This data corresponds to the perception, voiced by faculty, undergraduates, and graduate students alike in our surveys (Appendix K), that the department needs to offer a greater variety of courses. In one specific area—the percentage of faculty offering global, transnational, and multicultural literature courses—we found a significant discrepancy between the number of such courses we offer on a regular basis and the number offered by our peers (Table B-7). We address the need for greater variety in the curriculum in Table I-1, Goals 1, 2, 3, and 11 below.
Faculty and Student Surveys

It is gratifying to be able to report that faculty responses to both OIR’s surveys and the Self-Study Committee’s online survey questionnaire were overwhelmingly positive. Faculty satisfaction meets or exceeds the university standard in almost every area in OIR’s comparative report. 95.4% of English faculty members rated their overall level of job satisfaction as average to very satisfied (3, 4, or 5 on a 5-point scale—Appendix K(A), Table 12) and comparison report), and 76.8% were in the top two categories. There were three areas in which, relative to the university standard, our faculty members were only slightly less satisfied:

- the variety of advanced course offerings
- the clarity of departmental goals
- having adequate opportunities to influence decisions.

(See Appendix K (2), Faculty Survey Findings Comparison Report, Graphs 3, 5, 10)

With regard to the variety of advanced course offerings, faculty perceptions are suited to the data. As we have already suggested, the number of course offerings per faculty falls well below that of our peers (Table B-6). And although we have increased the number of course offerings in the Upper Division by 57% since the last self-study in 1994 (Table B-9), this increase has largely been in the newer concentrations (Rhetoric and Composition, Secondary English) and not in the Literature or Creative Writing concentrations where faculty and students report the greatest need. During the three-year period covered by this self-study, our Upper Division and Graduate level course offerings have remained almost stable. We intend, early in the next cycle, to convene a Task Force on the Undergraduate Curriculum (modeled after the parallel graduate Task Force that completed its work in 2004). We are already in the process of addressing each of the other areas as well. The self-study process itself has been remarkably clarifying, as can be seen by our extensive and well-developed list of goals and objects in Section I below. And the desire to address the perception of inadequate opportunities to influence decisions has led to a strengthening of our system of sections, committees, and concentrations.

Students, too, are very satisfied. Whether one consults the surveys of undergraduates or graduates, current students or alumni (Appendix K), a remarkably consistent picture emerges. Student satisfaction is clear both in absolute terms and in comparison to the university standard. In most cases, the graphs show that students are far more satisfied than their peers across campus.

But there are two areas in which students (both undergraduate and graduate, both current and alumni) report lower satisfaction levels, either in absolute terms or in comparison to the university standard:

- academic advisement
- variety of course offerings
Although we currently have four full-time academic advisers, faculty have agreed that we need to do a better job of steering students toward them. With regard to variety of course offerings, the written comments make clear that students are particularly desirous of more ethnically diverse and global/transnational courses. Many creative writers also complained of a lack of course offerings and adequate financial support. A number of undergraduates also complain of a lack of coherence in the major (consistent with numerous faculty comments that the 2000-level courses and the capstones lack consistent standards) and of unwieldy class sizes (Graph 6). All of this is consistent with faculty comments in the personal interviews conducted with every faculty member by the members of the Self-Study Committee (for a description, see Appendix R). To begin addressing the concern of coherence, we have developed learning outcomes and assessment tools for these courses.

A demographic profile of undergraduates, gathered from OIR surveys and other data provided by OIR (Table B-8), is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our data shows that our level of ethnic diversity is just on par with or below that of the University as a whole and many of our peer institutions. This suggests that we can do more to attract minority students, especially Asian-Americans and (the lack of data on this point speaks volumes) Latinos and Latinas.

When we asked questions about the kinds of writing to which undergraduate students are exposed, most current students report exposure to close readings and research essays but fewer report exposure to historical contextualization, analysis of biography, analysis based on literary theory, print or composition history, sources or influences, electronic forms of writing, or workplace forms of writing (See Appendix K (3), Undergraduate Student Survey Findings, Table 7, Graphs 17-27). This suggests we can work to give students a greater variety of writing opportunities. And while we are a “writing extensive” department—giving students in all our classes writing opportunities—we have relatively few “writing intensive” courses, according to the Writing Across the Curriculum program’s definition of a course in which writing and revision comprise at least 40% of the course grade and the students receive frequent feedback on their writing.
Graduate students were generally more excited about the program than were undergraduates (Appendix K (5)). Comments like “GREAT PROGRAM! HAS BEEN AN IMMENSELY REWARDING PART OF MY LIFE!” and “The profs in Rhet Comp are really wonderful” (written comments to Appendix K(5)) captured the general tone. One student wrote:

“Professors are interested in student concerns and academic interests. Professors are eager to support student-initiated learning and directed studies. Professors also encourage collaboration on academic work for publication or conference presentations.”

On the other hand, students did complain of having to work too hard as GTAs to progress toward their degrees (consistent with our own findings from peer institution data and comparisons with other departments on campus). Along with the concerns they share with undergraduates, they express particular concerns about what they perceive as a lack of career advisement (Graph 8), the frequency of course offerings (Graph 12), and the clarity of degree requirements (Graph 14). Graduate students repeatedly expressed the desire for expansion in three areas:

1) more courses in pedagogy or with a pedagogical component, tied to their professional goals of teaching in high schools and 2- and 4- year colleges;

2) more courses geared toward their career goals as professional or technical writers; and

3) more courses in ethnically diverse literatures.

Again, each of these comments was underscored, to some degree, by faculty comments in the Self-Study Questionnaire or the Self-Study Interviews. The Task Force on the Graduate Curriculum, which completed its work in spring, 2004, addressed the concern for clarity of degree requirements in detail (see Appendix I). As already mentioned above, we do engage in extensive pedagogical training of GTAs through the Lower Division Studies seminars and workshops (see Appendix U). Also, during this cycle we have added a pedagogy course, Engl 8180, and are planning to add others for each of the concentration areas in the next cycle; and our new director of Lower Division Studies, Marti Singer, has already published a teaching manual for our GTAs. So in this area we believe we are addressing the students’ concerns. Our Goals and Objectives for this Self-Study address each of the other concerns in further detail.

Overall, then, faculty and students responding to the surveys express a great deal of satisfaction with the English department, while identifying several key areas to be addressed.
Administration
The English department has a well-functioning organizational chart (Appendix B) and its Bylaws were revised in 2001 (Appendix C). The Chair meets frequently with the department directors (Graduate Program, Undergraduate Studies, Lower Division Studies). The Chair annually evaluates all faculty members, and is an ex-officio member of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee entertains all proposals for new courses and changes to the department, and advises the Chair on salary adjustments. The Associate Chair heads two committees, and acts for the Chair when necessary.

The department’s 12 standing committees are as follows:
1. Ph.D./M.F.A. Examinations
2. Events, Awards, and Public Relations
3. Lower Division Studies
4. Graduate Admissions and Review
5. Master’s Examination
6. New Appointments
7. Promotion and Tenure
8. Research Enhancement
9. Secondary English
10. Scheduling
11. Studies in the Literary Imagination
12. Undergraduate Studies.

In addition, the Chair appoints members of ad hoc committees as necessary, such as the Task Force on the Graduate Curriculum and the Academic Program Review Committee.

Each of our four concentrations has a faculty coordinator, and the scheduling task is further subdivided into 12 curricular sections, as follows:
1. Medieval Literature and Language
2. Renaissance and Seventeenth-Century English Literature
3. Eighteenth-century English Literature
4. Nineteenth-century English Literature
5. Twentieth-century British and Commonwealth Literature
6. American Literature before 1865
7. American Literature, 1865-1914
8. American Literature, 1914-present
9. Literary Criticism and Theory
10. Creative Writing
11. Composition, Professional and Technical Writing, and Linguistics
12. Folklore

Sections elect their heads annually, and are responsible for planning their 2-year schedule, developing special topics courses, consulting on graduate student issues and hiring issues, and brainstorming outside lecturers.
In interviews and surveys, faculty repeatedly recognized that the department could not function without its 10 excellent staff members, including: Marta Hess (Business Manager III); Tammy Mills (Administrative Specialist-Academic); Greg George (Department Technology Coordinator); Megan Sexton (Managing Editor of Five Points and Adjunct Assistant Professor); Heather Medlock (Editorial and Production Manager of Studies in the Literary Imagination); Lori Howard, (Business Manager I for SMLA); Kimberly Glover (Administrative Supervisor III); Michele Yulo (Administrative Specialist-Administrative); Heather Russel (Administrative Specialist-Administrative); April Fitz (Administrative Assistant). To meet our goals and objectives for the next cycle, we will need to hire several new staff members to coordinate the creative writers’ reading series, administer the expanded internship/service learning program, collect annual data on alumni, and upgrade and maintain our web pages.

**Infrastructure**

The department’s growth during the past decade has had manifold effects on our work environment. We now have 50 faculty members and over 100 GTAs using the department’s workhorse photocopier day in and day out. It is no surprise that, according to Rita Hunter-Williams at Xerox Corp., the photocopier broke down 14 times in 2003 (Appendix W). The average service call was 55 minutes, but that does not give an adequate idea of the opportunity cost to the department, since the actual down time was several hours to several days each month, including scheduling the service call, waiting for the repair person, and the repair itself. Clearly, a department supporting over 150 teachers needs a second workhorse copier.

Our growth also continues to present space problems for us. We have run out of office space to grow our faculty on the 9th floor of General Classroom Building. We need the College to begin searching for space on an adjacent floor, so that infrastructure considerations will not hinder our programmatic growth. In addition, the office space for 30-35 GTAs is in some years housed outside of the department altogether, which is a hardship for them in terms of class preparation and general integration into the department. In other years, we get by with 5 offices for GTAs on the 9th floor with 20 GTAs crammed into an office.

The Department recognizes the significance of computer technology and has secured a full-time staff position and a part-time assistant to fix computers, install new ones, maintain web pages, and assist faculty members, teaching assistants, and staff in the use of technology. In addition to departmental information, class syllabi, and the catalogue, the Department has five journals that require a web presence. It goes almost without saying that a welcoming, user-friendly online presence is critical for any educational enterprise. Yet the department’s web presence is sorely underdeveloped and under-maintained, due to the time constraints on Greg George, our highly talented but overworked technology coordinator. There is already more work than can be managed and much goes undone, especially in the areas of web maintenance and design and faculty/staff training.
Moreover, the department currently has no periodic rotation of faculty and staff computers to ensure that the department maintains compliant equipment. As it stands, most faculty members have machines that do not meet the minimum requirements established by IS&T for campus network use. (See English Technology Inventory, Appendix S). And our in-house publications currently use redundant technologies that might better be consolidated (see Appendix T and Table I-1, Goals 7, 8, and 12).

Finally, the department needs a new laboratory to enable recent faculty hires, as well as existing faculty members, to perform web usability studies. Such studies form an important part of where the field of rhetoric and composition is heading, and recent faculty members have been hired with the understanding that the department would move in this direction. Such a laboratory will be useful, not only for English but also for UETS and other departments. (See Table I-1, Goals 2, 7, 8, and 9).

Overall
This section has given a detailed and broad picture of a strong department that still has room for growth. The following sections fill in the picture, and present the areas for growth with greater focus.

**Section C: Progress Toward Goals and Objectives Since the Last Academic Program Review**

The recommendations that grew out of the 1990 self study and 1994 action plan (Appendix F) precipitated a ten-year span of considerable accomplishments in the three goal areas—instruction, research, and service. (There was no university strategic plan back then). While those reports studied all three areas at considerable length, it was in the area of instruction that they found the department most in need of change. We therefore report that in this area the department has made some of its most significant gains. From 1973 to 1994 the department experienced a loss of 13 full time faculty positions, down to a roster of 32. This was, nevertheless, a period marked by a steady increase in credit hours taught, a significant rise in theses and dissertations, and a desire on the part of the department to expand its class offerings. In other words, our faculty were overworked. This diminished faculty count therefore had the most immediate effect of encumbering the department’s mission to serve its students. Additionally, this prolonged faculty shortage was a hindrance to individual faculty scholarship and the growth of the department’s research agenda.

With the implementation of the 1994 action plan, the English Department has evolved into one of significant academic and scholarly prominence. From the 1994 low of 34 full-time faculty, we have grown to a roster of 43. These hires have been in areas that enhanced our course offerings to students as well as the diversity of our scholarship and our faculty body. Among the 24 faculty hired since 1994, specialists in non-traditional areas such as Jewish Studies, Southwestern Studies, African-American Literature, Post-colonial Literature, and Literary Theory and Cultural Studies have allowed us to open up and expand our interdisciplinary offerings. Our hires in Secondary English enabled us to
open a new concentration. Additionally, with our hires in Rhetoric and Composition and our increased number of GTAs, we have also been able to satisfy the recommendation in the 1994 study for our most central area of instruction while developing a significant new concentration. We have been able to answer the rising demand for composition courses without resorting to increased class sizes (although we still need to go further and actually decrease class sizes in this area). Departmental support of Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) has resulted in interdisciplinary writing-focused offerings for our students, and the benefits of this commitment extend beyond just English and Humanities majors to the entire student body.

We anticipated in 1994 that by growing our full time faculty roster, we would improve our graduate program in significant ways. We have witnessed the fulfillment of this vision in the increased numbers in our program as well as the more competitive pool from which we draw. As an indicator of the quality of our student pool, the average GRE scores for those admitted to the graduate program in 2004 were above 500. Moreover, we are successfully attracting students from diverse geographic, social and ethnic backgrounds. While we still contend that we need great improvements to our graduate student support packages, our successful elimination of part-time instructors has enabled us to offer a small number of competitive fellowships for graduate students. In the ten-year period 1994 – 2004 the number of undergraduate English majors increased from 448 to 656 and graduate majors increased from 135 to 244. These numbers represent an overall increase of more than 30 percent. We have been able to respond to the needs of this growing population of majors with increased course offerings at the upper division and graduate level: from 1994 to 2004 we increased upper division offerings by 50% (from 50 to 77) and our graduate offerings by 20% (from 59 to 71) (see Table B-9). At the same time, we recognize that we do not yet offer the variety of course offerings our students need.

In the area of scholarship and creative activity, our increase in faculty number and diversity has resulted in an impressive record of publications, conference presentations and research awards. Ours was a productive group even with the demanding load and numbers deficit in 1994; however, with the growth in faculty numbers and diversity and the improvement in class sizes and university research support since that time, our faculty has responded with great energy, as documented in Sections B and F. These achievements in research were partly a result of the previous study’s recommendation that teaching loads be determined by considering faculty members’ professional and service activity. The department responded to the suggestion that administrative and service work be distributed among all faculty to avoid individual overload. In particular, tenure-track members of our faculty are limited to service on two committees in their first three years. A balanced workload policy allows our junior faculty the opportunity to establish themselves professionally. The provision of competitive departmental Summer Research Awards ($7500 each), substantial funds of up to $1300 per year for travel to conferences, and, when possible, ad hoc subventions for permissions and other publication costs, has also contributed to faculty productivity.
In 1994 we had the advantage of a self-study that clearly outlined a set of goals and objectives that were critical to the growth of the department. Ten years later, after having gained significant ground, we are a stronger department in the critical areas against which we measure ourselves. We have strengthened our faculty in number, diversity and standing; we have made significant scholarly and creative contributions in our areas of specialization; we have grown our student body—in numbers, diversity and academic preparedness; and we have continued to be a department that meets the service needs of its students and the university.

Section D: Quality of Curriculum or Curricula Addressed in the Self-Study

Over the past three years, the undergraduate and graduate English programs at GSU have offered students great variety in possible courses of study. Undergraduate students can choose from four concentrations in Literature, Advanced Rhetoric and Composition, Creative Writing, and Secondary English on the undergraduate program; alternatively, they can also consider a major in the British-American Joint-Studies Program concentration, or engage in a number of exchange programs. None of our peer institutions except Wayne State offers such a diversity of program on the undergraduate level. Our graduate programs include a Master of Arts with an emphasis in literary studies; a Master of Arts with an emphasis in rhetoric, composition, and technical and professional writing; a Master of Arts with an emphasis in Creative Writing; and Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing. The doctoral program similarly allows for a focus on literary studies, rhetoric and advanced writing courses, or creative writing. The M.Ed. programs in English Education include 12 hours of graduate English.

Results from the OIR surveys indicate that undergraduate and graduate students think the curricula that make up these various programs are uniformly strong. But the surveys also raised two areas of concern related to the quality of the curricula. The first addresses the diversity of course offerings, especially on the undergraduate level. As one student remarked, “My one and only concern as an undergrad and now a Master’s student, remains the variety and the number of higher level English courses.” Multiple survey responses called for more courses in multicultural and global literature. One student wrote, “We seem to only cater to Rhetoric/Composition and British Literature. There needs to be more minority literature.”

Many of the ethnically diverse courses that are offered by the department are relatively new offerings. The graduate program offers fewer non-Anglo or African-American courses than the undergraduate. There is a striking disparity between the number of courses in literature from various ethnic groups and nationalities we offer and those offered at our peer institutions. GSU’s English faculty falls well below the average of faculty who teach courses that represent various ethnic and cultural groups in relation to the peer institutions sampled. Apart from occasional topics courses, only 12% of the faculty teach the multi-cultural courses; the next lowest found among our peer institutions was Wayne State at 18%. Apart from occasional topics courses, we currently teach only 6 undergraduate classes which could fall under those categories: World Literature, Post-
Colonial Literature, African-American Literature, Language in African-American Communities, African-American Literature by Women, and Caribbean Literature. And there are only two at the graduate level: 19th Century African-American Literature, and 20th Century African-American Literature. The vast majority of these few courses all focus on African American Literature. We imagine that, given the Department’s central location in downtown Atlanta—one of the most culturally diverse cities in the Southern United States—and given the diverse population of our students, new course offerings in literatures of diverse cultures and ethnicities will be well attended.

The second concern about the program revealed through the OIR surveys was related to academic/career advisement. An undergraduate student wrote, “The department should really have a more regular student-friendly advisement system, particularly in regard to transfer students. It’s very difficult to have one’s credits properly evaluated.” Graduate students expressed an even greater desire for more systematized advisement. One suggested, “Entering graduate students should meet with an advisor to have requirements clarified and receive help in choosing a course of study and the first semester’s classes. That advisor should be available for the rest of the graduate study.”

In many ways, the department anticipated student concerns about advisement. We have four advisors who are always available. In the spring of 2003, a faculty task force was formed to make recommendations that would grant graduate students more autonomy in their studies and provide them with more effective faculty guidance. The faculty approved of the task force’s revisions to the graduate requirements and implemented them in Spring, 2004 (see 2004 Graduate Requirements in Appendix I; Appendix L.) The department intends to create a similar task force in 2005 to clarify the undergraduate requirements and to add diversity to the program (Table I-1, Goal 11).

Another curricular concern involves the department’s approach to Writing Intensive courses. The English department, by the nature of its discipline, is a writing extensive department, but courses specifically designated as writing intensive have been almost exclusively the core composition courses: 1101, 1102, and 1103 (see syllabi for Approved Writing Intensives courses in Appendix H). All sections of these courses are taught as writing intensive since the three elements of writing intensive courses—extensive writing, revision, and one-on-one instruction—are all crucial components of composition instruction. Upper division courses are taught as writing intensive only at the initiative of a particular instructor, and this has occurred only on three occasions. As a result, the department has tended to plateau or even regress in its writing instruction at the higher levels. The department recognizes that it needs to consider ways of expanding its emphasis on writing. One means the task force will consider is to require that the gateway courses (2140, 2145, and 2150) and the senior seminars (4300, 4310a, 4310b, 4320, and 4330) be taught as writing intensive courses since these courses already involve extensive writing and instruction about writing. As the department advances its writing intensive goals, it will also need to give particular attention to class size. For a course to be truly writing intensive, there must be a limit on the number of students in the room. As the Writing Across the Curriculum program’s Service Center Report illustrates (Appendix E), national recommendations allow for 15-20 students in such a course and the GSU
Senate resolution on Writing Intensive courses states that classes of 25 or more are eligible for TA support in the form of Writing Consultants. If limits cannot be imposed, faculty members need to be given support in the way of GTA assistance.

Over the past three years, the English department has made significant strides in documenting the learning outcomes and learning outcome assessments. Throughout this time period, all graduating seniors were required to complete an exit portfolio comprised of significant work from English classes and a reflective essay on their development as a reader, writer, and thinker. (See portfolio requirements in Appendix G.) These portfolios were reviewed by faculty members to assess both the student’s work and the department’s program. Students were also required to take a senior seminar in their concentration as one of the courses in their major.

At first, the learning outcomes for the senior seminars, as for all the other courses in the English program, were implicitly embedded in the course syllabi. In Spring, 2003, however, select faculty members began to write explicit learning outcomes for the undergraduate program as a whole and for the department’s core courses. (See 2003 Learning Outcomes in Appendix G.) In Spring, 2004, additional improvements were made to both the learning outcomes and the learning outcome assessments. The Learning Outcomes were divided by concentration so that there could be a clearer coordination between the outcomes and assessment tools. (See 2004 Learning Outcomes in Appendix G.) In addition, assessment sheets were designed so that faculty in each concentration could provide feedback to both the student and the department on the portfolios and the senior seminars. (See assessment sheets for all four concentrations in Appendix G.)

Even before the department had fully designed its assessment tools, it began working to implement changes that would better enable students to achieve the learning outcomes. For example, the exit portfolios immediately revealed that students’ researching and documenting skills did not meet our expectations. Faculty members responded to this deficiency by giving additional attention to research; consequently, more recent portfolios give evidence of students’ notably improved abilities in this area of study. Now that we have assessment tools for both the portfolio and the senior seminars which will provide statistical results, we should be better able to determine student performance in various areas and to suggest programmatic change to address any signs of deficiency. This assessment process will also provide information for a review of the current learning outcomes, scheduled for Spring, 2007 in compliance with the expectation that learning outcomes be assessed every three years. In the meantime, we intend to work on outlining learning outcomes, tools for assessment, and means of reviewing those tools for the survey classes in the coming year, and it needs to be noted that learning outcomes, assessment tools, and a process for programmatic review were written for the graduate English program as the self-study was being completed.

Section E: Quality of the Students in the Academic Programs Under Review
This section summarizes and evaluates the quality of both the incoming and graduating undergraduate and graduate students as indicated below for the three-year review period.

**Input Quality Indicators**

**Admission for undergraduates:**

No particular admission requirements need be met for admission to the undergraduate English major. As a department we are somewhat skeptical of the value of standardized tests as predictors of success in English studies, especially for a department whose student population is urban and diverse. English majors do have a higher Freshman Index and a higher SAT score than the average GSU student and significantly surpass the minimum admission requirements in those areas.

From Fall 2001 to Fall 2005 requirements for admission to undergraduates to GSU have risen incrementally: The Freshman Index for all GSU students in FY 2003 was 2500; SAT verbal and math scores were 430/400. The Freshman Index for all GSU Arts and Science students in FY 2002 was 2615; in FY 2003 it was 2665. The Freshman Index for English majors was 2775, and 2740; in the last two years, 85 to 160 points higher than the GSU Freshman average.

The average verbal/math SAT scores for all GSU Arts and Science students 2002-2003, were 528/529 (1055) and 537/536 (1073). For English majors in FY 2004, the verbal/math SAT scores were 690/560 (1250) and 570/570 (1140).

**Admission for graduate programs:**

Applicants to the English graduate programs include an undergraduate degree with a major in English or a related field for M.A. and M.F.A. degrees and a Master’s degree in English or closely related field for Ph.D. A minimum GPA of 3.0 and transcripts from all college and universities attended are required. On the Graduate Record Exam general test with Verbal, Quantitative, and Analytical sections, applicants should have competitive scores not more than five years old, about the 50th percentile; Verbal scores are most important. A score of 1000 is desirable. Letters of recommendation (3 for Ph.D. and M.F.A., 2 for M.A) from persons who testify to the applicant's ability to do graduate work are required. In addition to a one-page statement of goals, an 8-12-page (M.A.) or 12-15-page (Ph.D.) writing sample of a literary analysis written for a previous class. Persons specializing in creative writing must submit a portfolio of 10 poems, 3 stories, or 50 pages of a novel plus a one-page biography. (See Appendix I).

**Applied/Admitted/Enrolled Graduate Programs**

Three graduate programs are under review: M.A., M. F.A., and Ph. D., for three years offering nine units of information. In all but two of the nine units, GRE Verbal average scores of the students admitted were greater than the GRE Verbal average scores of all students who applied. Similar differences occurred for the Math and Analytical scores. A low score of GRE Verbal 548 for the 2003 M.F.A. class was balanced the next year when the class of admitted M.F.A. students scored an average 616 on the GRE Verbal test. In summary, the graduate students admitted to the graduate programs are the more qualified
applicants and exceed the desired 1000 GRE Verbal and Analytical score by 71 to 213 points (Table E-1).

On average, 52% of the students from the applicant pool for the M.A. program were accepted. 61% of the students applying for the Ph.D. program were accepted. Acceptance ratios for the M.F.A. program are significantly less, but have increased over the three-year period under review: 27%, 38%, and 47%. In summary, with additional faculty to teach in the M.F.A. program, we can now accept roughly half of the applicants to any of our programs. (Table E-2)

**Output Quality Indicators**

Our graduates appear to be well-prepared to find positions in a variety of valid outcomes, yet the perceptions of the students and alumni (undergraduate and graduate) regarding academic and career advisement/preparation are at a medium range (2.92-3.86) overall (Appendix K). This indicates to us that we need to do a better job of academic and career advising and of following up on what students do following graduation to determine if their perceptions match reality.

Graduate alumni satisfaction with career advisement had a mean score of 3.38 out of 5 (Appendix K(9)); however, all but two of the twenty Ph.D. graduates in the time span under review have positions teaching at secondary schools, two-year colleges or four-year colleges and universities (Columbus College; Dalton College; Kennesaw State U.; Lee College, Tennessee; East Carolina State U.; U. Texas at Brownsville, for example); in administrative jobs as deans; or are working as independent scholars by choice (Appendix X). Half of the M.A. graduates have gone on to Ph.D. programs or to professional positions in business, or education as secondary teachers or as Visiting Instructors. Post-graduate plans of 36 of 71 M.A. graduates are unknown. Of seven M.F.A. graduates, two entered GSU’s Ph.D. program, two enrolled in PhD. programs at other schools, one is teaching as a Visiting Instructor at GSU, and the plans of two graduates are unknown (Appendix X).

Another measure of the quality of our graduate students can be found in their publications, professional presentations, and awards (Table B-10). Eleven prizes were awarded to graduate students including a Raymond Carver Short Story Award, a Mensa Education and Research Foundation Award, and Agnes Scott Writer’s Festival awards for first place short stories, poems, and essays. Graduate students had twelve scholarly and 28 creative writing publications, and altogether they were able to present 38 papers at conferences: four at international conferences, the rest at the Graduate English Association’s annual New Voices International Graduate Conference on Language, Literature, and Discourse Studies, the American Studies Association annual conferences, or at SAMLAC. In addition to these conference presentations, 80 graduate students led teaching seminars for their peers during the three years under review.

In summary, both placement and professional development measures indicate that our graduate students are highly qualified and successful upon graduation despite the high teaching loads and the lengthy time to degree (Tables B-5 and I-1, Goal 6). We wonder
how much better our students might do if they had better learning and teaching conditions with supports on a par with our peer institutions and with other departments in the college. We have not had the staff support to track our graduates as effectively as we would like to do. Hiring a staff member to track students and coordinate the marketing of our department (by publishing prizes and publications, for example, and posting open positions) will improve the opportunities for our students (Table I-1, Goals 5 and 8). Numerous creative writing applicants who are accepted into the program do not enroll because of our sub-standard assistantship packages (Table I-1, Goal 3).

The Department makes several competitive awards annually for undergraduate students: Bert H. Flanders Freshman Award for superior writing composition classes, Dabney A. Hart Sophomore English Award, James E. Routh Award for outstanding work by a senior. For graduate students, we give the Marguerite Pettes Murphy Award of outstanding achievement in studies and in teaching freshman and/or sophomore level classes; the Virginia Spencer Carr fellowship based on both need and excellence; and the Paul Bowles Fellowship in Fiction Writing. The GEA gave awards in several categories of literary criticism and creative writing in 2001 and 2002. Neither the award qualifications nor the winners of the awards are available on the department website nor in the catalogue. Again, a webmaster (Table I-1, Goal 8) devoted to developing and maintaining the department website could use these awards to market the department’s strengths, to contribute to the advisement of students, and to lead students to successful post-graduate positions.

**Section F: Quality of the Program Faculty**

During the review period, the full-time faculty in the English Department have been actively involved in research, outreach, and service. Whether measured by their research productivity, the amount of sponsored research they have generated, the honors they have received, the results of their promotion and tenure and reviews, or their service and outreach contributions, the English department’s faculty has done excellent work.

**Scholarly and Creative Productivity**

In the area of scholarly/creative productivity, the following summary includes publications in refereed journals, creative writing (poetry and fiction), and scholarly books and edited volumes, as well as conference presentations, where proposals were accepted through a refereed system and presented.

Faculty produced 40 articles in refereed journals during 2002, at an average rate of 1.05 per faculty member, and 20 creative writing pieces, at a rate of 5 per faculty member. In addition, 5 faculty published a full-length book or edited volume. Of the 42 full-time faculty listed during this year, 24 published an article and 4 published poetry, more than half of the faculty demonstrating productivity in these areas. In the area of conference presentations, 38 of the 42 faculty presented at least one paper at a conference, with the total presentations from faculty measuring 131 for the year.
In 2003, faculty produced 31 articles in refereed journals, and 25 poems or stories published in creative writing journals, 1.3 per faculty member overall. Twenty-five faculty members published articles in refereed journals during this time period, 5 in creative writing journals or books, and 3 faculty published a full-length book or edited volume. Thus, 28 of the 42 faculty contributed to quality publications. In the area of conference presentations, 28 faculty presented at conferences, with a total of 88 presentations this year across faculty.

During FY2004 (from July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2004), faculty published 27 articles, 16 creative pieces (at a rate of .71 per faculty for scholarly work and 3.2 for creative work), and 5 full-length books or edited volumes. Twenty-nine faculty members out of 43 during this time period published a book or an article/creative work in a quality journal. In the area of conference presentations, faculty read 109 papers, 38 faculty members contributing to this figure.

Overall, this information indicates that each year, over half of the fulltime faculty publish at least one article, sometimes two or three. And more than 88% of the faculty are involved in professional development presentations at conferences.

What is just as impressive is the quality of the publication venues. Our faculty members published books with Cambridge University Press, Columbia University Press, Palgrave/Macmillan, Broadview Press, the University of Michigan Press, and MIT University Press, among others. They have also placed articles with some of the most important journals in the relevant fields, including South Atlantic Review, The Irish Review, College Composition and Communication, Modern Drama, Studies in the Age of Chaucer, Composition Studies, Writing Program Administrator, Jewish Culture and History, New Literary History, and Yeats Annual Journal.

Finally, we are proud of our faculty’s work as editors on the five journals based in our department (South Atlantic Review, Five Points, Studies in the Literary Imagination, Eudora Welty Newsletter, and Journal of Advanced Composition online archive).

Faculty Honors
In the area of faculty honors, awards, and recognitions, English Department faculty report from 9 to 12 honors or awards per year (out of an average of 44 faculty). These awards range from nominations for delegate positions on professional organizations such as the Modern Language Association (our most prestigious association for literature) and Distinguished Professor Awards within Georgia State to awards for articles in respected academic journals like College Composition and Communication and book awards from professional organizations, publishing houses, and creative writing magazines. (See Appendix AA for a listing). In addition, faculty have won professional/community service and dissertation awards as well as appointments as Regents’ Professors. The honors and awards vary widely, but the consistency of recognition and valued work among this faculty is impressive.
Sponsored Research
The level of sponsored research is not by itself an accurate reflection of humanities faculty research productivity. Nonetheless, the steady stream of external grants that our faculty have secured makes us proud. As Table B-2 shows, in FY 2002, English Department faculty received $130,766 in external funding through the grants of 2 faculty members. Internal grants were awarded to 15 faculty in the amount of $263,603. In FY 2003, 8 faculty members received external funding in the amount of $269,881, and $114,594 in internal grant dollars was awarded to 8 faculty. Nine faculty were awarded external funding in the amount of $124,820 in FY 2004, and 13 faculty were awarded internal grants in the amount of $102,493. While the number of faculty applying for and receiving external grants has increased over the three-year period, the amount of money awarded fluctuates. Many of the grants received were in very small amounts, including ones for $1000 and $1500. Internal grant moneys worked the same way -- many small grants, very few large ones, which is typical for humanities faculty. While the university tends to reward sponsored research, most humanities faculty research is by its nature unsponsored.

Results of Promotion and Tenure and Reviews
During the review period, ten faculty members were promoted from the Assistant Professor rank to the Associate Professor rank with tenure: Tanya Caldwell, Stephen Dobranski, Michael Galchinsky, Audrey Goodman, Beth Gylks, Mary Hocks, Elizabeth Lopez, Marilyn Richtarik, Calvin Thomas, and Paul Voss. One Associate Professor was promoted to Full Professor: John Holman. No one was denied promotion or tenure.

During this period, eight faculty members successfully passed through their post-tenure review: David Bottoms, Murray Brown, Nancy Chase, George Pullman, Robert Sattelmeyer (2003); and Martha Singer, Malinda Snow, and Leon Stokesbury (2004). Five of our junior faculty completed their third-year review: Pearl McHaney and Renée Schatteman (2002); LeeAnne Richardson (2003); and Scott Lightsey and Elizabeth West (2004).

Service and Outreach Contributions
English Department faculty members are actively engaged in departmental governance and service outreach. Not counting Chair and Director positions, which include at least 7 faculty members, or ad hoc temporary committees that are created based on need, there are 12 departmental committees (See Appendix B). Of these committees, an average of 8 faculty serve on each (with a range from 5 to 12 members). Five faculty also serve as senators for the university, each serving on 2 to 4 subcommittees for the university senate. More specifically, in the three year period studied, faculty contribution was consistent with 42-44 faculty out of the 43-47 faculty members serving on a department committee in one capacity or another. For the university, the activity is also consistent: 20-27 faculty served on university or college committees (of 43-47 faculty members). Community service reported varied most across the three years, from 18-23 members (nearly half of the faculty), but still a significant contribution to the community from this faculty. English Department faculty also contribute to their respective professional organizations as organizers or chairs for conferences, reviewers, and members of
committees. Their activity ranged from 19 to 33, reporting activities such as responding to papers in progress for and with colleagues, organizing presentations and conferences, chairing and sitting on several professional organization boards, review boards, etc.

Section G: The Adequacy of Resources

1. Faculty Resources
While Table G-1, supplied by OIR, shows that the ratio of T/TT faculty to undergraduate majors has been 14 or 15 during the review period, this is not an adequate measure of the use of faculty resources, due to the large number of service courses taught by our faculty. Basing our own estimate on the credit hour data from Table B-4, we calculate that faculty members have actually taught, on average, 29 students per course during the review period (see Table G-2 below).
Table G-2: Average Number of Students/Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Hours Generated by T/TT Faculty</th>
<th># T/TT Faculty Minus Those on Leave</th>
<th># Hours/Faculty</th>
<th># Students/Faculty*</th>
<th># Courses/Faculty</th>
<th># Students/Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2002</td>
<td>13066.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2003</td>
<td>12639</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2004</td>
<td>13291.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>12999</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calculated by dividing the number of hours/faculty by 3 hours/student.

Moreover, it is not unusual for classes to reach as many as 30 students, particularly in the 2000-level surveys (2110, 2120, 2130, 2140—see Table D-1). In courses this large, it is difficult for the instructor to maintain a “Writing Intensive” syllabus. Thus, if the department is to meet its aim of increasing the number of WI courses (particularly in the 2000-level surveys) we would like to move the caps downward to 20. To do this, we will in turn need to free up further faculty to teach these courses. We cannot do so while at the same time increasing the variety of our upper division course offerings, as our peer comparisons suggest we need to do. Thus the only solution is to hire more faculty.

We note that class sizes and needs vary according to concentration. The Associated Writing Program’s guidelines for the “Hallmarks of a Successful Undergraduate Program in Creative Writing” recommends that creative writing workshops “not exceed 15 and that 12 be viewed as desirable and more effective.” But the current cap for GSU creative writing workshops is 20.

Finally, if we are to bring the doctoral students’ time to degree to a length parallel to that of our peer institutions’ graduates, we will need to hire approximately 11 new Lecturers in order to bring GTA teaching load from 2/2 to 2/1 (see Table I-1, Goal 6).

2. Administrative Resources

There are currently 10 staff positions (itemized in Section B) in the Department to support 43 T/TT faculty, 2 Lecturers, 5 Visiting Instructors, and 10 additional teachers as well as over 100 graduate students who also require administrative support because they regularly teach two or more classes a semester.

In 3 specific areas, these administrative resources fall short of what the department will need in the coming cycle. In order to administer the envisioned expansion of the Program in Internships and Service Learning, the department will need a staff coordinator (Table I-1, Goal 5). Similarly, a new staff hire will be needed to develop and promote the visiting writers series (Table I-1, Goal 3). Finally, the department desperately needs to hire another staff person to be the Department Web and Recruitment Coordinator (as described in Table I-1, Goals 5 and 8).
3. **Technological Resources**

The English department has only 26 computers that meet the university’s minimum requirements and 32 faculty and staff machines are below the minimum requirements. Moreover, when one factors in the graduate students who use department computers, there is roughly 1 computer for every 4 people teaching in the department. Increasing interest in visual rhetoric, multi-media publication and presentation, as well as online communications make increased computing power necessary, and traditional literary scholarship increasingly demands sophisticated computing power. Additionally, as first year composition moves toward instruction in computerized environments, as directed by the University Senate’s APACE committee, the people who teach those classes will have to have ready access to adequate computers. Not only does the department need a one-time upgrade from its present state; it needs ongoing, periodic upgrades every 3 to 5 years (see English Technology Inventory, Appendix S).

There is currently one photocopier shared by all faculty and GTAs in the department. Given that a large percentage of teachers use photocopying as a primary pedagogical aid, the Department needs to acquire at least one more copier.

4. **Space Resources**

While every faculty member has his or her own office, as many as 20 graduate students may have to share the same office in some years. As graduate students teach a large proportion of all students taught by the English department, and often need to spend a great deal of face to face time with students in writing conferences, it is essential that these people have office space that they do not have to share, or at least that they have to share with only as many others as will allow them to have it to themselves for several hours a day in order to accommodate their students’ needs.

Moreover, office allocations have long since reached their limit on the 9th floor of the General Classroom Building. As a result, in some years dozens are in another building. This decreases the GTAs’ sense of integration in the life of the department, and, on a day to day level, presents practical hardships in terms of getting computer printouts and making photocopies.

To take account of current and future growth, we estimate that we will need an additional 20-25 offices, preferably near the department on the 9th floor of GCB (see Table I-1, Goal 9).

5. **Laboratory Resources**

Currently the department has the use of two computer classrooms (303 Classroom South and 302 Urban Life). In our discussions with the Associate Provost, APACE, UETS, and IS&T with regard to composition with computers, we have identified a need, in the short term, for at least one more wired classroom (see Table I-1, Goal 4). In the long term, we are planning for an entirely wireless environment.

We also need to procure space and acquire equipment to develop a laboratory that will enable our recent hires in Advanced Composition and Rhetoric to perform the web
usability and multimedia studies that are an increasingly important part of this concentration’s work. We expect this laboratory to be used by faculty and students outside the department as well (see Table I-1, Goal 2).

6. **GSU Foundation Resources**
Through the GSU Foundation, the department maintains the English Enrichment Fund, as well as eight endowed funds for various prizes, fellowships and chairs, two special purpose funds for Five Points, and two unendowed scholarships for undergraduate students.

7. **Library Resources**
The University Library’s resources have been declining for several years due to severe budget cuts. The English department’s annual budget allotment for library acquisitions has decreased 45% in recent years (the same rate as for all other units in the university), it has become impossible to purchase new serials or electronic databases. According to the “English Department Review: Library Resources” by the department’s library liaison, Rebecca Drummond, no new relevant journals have been added in the last three years, and no less than 70 journals have been dropped. New journals are particularly needed in creative writing, rhetoric, Jewish Studies, and World Literature. For example, the library currently has only 18% of periodicals (7 of 40) listed by Cheryl LaGuardia, in the “Little Magazines” chapter of *Magazines for Libraries*. The library’s literary criticism purchases (28% of available titles for English literature, 18% for American literature) is vastly inadequate. As for electronic databases, the library’s report shows that we have lost and are continuing to lose them, and we have been unable to purchase any new databases necessary to our faculty members’ research. We provide a list of needed new databases at Appendix Z. While the library’s core collection of related books and journals remains fairly strong, there is clearly a good deal of catch-up work to be done in a number of areas. The heart of a research university is its library, and we hope that our library’s capacity to function at full strength will soon be restored.

**Section H: The Strengths and Weaknesses of the Program**

**Overview**
Over the last cycle, the department has grown in numerous positive ways. We have added a substantial number of majors and graduate students, as well as 9 new full-time faculty, and our full-time faculty has continued to move up in rank. As a whole, we have published over 40 books and editions. Twenty-five of our faculty have won external awards and grants and three have won University-wide teaching awards. We have fostered and developed an award winning exchange program, have added new classes as well as a new concentration in Secondary English, and have helped to found a new college-wide program in Jewish Studies. Additionally, our composition program has grown into a nationally-recognized model, and we have housed the Writing Across the Curriculum Program as well as the Writing Studio, where both undergraduate and graduate students can receive one-on-one teaching in writing, and polish their written work through revision. Generally speaking, the last seven years have been extraordinarily productive and successful, but there are many areas upon which we can expand and
improve. Because of our fairly steady and rapid growth, we need to develop ways to better coordinate and streamline our programs, publications and overall curriculum. We also need to improve our avenues of communication. Additionally, we would like to add to our faculty and to our variety of course offerings—particularly in the areas of global literatures and interdisciplinary studies; improve on our graduate student support and our student advisement; grow our creative writing reading series; move toward offering significantly more computerized composition instruction; expand our internship/service learning program; and increase support—especially in the arena of professional leaves—to our junior and research active senior faculty.

Strengths

1. Faculty Size and Rank
As is noted in Table B-1 B, the Department currently has 43 full-time faculty, 32 of whom are tenured. Of those 43 full-time members, we have 11 Assistant Professors, 20 Associate Professors, and 12 Full Professors. According to Appendix F, in 1994, at the start of the last review process, the number of full-time faculty was 34. So in terms of size we have had a net gain of 9 full-time faculty positions since the last review took place. Of the full-time faculty in 1994, 6 of those were full professors, 15 were Associate Professors; 13 were Assistant Professors. So since 1994, we are a slightly more seasoned department, though we have maintained a good overall balance between ranks, and our faculty members have continued to gain promotion and tenure at a steady and consistent rate.

2. Student Headcounts by Level and Program
In the year 2004 we had 656 English majors and 244 graduate students, increasing from 448 majors and 135 graduate students in 1994 (see Appendix F). This is an increase in majors of about 32% and in graduate students of roughly 45%. In the last two years alone, we have gained 71 undergraduate students and 26 graduate students, a growth of 5% at the undergraduate level, and 27% at the graduate level.

3. Number of Faculty Who Are Research Active
The faculty has been extremely active in publishing and producing research. As noted in Table 2 and also Graph 2 of OIR’s 2003 Faculty Survey Findings, 62% had served on editorial boards in their field, and 74.4% had refereed or served as a reviewer of one or more articles submitted to journals in their field. According to page 16 of the Faculty Survey Findings, 61.8% of the faculty have authored or edited at least one book over the last five years: 42.9% had authored or edited one book, 11.9% had authored or edited two books, and 7.1% had authored or edited three books. Roughly 96% of our faculty had published articles, manuals or reviews, more than 95% had given formal presentations at professional meetings over the last 5 years, and 72 % had given formal presentations at other colleges and institutions.

4. Amount of External Funding Generated
The Department has also had wonderful success securing external funding, as the listing in Section A above shows. These funds have come from nationally prominent granting agencies. There is no question that the majority of our faculty has been active in their
respective fields, garnering both publication, professional acknowledgment, and monetary support for their work.

5. Publications
One of our great strengths as a department has been our eager involvement in the production of literary and scholarly magazines and journals. We currently house five different publications in our department, including the Eudora Welty Newsletter, Five Points, the Journal of Advanced Composition electronic archive, the South Atlantic Review, and Studies in the Literary Imagination. These publications have garnered national and international recognition for the department as well as providing opportunities for our students and faculty to gain experience editing and producing them.

6. Teaching
In our department, we have generated an extraordinary number of credit hours and offered a tremendous breadth and depth of courses. Tenure-track faculty in 2004 taught 13,291.5 credit hours, and our overall credit hour generation in the English Department, including courses taught by full-time faculty, part-time instructors, GTA’s and Visiting Instructors, totaled 39,327.

Between fiscal year 2002 and 2004, we also taught a large number of courses: about a hundred different undergraduate classes, and 69 graduate classes. We taught roughly 19 different composition/rhetoric classes at the undergraduate level and 6 at the graduate level. There were 15 American literature classes offered at the undergraduate level and 14 at the graduate level—20 English/Irish literature classes at the undergraduate level and 25 at the graduate level. In creative writing we taught ten different undergraduate workshops and seminars and six workshops and seminars at the graduate level. We also taught World Literature, several folklore classes, feminist literature classes, History of the English Language, courses in literary history and criticism and theory, as well as a number of linguistics courses. There is no question that we provide numerous opportunities for our majors. We are especially strong in English and American literary studies.

7. Composition and Rhetoric
Some of our greatest achievements over the last cycle have occurred in this area of our department. We have hired four tenure-track composition rhetoric specialists who have helped in the development of a nationally renowned teacher training program for our GTA’s, a well-staffed and organized Writing Studio, and a campus-wide Writing Across the Curriculum Program.

8. Creative Writing
Our creative writing program has grown in both size and stature since our last self-study report. Members of our department spear-headed the now internationally acclaimed journal Five Points, our graduate students and faculty have won numerous awards and been published widely in excellent journals and literary magazines throughout the country, and David Bottoms, our senior poetry faculty member, was named Poet Laureate of Georgia.
9. **Service Centers.** The Writing Across the Curriculum program and the Writing Studio ensure that the English department helps serve the needs of students and faculty across campus.

*Weaknesses*

Most of our program’s weaknesses stem from two areas. Either we have grown so quickly we have not been able to coordinate, streamline and/or support that growth adequately, or in several ways we have not yet caught up with major shifts in the field. Our need for resources is almost solely a result of these two problems.

1. **The Coordination of Resources**
   As noted, because of the tremendous growth the English Department at Georgia State has experienced over the last ten years, we have not been able to keep up with the staffing and infrastructure improvements that would enable us to support some of our new development. This has been especially true with regard to our increased number of graduate students and junior faculty, our publications, and our physical environment.

2. **Support of Graduate Students**
   Compared to our peer institutions, our graduate students are taking on average 2-3 years longer to complete their degrees. Part of the problem is that we require too much teaching from our GTAs, another part is that we do not have an adequate system in place to help our graduate students with career advisement and preparation, and another part is that the university has not to this point provided medical benefits. Compared to our peer institutions, we also offer too little in the way of Service Learning and Internship opportunities. And we can continue to develop more effective ways to train and mentor our TA’s—especially with regard to on-line classroom teaching, teaching literature, and teaching creative writing. Finally, we offer little travel support for our graduate students, and in order to make them competitive for academic careers, we need to do more to support their efforts to gain professional experience.

3. **Support of Faculty Research**
   Most of our peer institutions offer professional leave to their active faculty members every 7 years, and offer either a semester or a year professional leave to junior faculty during their fourth year. Georgia State offers a $7500 Research Initiation Grant to junior faculty during the summer of their 1st year—in other words junior faculty have essentially one summer of support to focus on their research and writing. Additionally, the College offers the English department only 2-3 leaves per year for Associate and Full Professors. To enable all of our active research faculty members to have a leave every 7 years, we would need to be awarded 4-5 leaves per year. The obstacles to greater productivity also include a lack of University-level support, and dipping library acquisitions (see Table I-1, Goal 10).

4. **Creative Reading Series**
   Despite our vibrant and growing creative writing faculty and graduate programs, our reading series is unorganized, poorly advertised, and underfunded when compared to our
peer institutions. Part of the problem is that the various organizations within our department who do commission fiction writers and poets to give readings need to communicate and organize their efforts more effectively. Part of the problem is that the department is allocated only $9,000 per year to bring in outside readers, as compared with programs like that of the University of Pittsburgh, which spends $40,000 each year on its reading series.

5. **Marketing and Recruitment**
Currently, our department is unable to keep up with the demands of servicing and maintaining its website and recruiting students to its many and diverse programs. Just to keep faculty, staff and GTA computers updated and running, our Technology Coordinator is being stretched well beyond his limits.

6. **Work Environment**
Currently, for its 50 full-time faculty and 104 GTAs, the English Department owns one workhorse photocopy machine, a machine that breaks down frequently. We need another photocopier to keep up with the copying demands of so many employees. Additionally, we now house many of our GTAs in buildings well away from the Department. We need more office space close to the 9th Floor of the General Classroom Building in order to accommodate our faculty and large number of GTAs more conveniently.

7. **Shifts in the Field**
For the most part, the department has been successful growing and changing, meeting the needs of its majors and its discipline; however, there are several ways in which we need to think of stretching and reconfiguring ourselves. The largest gap in our department, as indicated in faculty and student surveys, has to do with a gross under-representation in our course offerings of global and transnational literatures and ethnic literatures in the United States.

8. **On-Line Composition Instruction**
All of our peer institutions offer introductory writing classes in on-line computer classrooms. We currently offer only a few on-line introductory level writing classes. This is in part because we have one computer classroom available to do this kind of on-line instruction. We need at least three computer classrooms in order to allow every section of every class consistent on-line writing instruction.

**Conclusion**
The data demonstrates that the English department is strong as it is, and, if properly supported, will grow even stronger. We recall the statement in the College of Arts and Sciences 2000-2005 Strategic Plan that, “in view of the accomplishments of the program in English . . . the University aims to make [English] the leading department in the Southeast.” We endorse this aim wholeheartedly. We know that with the university’s support we are ready to move up to the next level.

Section I: Program Goals and Objectives for the Next APR Cycle
To reach consensus on the Goals and Objectives for the next APR Cycle detailed in this section, the English department engaged in a year-long and wide-ranging series of activities. Going far beyond what was called for by the APR Template, these activities included online surveys of all faculty (beyond the surveys OIR conducted), a recorded, personal interview between a self-study committee member and each faculty and staff member, the creation of an aggregated list of nearly 600 recommendations from all sources, the production of a series of reports by committee members and other members of the department, a series of six meetings of the full faculty to discuss the draft goals and objectives, revisions, Executive Committee consideration, further revisions, and a final faculty vote. Please see Appendix R for a fully itemized description of the self-study procedures.

The areas addressed by our 14 Goals are as follows:

Goal 1: Literature Concentration
Goal 2: Rhetoric and Composition Concentration
Goal 3: Creative Writing Concentration
Goal 4: Lower Division Studies
Goal 5: Internships, Service Learning, and Career Advisement
Goal 6: Doctoral Students’ Time to Degree
Goal 7: Technology Support
Goal 8: Marketing, Recruitment, Web Presence
Goal 9: Work Environment
Goal 10: Faculty Research Support
Goal 11: Quality and Coherence of the Curriculum
Goal 12: Department Publications
Goal 13: Writing Across the Curriculum
Goal 14: Writing Studio

We present our Goals in Table I-1, each with its own goal statement, rationale, links to the relevant sections of the College of Arts and Sciences Strategic Goals statement (2000-2005) and the University Strategic Plan (2000), objectives, estimate of resources needed, and plan for implementation.