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INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW OF DEPARTMENT AND RATIONALE

SECTION I: Our History and Context

A. Foci

Students:

1. How do we engage, communicate with, and advise students in order to interest, recruit, and retain them in the study of English?

   • How can we build a more cohesive community among our students?
   • What strategies can we develop to attract students to our minor?
   • How can we engage students in discovering the significance and value of the study of English?
   • What sorts of opportunities can we provide students that will help them see the various ways to use their English experience in their current and future careers?
   • What suggestions do you have for developing an effective advising system?

Faculty:

2. In what area should we be hiring? In other words, what do you see as our needs for faculty hiring and which concentration(s) have the greatest needs?

   • For what reasons do we need to be hiring; e.g. retirements, existing deficiencies; growth areas?
   • How do we maintain faculty professional development when travel budgets are inadequate?
   • What recommendation would you make for increasing faculty development and morale?
   • How can we improve working conditions for associate faculty without cutting into the budget for hiring full-time faculty?
   • How do we achieve parity between the numbers of lecturers and the number of tenure-track faculty and decrease the imbalance between them?

Curriculum:

3. How can we develop a curriculum that is attractive to students and provides them with experiences that will help them succeed?

   • What will be required to create and sustain quality instruction while developing a stronger online presence?
   • How do we revise and develop courses that reflect changes in 21st century literacies and careers?
   • Do we need to develop any new minors or certificates for undergraduates such as a minor in minority literature?
Student Advising/Career Development:

4. How can we continue to assess and improve on student advising as well as afford students career and academic opportunities in the likeness of internships and other experiential learning activities?

- Do we continue to allow the capstone to serve as an exit to the major?
- Do we keep creating internship opportunities and make it mandatory for students to participate instead offering the capstone?
- How do we improve student advising and the interactions/relationships between faculty and advisees?
- How can we better utilize the software and systems in place to assist faculty to advising

Resources/Space:

5. How do we improve and increase staff support for our department, especially in the face of budget restrictions and impending retirements?

- How do we make the English Department a more welcoming and workable space for faculty and students? Context: we are spread across four floors in Cavanaugh Hall as well as several off-campus venues.
- How can we seek and secure other resources in addition to what is given to us by the school?
- Should we create an advisory board to address the needs of staff and securing additional staff support?
B. IUPUI and Its Mission

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) is an urban campus located near the heart of downtown Indianapolis. The stated vision guiding IUPUI is “To be one of the best urban universities, recognized locally, nationally, and internationally for its achievements.” IUPUI’s mission is “to advance the State of Indiana and the intellectual growth of its citizens to the highest levels nationally and internationally through research and creative activity, teaching and learning, and civic engagement.”

IUPUI’s location in downtown Indianapolis offers many opportunities, as Indianapolis is the political and economic hub of the state of Indiana, serving as the state capitol and the home of several major businesses, including Ely Lilly Pharmaceuticals and WellPoint, Inc. Because of the many programs and schools on the IUPUI campus dedicated to health, such as the IU School of Medicine, the IU School of Nursing, the Dental School, the new School of Public Health as well as a variety of Centers with a health focus, IUPUI is Indiana’s urban research and academic health sciences campus.

IUPUI’s location in Indianapolis offers a variety of cultural opportunities, with the city hosting the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra, the Indianapolis Repertory Theater, the Indianapolis Museum of Art, the Eiteljorg Museum of American Indians and Western Art, and the Children’s Museum of Indianapolis. And, as the home of the Indianapolis 500, the Brickyard 400, the Indianapolis Colts football team, the Indiana Pacers basketball team, and the national headquarters for the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), the city has become a center for both amateur and professional athletics. All in all, IUPUI’s location in the center of a major metropolitan area offers a wide range of opportunities for the development of programs and partnerships relevant to the success of faculty, staff, and student in the Department of English.

IUPUI is a research university that was created in 1969 as a partnership between Indiana and Purdue Universities, with Indiana University having administrative responsibility. With over 30,000 students from all 50 states and 122 countries, IUPUI grants degrees in more than 200 programs from both Indiana University and Purdue University. Students at IUPUI are more likely than their counterparts at IUB to be first generation college students, to be from diverse ethnic backgrounds, to be less affluent, and to attend part-time. The recession has hit Indiana hard. The Indianapolis Star reports that median income in the state has fallen 13.6% in the last decade. Our students are on average 25, three years younger now than in 1990, and they are struggling economically. 30% of them were eligible for free lunches in high school. A lucky few have full-time jobs; many cobble together two or even three part-time jobs to remain students. IUPUI is setting up a food bank on campus this fall.

Providing educational opportunity to Indianapolis and Central Indiana is at the core of the IUPUI mission; however, IUPUI’s diverse student body reflects the institution’s ongoing efforts to provide rich educational opportunities across the region, state, nation, and the globe. To assess the position of the Department of English within its larger context, it is also important to understand the values embraced by the university:

IUPUI values the commitment of students to learning; of faculty to the highest standards of teaching, scholarship, and service; and of staff to the highest standards of service. We recognize students as partners in learning. We value the opportunities afforded by our location in Indiana’s capital city and are committed to serving the needs of our community. Our students, faculty, and staff are involved in the community, providing educational programs, working with a wide array of community partners who serve Indianapolis and Central Indiana, offering expert care and assistance to patients and clients, and engaging in field research spanning virtually every academic discipline. IUPUI is a leader in fostering collaborative relationships; thus we value collegiality, cooperation, creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship as well as honesty, integrity, and support for open inquiry and dissemination of findings. We are committed to the personal and professional development of a diverse campus community of students, faculty, and staff; to continuous improvement of its programs and services; and to building a
strong, welcoming campus community for all. (http://www.iport.iupui.edu/iupui/visionmission/)

Degree programs in the academic divisions at IUPUI are regionally accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (NCA), which oversees the processes of academic evaluation and approval for the campus as a separate unit and as a component of the Indiana University and Purdue University multi-campus systems. The NCA has accredited IUPUI degree programs at the associate and baccalaureate levels, in addition to certain master’s degree programs. The North Central Association first accredited the IUPUI campus in 1972. The campus was subsequently accredited for ten-year periods in 1982-83, 1992-93 and 2002-2003. The most recent visit to the campus from the NCA was in November 2012.

C. The School of Liberal Arts

The School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI is the home of 11 departments (including the Department of English) and over 30 academic programs, institutes and research centers with national and international reputations for scholarly activity. The school offers a range of bachelor’s degrees, undergraduate minors and certificates at the undergraduate level. At the graduate level, the school offers approximately 20 Master’s degree programs and two Ph.Ds. (Philanthropic Studies and Economics). Philanthropic Studies in the near future will become the School of Philanthropy, leaving Ph.D. programs in Economics and Health Communication.

The mission of the School of Liberal Arts, as articulated in its Strategic Plan for 2010-2015, is “creating and exchanging knowledge that promotes understanding of the human experience.” The aspiration of the school is “to become a model 21st-century urban liberal arts school and a preferred location for learning and research in the humanities and social sciences.”

The mission and aspiration of the School of Liberal Arts (SLA) are built on a set of core values, according to the Strategic Plan 2010-2015, which can be found in full at:


The strategic plan for SLA identifies five specific goals that help define the priorities of the school for the next decade. These goals include:

- Goal 1: Create learning opportunities that inspire students to develop their intellectual abilities academically, technologically, and practically in order to enhance their personal, professional, and civic lives.
- Goal 2: Continue and improve the quality and productivity of scholarly research and creative activity performed by Liberal Arts faculty and students.
- Goal 3: Increase awareness, appreciation, and support of the School of Liberal Arts and of the impact and involvement, within the community, of its students, faculty, staff, and alumni.
- Goal 4: Support students, staff and faculty through improved efficiency, communications, and working environment.
- Goal 5: Protect and promote the financial future of the School.

D. The Department of English

The English department’s mission is rooted firmly within the mission, values and goals embraced by the School of Liberal Arts and IUPUI.

Mission Statement

Through its courses and other activities in writing, creative writing, literature, linguistics, language instruction, and film, the Department of English seeks to foster students’ abilities to read closely, think
deeply and critically, research effectively, and write with clarity and purpose, preparing students for meaningful lives and a variety of careers.

Vision Statement
By its commitment to excellence in all aspects of its mission, the IUPUI Department of English aspires to become nationally and internationally recognized as a leader among urban, public universities in the areas of scholarly research, creative activity, classroom pedagogy, diversity, and service to the profession and the larger community.

Diversity Statement
The Department of English values diversity in its faculty, students, and staff, and in the work it does to advance the goals of its discipline. As a result, it seeks opportunities to enhance and extend the diverse and inclusive elements of its teaching, research, and service, and their impact on university and community lives.

The Department of English defines diversity as accepting, respecting, and recognizing individual differences. These can be along the dimensions of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, age, physical abilities, religious beliefs, political views, languages, or ideologies. Exploring these differences in a safe, positive, and nurturing environment creates understanding beyond simple tolerance, honoring and celebrating the varying aspects of diversity within individual identities (definition adapted from the University of Oregon's "Definition of Diversity").

The Department pursues diversity by developing courses that embrace diversity in their content using teaching strategies that challenge and engage all members of the classroom community, encouraging faculty research or expertise that supports diversity inquiry, recruiting and retaining diverse faculty and staff, and attracting and retaining diverse students. The Department seeks to reach out to other communities in a range of interests and concerns, and prizes its community collaborations that have an impact on enhancing diversity and civic responsibility.

D. Context for 2013 External Review

Appendix A provides the complete report submitted by the 2005 external review committee as well as the full department response. The following sections provide (1) an update of how the department has followed through, as of June 2013, to its 2006 review response, and (2) the 2008 department strategic plan (Appendix B).

D.1. 2005 Review and Department Response as of Spring 2013

Our previous department review was conducted in October 2005, with the review team giving us 17 major recommendations (see appendices for both the 2005 review and 2006 response). In response to the ensuing departmental discussion of the recommendations, the department chair at that time (Susanmarie Harrington) outlined seven priorities for the department to pursue. These seven priorities are listed below as stated, along with the actions taken to address those priorities over the past five to seven years:

a. Addressing hiring needs
   i. **Action steps proposed:** “make justified requests to the Dean for two tenure-line appointments, one in literature and one in applied linguistics/TESOL, followed by two additional requests in each of the next 3 years.”
   ii. **Actions taken:** The following tenure-line hires have been made since the review:
      * 2006: Creative Writing/Poetry (Mitchell Douglas)
      * 2006: Film Studies (Debra White-Stanley—left in 2009)
      * 2007: Applied Linguistics/TESOL (Julie Belz)
• 2007: Literature/Drama: (Terri Bourus)
• 2009: EAP Program Director/Applied Linguistics (Estela Ene)
• 2010: Writing & Literacy/Digital Rhetoric (Andy Buchenot)
• 2011: Children’s & Adolescent Literature (Megan Musgrave)
• 2012: Film Studies (Janani Subramanian)
• 2013: Creative Writing/Fiction (Kyle Minor)

iii. Notes:
• Four tenure-line faculty who had full appointments in the department also retired during this time period: Harrington (Writing & Literacy: resigned in 2008), White-Stanley (Film Studies: resigned in 2009), Turner (Literature: retired in 2009), Davis (Writing & Literacy and Literature: retired in 2009).
• Henry-Anthony (Literature) was hired as a Public Scholar for the Africana Studies Program in 2007; she has a 50% appointment in English.
• Further discussion of lecturer-line hires/departures and current tenure- and lecturer-line hiring needs are discussed below.

b. Revising key policies and guidelines
i. Action steps proposed: “creating (for lecturers) and revising (for tenure-line faculty) annual review guidelines; creating clearer promotion and tenure guidelines.”
ii. Actions taken:
• Annual review guidelines were revised/developed for both tenure-line and lecturer line faculty in 2006
• Annual review process was dramatically revised and simplified in 2009. (Stable annual review/mentoring panels for assistant professors instituted to promote better annual feedback.)
• Explicit department expectations for promotion (and tenure) for both tenure-track and lecturer lines were approved in 2008.
• The Program Directors Committee replaced the elected but largely ineffective Executive Committee in 2009.
• Department by-laws were updated in 2009.

c. Revisiting department majors
i. Action steps proposed: “improving department advising, revising our website, addressing issues of assessment in the major, addressing issues of curricular focus.”
ii. Actions taken:
• New website was created from scratch
• Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) were developed for the major and Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs) were identified for all courses.
• Five of the six English concentrations (not Film Studies) were revised and approved by the School Faculty Assembly in 2009.
• Process for assigning advisees more efficiently to faculty in the student’s concentration area instituted

iii. Notes:
• Assessment of the major still has not been adequately addressed, as discussed further below

d. Improving morale
i. Action steps proposed: “celebrating faculty accomplishments; streamlining meeting agendas; emphasizing optimism and the capacity for change; sharing information about expectations, policies, budgets, planning.”
ii. Actions taken:
• Chair posts to department listserv significant faculty accomplishments (grants,
important awards, books, etc.)

- News releases, bio pieces, appointments, book covers, etc., on/by/of faculty are posted on department display boards and, in some cases in the annual department e-newsletter.
- Faculty are encouraged to work within program areas and through program directors to recommend/propose changes.
- A department Oncourse site was created to house and make easily accessible important information with regard to employment, scholarship, and instruction within the department.
- Department meeting agendas include at least one discussion issue relevant to the department.
- A Holiday Party for the whole department is held every year

e. **Focusing attention on research and teaching**
   i. **Action steps proposed:** “revising annual review guidelines, articulating performance expectations for faculty and streamlining the review process; producing departmental guidelines for promotion and/or tenure processes, articulating logistics and conceptual issues to encourage progress through ranks with less stress.”
   ii. **Actions taken:**
      - (See first and second bulleted items in area d above)

f. **Focusing attention on personal professional development**
   i. **Action steps proposed:** structured mentoring for new faculty; discussion of mentoring by department as well as mentoring by individuals; individual attention to associate professors who may seek promotion to professor.
   ii. **Actions taken:**
      - All new faculty are connected with a department mentor.
      - All new assistant professors have a three-member review panel, chaired by the mentor that performs all annual reviews and makes up the core of the third-year and P&T primary committees.
      - “Planning for Promotion” outline was developed and is distributed by chair to all associate professors at the time of the Faculty Annual Review. Chair has had individual “planning for promotion” conversations with eight of the associate professors in the past three years, with actions to take for promotion outlined for each.
   iii. **Notes:**
      - Only one associate professor has gone up for promotion to full professor in the past six years; two are currently going up (one for tenure only and one for promotion) and three plan to go up for promotion in either 2014.

g. **Developing a Strategic Plan**
   i. **Action steps proposed:** “consultation with Executive Committee and other standing committees to produce a strategic plan by Fall 2008; implementation of pilot assessment of the undergraduate major in 2007.
   ii. **Actions taken:**
      - Strategic plan was approved by the department in fall 2008
   iii. **Notes:**
      - Due primarily to departure of department chair in June 2008, work on assessment of the undergraduate major stalled until 2012. Groundwork for implementing assessment steps is now being established, but the department has not adequately addressed this proposed action step from the 2005 review.
D.2. English Department Strategic Plan: 2008-2013

During 2008, the department engaged in a series of conversations to establish a strategic plan. The following plan was approved in December 2008.

**Goal 1: Stimulate and Sustain Excellence in Research and Creative Activity**

*Objective 1.1: Increase department’s national visibility in research and creative activity*
- Encourage and expect tenure-line faculty at all levels to produce and submit for publication meaningful new work in their areas of expertise
- Facilitate faculty travel to conferences and professional meetings
- Communicate and celebrate research
- Recruit graduate students and outstanding undergraduates for research assistantships and establish funding to support these assistantships

*Objective 1.2: Retain and hire excellent faculty in key areas*
- Retain and hire excellent faculty who have active research agendas that address areas of departmental need
- Offer competitive salaries
- Facilitate mentoring of junior faculty in the areas of research progress and opportunities
- Pursue support for new endowed chairs and professorships

**GOAL 2: Stimulate and Sustain Excellence in Teaching and Learning**

*Objective 2.1: Promote excellence in teaching*
- Promote faculty development in teaching
- Recognize excellent teaching
- Promote contribution to the scholarship of teaching

* Objective 2.2: Retain and hire excellent faculty in key areas*
- Hire faculty in response to enrollment growth and to achieve our vision for developing graduate programs
- Offer competitive salaries

*Objective 2.3: Strengthen Undergraduate Education*
- Enhance student learning
- Improve advising of students
- Enhance student activities and engagement

*Objective 2.4: Strengthen MA Program in English*
- Attract more and better students
- Increase retention and graduation rates
- Expand the graduate curriculum

**GOAL 3: Stimulate and Sustain Excellence in Service and Civic Engagement**

*Objective 3.1: Promote excellence in service*
*Objective 3.2: Increase and promote civic engagement*

**GOAL 4: Enhance Working and Learning Environments**

*Objective 4.1: Improve faculty morale at all levels*
*Objective 4.2: Improve staff morale and working conditions*
*Objective 4.3: Promote diversity among faculty, staff, and students*
*Objective 4.4: Improve physical environment of the department*
*Objective 4.5: Increase resources in support of the department’s missions*
SECTION II: Department of English Students, Faculty, and Resources

A. Department of English Students
Information Management and Institutional Research (IMIR) has provided the following tables to the department. Note that in most cases in this self-study, reported data lag by one or two years.

A.1 Undergraduate Students:

A.1.1 Enrollments, Demographics, and Credit Hours

Enrollments and Demographics: Tables 1 and 3 provide demographic data for the undergraduate students in the Department of English over the last 10 years. Numbers are for students who have declared the BA in English who are registered in courses during fall semester.

Table 1: Undergraduate Students in the Department of English, IUPUI (Fall Semesters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semesters</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC Official</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution by Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution by Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 and Over</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution by Student Class Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution by Full versus Part-time Enrollment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution by Indiana Residency Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Resident</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New IPEDS ethnicity definitions were applied for years 2010-2012.

Current advising data indicates that our number of undergraduate majors is 227 students as of September 2013. We are the third largest BA program in the School of Liberal Arts, after Communication Studies and Political Science.
The most notable statistic from Table 1 is the number of declared English majors (“Head Count Official Census,” top row). Looking at three-year trends, the average number of majors in the department for the three-year period of 2003-2004-2005 was 267. The average number of majors in the department for the three-year period of 2010-2011-2012 was 248; this represents a 7% decline in majors over the past decade. [Trends within the individual concentrations in the department are discussed later in this report.] For comparison, there was an overall increase in majors in the school of 13% from the three-year period of 2003-2004-2005 to the three-year period of 2010-2011-2012. Looking again at Table 1, the largest drop-off in English majors seems to come from “older” students (those 25 and over), a decline of 29% from 2009 and 26% from 2003, and students who are enrolled full-time, a decline of 20% from 2009 (although no meaningful decline from 2003, 154 students to 153). In addition, comparing the three-year periods 2003-2005 and 2010-2012, most of the decline in majors is among freshmen and sophomores, with the average percentage of majors at those two levels declining 20.6% and 19.2%, respectively, as compared to a 4.9% and 1.7% decline in junior and senior majors, respectively.

While we do not know the reason for these recent declines, we believe three issues may be contributing to these trends:

1. It is likely that many students who found themselves unemployed or underemployed during the economic downturn that began in 2007-2008 chose to go or return to school full-time to get college degrees. Now that these students are finishing their degrees, we are moving to a more traditional profile of English majors who are in their late teens and early twenties. This interpretation is supported by the fact that the number of full-time English majors increased 33% in the two-year period from 2007 (144) to 2009 (192) when the economic downturn began, before decreasing in 2012 (153).

2. There has been increasingly prominent discussion in the media about the perceived lack of value of a liberal arts degree in general, along with an increased push for supposedly more job-specific degrees in light of the job market difficulties discussed above. We believe this may be discouraging some students from pursuing the English major.

3. The cost of an undergraduate education at IUPUI has increased significantly over the past 10 years, which is reflected in the fact that 73.1% of English majors on the 2011 IUPUI Continuing Student Satisfaction and Priorities Survey (see Table 2 below) indicated that they are receiving some level of financial aid in support of their education (compared to 87.5% for the campus as a whole).

The overall demographic make-up of our undergraduate students is comparable to the make-up of the entire School of Liberal Arts, as can be seen in Table 3, although the department tends to have a slightly higher percentage of women (68% to 61% in 2012) and a slightly lower percentage of minorities (16% to 23%) than the school as a whole. In 2012, English majors also tended to be, on average, younger than undergraduate students in the school as a whole (36% to 48% age 25 or older).

Looking at data from the 2011 IUPUI Continuing Student Satisfaction and Priorities Survey in Table 2 comparing responses from undergraduate students whose primary degree program was in the English department (N=26) with all students on campus (response rate ~18%), the following comparisons stand out for English majors. [NOTE: the number of students responding to this survey, 26, is very small, so interpretations should be made with caution, as reported results may not represent real trends.]

- While our students are shifting toward a more traditional college age, English majors are more likely than the average IUPUI student to work two or three jobs (37.6% to 19.6%).
- Our students who work off campus tend to work more, with 57.1% of those students working 26+ hours/week compared to 39% for the average IUPUI.
- Only 44% of English majors categorized themselves as “single, never married,” compared to 73% of all IUPUI students, with 32% indicating they have children at home, compared to 28.4% for IUPUI students as a whole.
• While nearly 80% of IUPUI undergraduate students enrolled for at least 12 credit hours (full-time status), only about 62% of English majors were enrolled as full-time students (a statistically significant difference).

Table 2: 2011 IUPUI Continuing Student Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK AND COLLEGE</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>All Resp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many jobs are you currently holding?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND AND FAMILY</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>All Resp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage indicating they have children at home</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of respondents with children, how many?</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>All Resp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your marital status?*</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>All Resp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single, never married</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated, widowed, or divorced</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFF-CAMPUS EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>All Resp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage indicating they are currently working for pay off campus</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of those who work off-campus, percentage indicating they work...</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>All Resp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-15 hours per week</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25 hours per week</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-34 hours per week</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 or more hours per week</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment status **</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>All Resp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time (12 hours or more)</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time (11 hours or less)</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Undergraduate Student Profile of the Department of English as Compared with the IU School of Liberal Arts (SLA).
Credit Hours: Table 4 gives the credit hours taught in the department of English, not including Film Studies courses, by calendar year and level (lower division, upper division, and graduate). One notable trend stands out across all three levels. The average number of “lower division” credit hours taught in the department dropped 9.2% from 20,829 for the three-year period 2005-2007 to 18,920 for the three-year period 2010-2012; the average number of “upper division” credit hours taught in the department dropped 4.5% from 3630 for the three-year period 2005-2007 to 3468 for the three-year period 2010-2012; and the average number of “graduate” credit hours taught in the department dropped 2.1% from 759 for the three-year period 2005-2007 to 743 for the three-year period 2010-2012. Not surprisingly, the overall percentage of credit hours the department contributes to the school dropped from a three-year average of 17.9% for 2005-2007 to 16.3% for 2010-2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: English Department Credit Hours by Level and Year*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UG Courses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0              1137  1174  1785  2511  1930  1570  1486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100            13884 14577 13818 13866 12987 12108 12792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200            5536  5310  5265  4676  4899  5310  4719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division 20557 21061 20868 21053 19816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300            3178  2903  2973  2763  2848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400            643  592  600  705  713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division 3821 3495 3573 3288 3423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total UG Hours 24378 24556 24441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Courses 691  808  778  712  757  687  806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of School Hours 17.8% 18.0% 18.4% 18.3% 17.0% 16.2% 16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Applicants Admitted 100% 98% 100% 96% 96% 97% 100% 96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Admits Enrolled 72% 60% 72% 67% 60% 58% 46% 49% 55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include credit hours from ASL and Film Studies.

Further discussion on possible reasons behind this downward trend in English department enrollments is offered later in this report in the section covering the undergraduate concentrations and the graduate program.

A.1.2 Admission, Retention and Graduation:

Admission: Table 5 gives data on student application and admission (including transfer students) directly into the English department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Undergraduate Students: English BA Applicants and Admits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English BA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Admits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Applicants Admitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Admits Enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36  46  36  57  71  90  71  61  55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36  45  36  55  68  86  69  61  53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26  27  26  37  41  50  32  30  29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% 95% 100% 96% 96% 96% 97% 100% 96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72% 60% 72% 67% 60% 58% 46% 49% 55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trends in Table 5 reflect broadly those in Table 1 discussed above. One notable trend presented in this table is the percentage of admitted students who enrolled. From 2004 to 2006, on average nearly 70% of students admitted directly into the English BA program enrolled; for 2010-12, the three-year average dropped to 50% of those admitted enrolled. We can only speculate on the reasons for this trend, but two reasons suggest themselves: (1) It is likely that growth of Ivy Tech Community College (http://www.ivytech.edu) over the past decade as a credible, and significantly less expensive, option for students taking 100- and 200-level courses has led to a direct decrease in the number of students who enrolled in our department; and (2) It is likely that as admission requirements for IUPUI have increased over the past decade, the caliber of the students who are admitted has also increased, putting us into more direct competition with IU and Purdue, as well as other more elite private colleges.

**Retention:** A critical factor in maximizing our student population is retention and persistence to graduation. Table 6 provides data for the Department of English’s retention of undergraduate students from 2005 to 2011. Overall retention of students from one year to the next remains relatively strong at 72% after 2011, which is greater than the overall school rate of 69%. However, the department as a whole clearly does a better job of retaining students who are juniors and seniors in the major, with an average retention rate for the past four years (2008-2011) above 75%, than we do freshmen and sophomores, for whom we have an average retention rate below 65%, with as many as 23% (compared to 19% for the school) of un-retained freshmen and sophomores staying in the IU system but going to other Liberal Arts majors or majors in other IU schools/campuses after 2011, a notable increase in movement out of English from previous years. This suggests that we should pay particular attention to our gateway and other 100-level courses that students take early in the major when they are not as firmly committed to pursuing an English concentration.

**Question:**

With the goal of increasing retention both at the lower and upper levels, what active steps can we take to better advise, engage and support students in the English major to make stronger connections to faculty and program areas?
Table 6: Undergraduate Student Retention: English BA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Semester (Fall only)</th>
<th>Total Enrolled</th>
<th>Retained within Major Earned Degree</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Retained in Liberal Arts Earned Degree</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Retained by Campus Earned Degree</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Retained in IU system</th>
<th>Earned Degree</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR/SO</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR/SR</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One-year retention rate by class standing; percent distribution by subsequent enrollment status.
Graduation: Using data from Tables 1 and 7, the graduation rate for academic year 2010-2011 was 24.5% (calculated as 65 BAs in academic year 2010-2011 divided by 265 students enrolled fall semester 2010) and 22.5% for academic year 2011-2012 (57/253). [This compares to a graduation rate for the school of 22.6% for 2010-11 and 24.7% for 2011-12.] These rates are a significant improvement from the English graduation rates for academic year 2003-2004, which was 17.5% (55 BAs in academic year 2003-2004 divided by 251 students enrolled fall semester 2003), and for 2004-2005, which was 17% (48/282). The primary reason we suspect for this general increase in the graduation rate is the increasingly rigorous admission requirements over the past several years that has brought better prepared students into the school and department, making it more likely students are able to see their degrees to completion.

One other notable data point from Table 7 is the high percentage of English BA graduates who are female, 75% in 2011-12 as compared to 61% for the school as a whole.

Table 7: Undergraduate Students: English BA Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English BA Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of School BAs</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Indiana Resident</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% African American*</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Other Minority*</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% International*</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Age 25 and Older</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exit Survey and Graduating Student Reflections. IMIR provided department-specific data from the 2012-13 School of Liberal Arts Exit Survey. Fifty-nine students were identified who indicated their degree would be in a program in English (including students who indicated their degree would be the BS in American Sign Language). Generalized results from the survey indicate the following:

- About 71% indicated that their plans included searching for or beginning a full-time professional position and about 31% planned to apply to or begin studying in a graduate program.
- Students rated their ability to “show substantial knowledge and understanding of at least one field of study, “learn how to think” and “express ideas and facts to others effectively in written formats” most highly. Their lowest rating was on their ability to “engage with the campus community.”
- English respondents were most satisfied with the “Quality of teaching by faculty in your major area” and least satisfied with “Opportunities to participate in faculty members' research.”
- The mean number of times students indicated they met with their advisor was 6.2. Sixty-five percent rated their advisors ability to provide them with accurate and helpful information about their major as Excellent.

A.2 English Undergraduate Minors:

The department offers six minors: Business and Professional Writing, Creative Writing, Film Studies, Linguistics, Literature, and Writing. The number of students who have earned each minor by year is given in Table 8.
Table 8: English Minors Awarded by Degree Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Minors Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Prof. Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“English”*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These represent students whose specific minor area was not documented for some reason.

Over the eight-year period given in Table 8, 14 of the 55 total English minors (25%) awarded were to students receiving the BA in General Studies, six of those were Literature minors and four were Creative Writing. Six of the 11 students (55%) receiving the minor in Film Studies were from the department of Communication Studies. Otherwise, there are no other clusters of majors represented by students who pursued any particular English minor. Fourteen of the 55 minors awarded (25%), not including those to General Studies majors, were awarded to students from other schools, including Science (4), Education (3), Business (2), Informatics (2), Herron (1), Journalism (1), and SPEA (1). The department has made little to no effort through the years to actively promote our minors as attractive options for students pursuing other majors.

**Question:**

How can we better promote our six minors so that they are seen as viable and attractive options for students pursuing other majors?

What other kinds of interdisciplinary minors could we offer that would attract and retain students?
A.3 Graduate Students

Table 9 provides demographic data for the graduate students who are pursuing the MA degree in English or one of three graduate certificates: the Teaching English as a Second Language Certificate, the Teaching Writing Certificate, or the Professional Editing Certificate (which is actually affiliated with the Institute of American Thought, although many of its courses are in English).

Table 9: Graduate Students in the Department of English (Fall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Official Census</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English MA</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Editing CRT</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESLCRT</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Writing CRT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution: Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution: Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution: Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 and Over</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution: Full vs Part-time Enrollment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution: Indiana Residency Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Resident</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New ethnicity definitions were applied for years 2010-12.

For Fall 2013, the department admitted 17 new MA students. Graduate certificates are discussed later in this report.

The most notable statistic from Table 9 is the number of students pursuing the English MA (“Head Count Official Census,” top row). The total number of MA students in Fall 2012 (26) was down 23.5% over 10 years from 2003 (34), and down 36.6% from the high point five years ago in 2007 (41). As with the undergraduate majors discussed above, the drop in students in 2012 is fairly extreme and possibly idiosyncratic, so it is better to look at three-year trends. The average number of MA students in the department for the three-year period of 2003-2004-2005 was 27. The average number of MA students in the department for the three-year period of 2010-2011-2012 was 33; these three-year averages show a 22% increase in students over the past decade. However, for comparison, overall enrollments in MA programs in the School of Liberal Arts are up 96% from 2003, due in large part to the addition of several new MA programs in the school, although down 6.5% from 2007.

Again, we can only speculate on the reasons for this enrollment trend, but two reasons suggest themselves: (1) Now that teachers in the public school systems no longer earn an increase in base pay when they obtain a graduate degree, the incentive for school teachers to pursue graduate degrees is not as
strong; and (2) As the weak economy continues, the interest in an MA in English and graduate work in the humanities in general is possibly weakening as well.

Students in the English MA made up 13% of the MA students in the school in 2012, as compared to 16% in 2007. Based on statistics provided by IMIR, in 2012 English graduate students (MA and certificate students combined) are more likely, compared to all graduate students in the school, to be part-time students (88% vs. 68%), more likely to be Indiana residents (95% vs. 71%), and more likely to NOT represent a minority group (93% vs. 85%).

Questions:

How can the department attract graduate students in light of current trends in higher education, changes in the public school systems and the economy?

A.3 Student Advising

See Section IV.A.4.

B. Department of English Faculty

Our department is led by a chair, two associate chairs (one for student affairs and one for faculty affairs), and directors of the graduate, undergraduate literature, writing, creative writing, film studies, and ESL programs. There is no longer an Executive Committee (half appointed by the chair, half elected by the faculty) that advises the chair in organizing the work of the department. Instead, Program Directors meet monthly to advise the chair, assist with the agendas for department meetings, etc.

The department numbers roughly 49 full-time faculty, 25 in tenure-line ranks and 26 in lecturer ranks. We also have 49 Associate/Adjunct Faculty. Despite the declarative nature of the preceding sentence, we must observe that it is difficult to pin down the exact size of the department given the number of full professors with appointments in English who hold full-time administrative or research appointments in other units and thus have few, if any, responsibilities within the department. For example, the director of ICIC is a Professor of English. Suffice it to say, as Table 10 shows, we are a large department in which full-time non-tenure-line faculty slightly outnumber the full-time tenure-line faculty.

Table 10: Rank and Diversity of Full-Time Faculty in the Department of English

Note: New ethnicity definitions became effective Fall 2010 (Prepared by IMIR, September 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Gender by Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race/Ethnicity by Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Full-Time Faculty Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race/Ethnicity by Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Full-Time Faculty Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Department of English Staff

Our staff includes a coordinator (Wanda Colwell), an administrative assistant assigned to the main office and graduate program (Patricia King), and program secretaries assigned to the Writing Program (Vicki Hale) and the ESL program (Melanie Curfman). They do as good a job as possible running the day to day operations of our 55 plus member department and associate faculty; however, it is important to note that they are underpaid and overextended. Work Study students assigned to our department assist our staff.
SECTION III: Curriculum, Concentrations, Student Engagement, and Retention

A. Undergraduate Major Curriculum (Concentrations)

The English major requires completion of one of the following six concentrations: Creative Writing, Film Studies, Language and Linguistics, Literature, Writing and Literacy, or English Studies. Each concentration requires 33 credit hours in English with a minimum grade of C in each course. All English majors must complete at least 15 hours in English at the 300-400 level. Each of the six concentrations is described below.

The English Department is a large and complex unit. A “snapshot” picture of student enrollments by program area and level will provide a sense of the relationship of the parts to each other. Figure 1 represents the same information in two different formats – student enrollments (graduate and undergraduate combined) for the academic year Fall 2011, Spring 2012, and Summer 2012 (sessions 1 and 2 combined). Note: “special courses” include not only the capstone and internship courses, but also all independent study and directed reading courses,

Figure 1: Student Enrollments by Area (Grad and Undergrad Combined): F2011, Sp2012, SS2012

These data show that for academic year 2011-12 enrollments in the first-year Writing Program courses (ENG W130, W131, W132, W140, W150, W231) made up fifty percent of student enrollment for the
department during academic year 2011-12. The WP together with the English for Academic Purposes (EAP) Program (9%) and the American Sign Language Program (7%) accounted for 66% of all English department enrollments. The concentration areas (both graduate and undergraduate courses) made up the remaining 34% of student enrollments: Literature (14%), Creative Writing (6%), Writing & Literacy (6%), Film Studies (3%), Linguistics/TESOL (3%), and “special” courses (2%).

Figure 1 shows undergraduate student enrollments for the academic year 2011-12 in the five English concentration areas, while Figure 3 and Table 3 show graduate student enrollments.

A.1 Creative Writing

Overview: The creative writing curriculum helps cultivate an appreciation of literature from the perspective of the writer. It encourages students to sharpen their critical judgment of their own writing and that of their classmates through coursework in the theory and craft of fiction, poetry, creative nonfiction, and screenwriting. Students enrolled in creative writing classes study a wide selection of literary models, engage in writing experiments and exercises, learn about publishing opportunities, and participate in constructive critiques (workshops) of peer work in progress.

Faculty: The creative writing program currently has five full-time faculty—four tenure-line and one senior lecturer—with four other lecturers contributing at least one course per semester.

Curriculum: Since 2010, majors in the creative writing concentration have been expected to complete the following course of study:

Gateway Courses (two classes, 6 credit hours) Students are encouraged to complete W207 and W208, but may choose from these three:

• ENG W206 Introduction to Creative Writing
• ENG W207 Introduction to Fiction Writing
• ENG W208 Introduction to Poetry Writing

Concentration Core (four classes, 12 credit hours, one course may be repeated once for credit if taken with a different instructor, and one must be at the 400-level)

• ENG W301 Writing Fiction
• ENG W302 Screenwriting
• ENG W303 Writing Poetry
• ENG W305 Writing Creative Nonfiction
• ENG W401 Advanced Fiction Writing
• ENG W403 Advanced Poetry Writing
• ENG W407 Advanced Creative Nonfiction

English Experience (four classes, 12 credit hours)

Literature (three classes, 9 credit hours): Students choose three in consultation with an advisor; at least one must be upper-division.

Language, Pedagogy, and Editing (one course, 3 credit hours): Students choose from the following English courses: W280 Literary Editing and Publishing; W301 Language and the Study of Writing; W365 Theory and Practice of Editing; W408 Creative Writing for Teachers; W426 Writing Nonfiction: Popular and Professional Publication; Z206 Introduction to Language Use; Z301 History of the English Language; Z302 Understanding Language Structure: Syntax; Z310 Language in Context: Sociolinguistics. Others courses may satisfy this requirement with advisor approval.

Capstone (one course, 3 credit hours): Students may choose either E450 (including sections specifically for creative writing students) or an L440 Senior Seminar in Literature. Occasionally, students may complete a W411 Directed Writing instead.
In 2012-2013, the English Department graduated 57 students, of which 16 (or 28%) were in the creative writing concentration. The department also has a creative writing minor (see Appendix I). In 2012-2013, four students graduated with creative writing minors.

**Students:** The creative writing concentration is the second largest in the department in terms of percentage of enrollments. In 2008-09, creative writing concentration students numbered 522, or 18% of the total. In 2011-12, the last full academic year for which enrollment data are available, creative writing enrolled 532 undergraduate students, accounting for 20% of all credit hours in the department, a growth of 2%.

The concentration typically offers eight sections of W206 Introduction to Creative Writing per year; four of W207 Intro to Fiction Writing; two or three of W208 Introduction to Poetry Writing; two of W280 Literary Editing and Publishing; two of W301 Writing Fiction; one of W302 Screenwriting; one or two of W303 Writing Poetry; two of W305 Writing Creative Nonfiction; two of W401 Advanced Fiction Writing; one of W403 Advanced Poetry Writing; two of W407 Advanced Creative Nonfiction; and one of W408 Creative Writing for Teachers.

Tenure-line faculty in the concentration provide the bulk of academic advising, though lead advisor Jim Powell has helped with this work, given that the concentration has only four tenure-line faculty members, one now department chair and one new to IUPUI.

**Graduate Offerings:** Each year, the creative writing concentration offers two sections of W511 Graduate Fiction Writing, one of W513 Graduate Poetry Writing, two of Graduate Creative Nonfiction, and one of W508 Creative Writing for Teachers. In 2008-09, grad students in creative writing numbered 15 or 6% of the total enrolled in English. In 2011-2012, by contrast, graduate students enrolled in creative writing classes numbered 33 or 12% of the total enrolled in English. This doubling of enrollments in a three-year period is an occasion for cautious optimism. However, creative writing, unlike linguistics, literature, or writing & literacy, does not yet have a graduate certificate option, which might affect enrollments in the near future.

**Strengths and Opportunities**

- Our concentration offers the largest number of undergraduate creative writing classes of any program in the state.
- All our faculty members teach both in their genre of specialization and at least one other genre.
- Creative writing students tend to make friends in the concentration because of our lively pedagogy, which offers opportunities for interaction, and extracurricular activities, such as attending Reiberg, faculty, and student readings; editing the literary magazine *genesis*; and participating in the Associated Writing Programs conference as a group.
- All of our tenure-line faculty have active research / creative activity agendas; three (Douglas, Kovacik, and Rebein) published books in 2013, and the fourth (Minor) will be publishing his second story collection in 2014. Kovacik is currently finishing a two-year term as Indiana Poet Laureate.
- Senior Lecturers who teach for us also write and publish, despite their heavier teaching load. Kirts writes regular restaurant reviews for *Indianapolis Monthly*, Powell received a Creative Renewal Fellowship from the Arts Council of Indianapolis for his short fiction, and Williams recently published an essay in the national journal *Cutbank*.
- Our collegial faculty work together to schedule our courses to accommodate our students’ busy lives. Each semester, we offer our classes at a range of hours and times to ensure that all students can meet their requirements.
- The student literary magazine *genesis* recently celebrated its fortieth anniversary of publication. Since the last self-study in 2006, the creative writing program has secured a workspace, computer, and software instruction for student editors, which has ensured smoother transitions from one team of editors to the next.
- Faculty from our program play an active role in the department, School, and university. Prior to becoming our chair, Rebein was Director of Graduate Studies and Associate Chair for Faculty.
Kovacik played a central role in establishing the IUPUI Arts and Humanities Institute. Kirts organizes the department’s awards ceremony and coordinates the university’s high school poetry contest—a form of outreach that also attracts talented students to our campus. But there is not enough staff support for our activities.

- Our faculty are also known for their civic engagement. Douglas has worked with Second Story, a local literacy organization for children. All of our faculty have partnered with the Writers’ Center of Indiana and the Etheridge Knight Festival of the Arts to put on readings and offer workshops. As poet laureate, Kovacik has organized readings and given talks on Indiana poets throughout the state.
- Recent graduates of our program have gone on to MFA or PhD programs at Ball State University, Butler University, Lesley University, North Carolina State University, Purdue University, Vermont College, and the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee.
- Typically all but one of our classes each semester are taught by full-time faculty. Part-time faculty teaching in the concentration have MFAs.
- Changes in the School of Liberal Arts guidelines for majors in the school will make it easier for English majors in concentrations other than ours to select a creative writing minor.

**Weaknesses and Threats**

- Because our concentration is perceived as interesting and “fun,” it attracts a certain percentage of weaker, less academically rigorous students. Any student who completes the prerequisite courses with a grade of C or better is eligible for more advanced work. As a result, some students in the advanced courses—particularly in fiction—threaten to bring down the level for everyone.
- We need to do a better job of helping students see the relevance of our major and understand how a creative writing concentration can prepare them for future careers.
- Students who seek out regular academic advising are able to move through the program in an organized manner because of the way our concentration schedules its offerings. But those who don’t sometimes set themselves up for failure by, for example, taking two upper-division prose workshops in a single semester or repeating a 300-level workshop after having completed the 400-level one in that same genre.
- Faculty in our concentration have large numbers of advisees. With the retirement of Powell in December 2013 and with Rebein serving as chair, faculty will struggle to keep up with demand.
- The concentration has a prerequisite system, but every semester we must check our rosters to make sure all students have had the necessary prereqs. Just about every class has one or more students who’ve been admitted without the requirement and then must be dropped. This is a failure of the university’s registration coding system.
- Since our last external review, our faculty have worked to make our classes more rigorous by incorporating more reading and analytical writing. But, at least anecdotally, the critical prose of students in our concentration lags behind that of their counterparts in some of the other concentrations.
- Three other concentrations in the department—linguistics, literature and writing & literacy—have graduate certificates, which are popular with our students because they help organize M.A.-level work in a meaningful way. Our concentration is considering a certificate, but has not yet proposed one. We might lose enrollments to those other concentrations until we do.
- Campus administrators keep pushing online education. Thus far, our concentration has resisted creating online offerings—with the exception of the hybrid Creative Writing for Teachers, which alternates classroom and online experiences on a weekly basis—because we feel that live interaction is essential to our pedagogy.
- Because of our competence and collegiality, the creative writing faculty are frequently tapped by the department, school, campus, and community for extensive service.
- The School of Liberal Arts has seen a significant drop in number of majors. While recent graduation data suggests that the number of creative writing majors has not declined, the program will join the rest of the English department in better promoting our students, faculty, and curriculum.
A.2 Film Studies

Overview: A significant program, the Film Studies concentration enrolls on average two hundred and fifty students per year, in two (each Spring) or three (every Fall) sections of FILM-C 292 Introduction to Film and in at least two upper-division courses per semester. The program offers two courses each summer, including an upper-level course. Film Studies has grown as a result of many of the debates on theory, analysis, historiography, narrative, ideology, and pedagogy that have dominated the humanities in general and English Studies in particular.

Our film program has grown intrinsically from its position within English Studies; Professor Bingham's successful collaborative paradigm for the C292 Introduction to Film course was adapted from the English L105 course for beginning literature students. In 2012, it was re-purposed again, this time for the online environment. Our students gain an excellent comprehensive education in film theory, history, aesthetics, genres, and auteurs.

Faculty: Film Studies has a tenured professor (Bingham) and a tenure-track assistant professor, (Subramanian). The program has adjunct faculty members who usually cover 1-3 sections per academic year

Curriculum: The requirements are distributed among courses in film theory, genre, film and media history, relationships between film and writing, and film authorship.

Students: Students who enroll in courses with the academic subject code "FILM" pay a course fee used to purchase DVDs, videos, and equipment for the courses.

Film Studies students experience a combination of rigorous study of cinema and a system of critical thinking that makes them competent, confident critics. The average teaching effectiveness end-of-course student evaluation scores for program faculty in 2012 were 4.61 out of 5.00. Alumni of the program include a film editor for Bunim-Murray Company in Los Angeles; a script supervisor for independent films, based in Los Angeles; an assistant director of public programs for the Indianapolis Museum of Art; students who have gone on to graduate school in English, Philosophy, and other disciplines at schools such as IUPUI, Ball State University, and San Francisco State University; and a software developer for Microsoft in Redwoods, Washington, who now donates to our program. "I hope you still make your students journal every week," This Microsoft employee, Bonnie Lehenbauer (B.A., 1998), wrote to Bingham in 2011, "Getting over my fear of writing [was] clearly the most valuable element of my undergraduate education."

Strengths and Opportunities

• The most important shift in the film world has been simply the change from film. The death of celluloid and its replacement by digital forms, however, occurred in most classrooms, including ours, more than a decade ago.

• The Film Program offered its first online section of Introduction to Film in 2012, and will stay attuned to courses that might benefit from being taught in online versions. In a field, which, more than most in English studies, always did depend upon and respond to technology, we will be ready for changes when they are ready for us. For instance, ten years from now, all classroom media may be streaming but, based upon some streaming Amazon films Bingham showed in Fall 2012, the visual quality is currently far below what can be projected from Blu-ray discs. As the medium of film changes, so do distribution platforms, such as Netflix, You Tube, and many others. We must continue to give our students the tools to think critically about how cinematic texts are created, received, and sent. The technology changes; it always has.

Weaknesses and Threats

• Our program has not been immune to the downbeat enrollment trends that have beset the Liberal Arts. Media studies continue to hold an advantage over many other fields, however. Our program has
cancelled only one regular semester section in the past three years. It's easier for us than it is for, say, Linguistics, to calculate what offerings will be both popular and in keeping with the standards of the program. It's important to respond to enrollment trends without over-reacting. None of us has lived through periods like this before, and we must be careful, as Indiana University in general has been since the Great Recession of 2008, not to sacrifice programs it has taken decades to build due to short-term exigencies.

A.3 Language and Linguistics

Overview: The language and linguistics concentration offers a program of study of language structure and use that introduces and explores basic theoretical assumptions, fundamental concepts, and methodological approaches. Beyond the introductory phase of their course work, students may choose from classes that cover a broad range of linguistic research, for example, into the relationship between language and culture, society, writing, and gender. In addition, students may choose courses that are primarily theoretical in nature, such as syntax and semantics, or they may choose courses that are more applied in nature, such as second language acquisition and teaching English as a second language. In general, students will emerge from their studies in this concentration with the skills and knowledge to investigate a variety of language issues in a rigorous, scientific manner.

Faculty: While seven faculty members teach language and linguistics in the department, only one currently does so full-time. For several recent semesters, none had full teaching loads in the program due to administrative responsibilities. The faculty who teach courses in the language and linguistics program include five tenured faculty, one of whom has just become associate dean of Liberal Arts for Faculty (and will thus not teach many classes), and two senior lecturers.

Curriculum: The distribution requirements for the language and linguistics concentration for the BA in English were revised in 2010, and are now as follows:

**Gateway Courses** (two classes, 6 credit hours)
- ENG Z205 Introduction to the English Language
- ENG Z206 Introduction to Grammar

**Concentration Core** (four classes, 12 credit hours)
Choose four from these courses:
- ENG Z301 History of the English Language
- ENG Z302 Understanding Language Structure: Syntax
- ENG Z303 Understanding Language Meaning: Semantics
- ENG Z310 Language in Context: Sociolinguistics
- ENG Z432 Second Language Acquisition
- ENG W310 Language and the Study of Writing
- ASL L340 Discourse Analysis: English

**English Experience** (four classes, 12 credit hours)
In consultation with the advisor, students choose four English courses at the 200-level or above, with at least two at the 300– or 400-level. At least three courses must be outside of the Language and Linguistics concentration and at least one course must be in Literature.

**Capstone** (one course, 3 credit hours)
Choose one:
- ENG E450 Capstone Seminar
- ENG Z405 Topics in the Study of Language
The department also has a **minor in linguistics** (see Appendix X), but no one has completed that minor in several years. A list of all Language & Linguistics courses offered is given in Appendix Y.

When the concentration was updated in 2010, we changed undergraduate course numbers from “G” prefixes to “Z” prefixes for two reasons: first, we wanted to clarify the titles of several courses so that students could have a better sense of what the course would be about, and second, there would be less confusion with courses in the EAP Program (for non-native speakers of English) that also have the “G” prefix. Because other IU campuses use the “G” courses, we could not simply change the course title.

**Students:** The undergraduate language and linguistics concentration is one of the smallest concentrations in the department in terms of majors, while the graduate TESOL Certificate and the TESOL Concentration in the English MA program attract a fairly large percentage of the graduate program enrollment each year (see separate section on the TESOL Program).

Most of the students who take undergraduate courses in language and linguistics are not pursuing the concentration in language and linguistics.

- We have not been able to run the 100-level course, ENG Z104: Language in Our World, for the past three years due to low enrollment; we have only been able to get it to run when we have paired it with a course in the EAP Program. We have not been able to get students across campus to take this course to meet general education requirements.

- We offer three 200-level courses: Z204: Rhetorical Issues in Grammar and Usage; Z205, Introduction to the English Language; Z206, Introduction to Grammar. Two-- Z205 and Z206-are the core courses for the language and linguistics concentration. All three can be used to meet “English Experience” or other requirements in the other English concentrations, but they are typically one of many options, and advisors in other concentrations often steer students elsewhere for a variety of reasons. Z205 is required for English Education majors, and Z204 is one of two options for another English Education requirement, but with the decline in students pursuing the English Education major, demand for these courses is also declining. In Fall 2012, due to low demand, we had to cancel our only section of Z204 and one of two sections of Z205.

- We offer four 300-level courses: Z301, Z302, Z303, Z310. All can be used to meet “English Experience” requirements in the other concentrations, but again are only one of several options. As we do not have prerequisites for any of these courses, students in other majors across the school sometimes take these courses to meet upper-division distribution requirements for their majors. English Education majors can take Z301 or Z310 (two of three options) to meet one of their requirements.

- We regularly offer three 400-level courses: Z432: Second Language Acquisition, Z434: Intro to TESOL, and Z441: TESOL Materials. All of these courses are currently cross-listed with graduate-level courses. Typically, only 1-2 students in the Language and Linguistics or English studies concentrations enroll in these courses any given semester; other undergraduate students are typically from the School of Education. Most students in any of these courses are graduate students pursuing the TESOL Certificate or the MA in English.

The graduate TESOL Certificate Program and the TESOL concentration for the English MA are described in the next section of the self-study. Students in these two programs take most of the courses offered at the graduate level. Two regularly offered courses taken by students pursuing other concentrations for the English MA include ENG G500: Intro to the English Language, which is offered every semester, and ENG G652: English Language Sociolinguistics, which is typically offered once a year. G500 is one of three “core courses” from which MA students must select two, so it often has students with a wide variety of interests. ENG G652 is an elective for the English MA.
Table 11: Enrollment Trends across Levels, 2008-09 to 2012-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level/Year</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100-level</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-level</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-level</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-level</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad level</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Undergraduate, Graduate, and Total Enrollments by Year

As Table 11 and Figure 2 show, enrollments in courses offered in the language and linguistics program, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, are trending downward after a peak in 2009-2010, with a drop off in 2012-13, primarily due to the cancellation of two 200-level courses in Fall 2012.

Strengths and Opportunities

- Our main strength is our faculty, who represent a broad spectrum in the field of linguistics.
- Courses in Language & Linguistics are seen as integral to the concentrations in the English major as all but one (Creative Writing) require at least one course to fulfill concentration requirements.
- We think that the best way for us to recruit more students into our courses, and possibly into the concentration, is to more actively promote the minor in Language & Linguistics. We plan to change the requirements for the 15-credit minor so that students can use one or possibly two courses from other departments (World Languages & Cultures, Philosophy, etc.).
- We believe that a minor in TESOL would be attractive to students not only in WLAC but also in other majors like International Studies, Anthropology, etc. This would require the development of a new course as well as running stand-alone undergrad sections of courses that have always been cross-listed with grad sections in the past; staffing the additional courses might be a challenge.
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• We are talking about making an internship a requirement for the concentration. Ours would be the only English concentration to require an internship; there are many opportunities available, and requiring the internship would help showcase the concentration’s connection to the real world.

• We currently only offer one section of Z205 as a hybrid course once a year at most. We are considering offering one or more sections of our 300-level courses as well as ENG G500 and L532 online once a year. We expect that the online courses would not only increase enrollments, but also attract more students to the concentration or minor.

Weaknesses and Threats

• Many students who take our courses are not majors in the Language and Linguistics (L&L) concentration. We have to focus our courses, particularly our upper level courses, on students who do not have a strong background in the foundation L&L courses.

• We have only one faculty member (DiCamilla) whose primary focus (now) is on undergraduate students in the L&L concentration. All other faculty have either administrative responsibilities in the department/school or primarily teach at the graduate level (or both). There is little or no sense of ‘cohort’ or ‘community’ among students pursuing the L&L concentration. In addition, DiCamilla (primarily), Shepherd, and Upton are the only faculty who advise undergraduate majors in the L&L concentration, and Upton’s new position as associate dean for faculty in Liberal Arts will preclude advising.

• We have not done a very good job in promoting the concentration to attract majors. We have no ‘events’ or student activities that showcase the field or the work that students are doing.

• In essence, our curriculum is a set of (very good) stand-alone courses that do not lead students to a clear sense of how the concentration will benefit them once they graduate. We do not have any assessment in place across courses to evaluate the skills and knowledge students are developing.

• Our three regularly offered 400-level courses are all cross-listed with graduate sections because we do not have strong enough enrollments to run the undergrad sections on their own. This is not an ideal situation for either the undergraduate or graduate students.

A.4 Literature

Overview: The Literature Program offers courses in Shakespeare and, concentrating on literature since 1800, in British, American, and world literature We offer introductory courses at the 100-level, genre courses and world masterpieces at the 200-level, critical and historical surveys at the 300-level, and advanced topics and authors courses at the 400-level. Classes emphasize close reading, development of a critical lexicon, and the practice of moving from text to interpretation through frequent essay writing. Our lower-level classes introduce students to the basics of literary argumentation; our upper-level and graduate classes include theoretical concepts and literary criticism. A decade ago, departments of English were moving away from the rubric of periodization to organize the study of literature around theoretical and thematic issues. Although we continued to offer survey courses in American and British literature, our earlier concentration’s requirements did not oblige students to take these courses. Concerned that many of our upper-level students had little understanding of literary history, we created new requirements for four survey courses, The department has a general capstone course, E450, but we advise students to enroll instead in the senior seminar in literature (L440), which provides in-depth study of authors or a milieu.

The Department and the School of Liberal Arts have experienced declining enrollments in the last three years; we have canceled sections with fewer than 15 students to meet budget constraints and have developed a series of online courses to stem the tide.

Faculty: The literature faculty consists of nine tenure-line faculty and one full-time lecturer. Currently these faculty, two faculty from the Institute for American Thought and a visiting assistant professor appointed through spring 2014 teach 90% of the Department’s literature courses. Writing Program
lecturers, Creative Writing faculty, and other PhDs in literature regularly teach courses for the program. Over the next five years, we anticipate three retirements, which gives us an excellent opportunity to plan hiring priorities.

Faculty expertise and teaching loads vary widely, reflecting university hiring priorities and faculty members’ specific administrative appointments. Of the current eleven full-time faculty in literature, four are primarily Americanists, four are primarily Europeanists (with two of those covering Shakespeare), one is a Caribbeanist, and two are specialists in children’s and adolescent literature. There is considerable overlap in areas of expertise, as in the case of Kubitschek, an African-Americanist who also teaches the English Romantic and Victorian periods; or Hoegberg, who teaches the British tradition but is well-versed in colonialism and African lit; or Schultz, who specializes in 19th-century literature in the U.S. and Britain but also teaches in the Medical Humanities Program. Our undergraduate and Master’s-level students profit from literature faculty members’ affiliations with campus interdisciplinary programs in the Medical Humanities, the Institute for American Thought (through which students may enroll in courses on editing), Women’s Studies, Philanthropic Studies, and Africana Studies.

Since the last program review, we have lost two tenure-track specialists in British literature (modernism and early modern era) and one lecturer in children’s literature. We were able to replace the latter with a tenure-track appointment in 2010. We hope to be able to search for a Modernist soon; because our program focuses on Western literature since 1800, we need to offer 20th-century Irish/British literature. At one time each of our faculty taught five courses annually, but the department has always promoted multidisciplinarity and other extra-departmental connections. As a result, more than half the literature faculty, participate in special programs or have administrative responsibilities that can only be carried out with reduced teaching loads.

- Bourus directs the New Oxford Shakespeare project (one or two courses for English annually)
- As associate department chair, Thorington-Springer is released from two courses (three courses for English annually)
- Schultz administers the Literature Program and currently has an additional release to edit a book series (three courses for English annually)
- Marvin administers the Masarachia Scholars program and teaches in American Studies (three courses for English annually)
- Henry Anthony administers the Olaniyan Scholars Program and has a half-time appointment in Africana Studies (two courses for English annually)

While such appointments and course releases reflect the administrative influence of our literature faculty at IUPUI and in the discipline, they also create a need for an average of two to four part-time instructors per semester. When faculty are released from courses with grants or fellowships, we hire PhDs willing to work as part-time employees; they are often excellent, well-prepared instructors.

Curriculum: Undergraduate, the Literature Concentration. In 2010 the literature faculty revised the requirements for the literature concentration, expanding the requirements from 24 to 33 credits. The new concentration is both more rigorous and more diverse, providing our graduates with a coherent foundation of knowledge and skills to prepare them for a wide variety of potential careers.

We continue to offer courses in various faculty members’ areas of expertise (Southern literature, Black masculinities, the literature of domesticity, for example) but are finding that broader topics are more likely to fill classes.

Students in the concentration are now required to study the critical and historical foundations of both British and American literature and to complete at least one Shakespeare course and one diversity course. This expanded core of requirements ensures that our students will be well-read and adept at critical analysis. We also now require non-literature courses in two targeted areas--Linguistics and Editing—that
connect the study of literature to essential fields of expertise and possible career opportunities. Students now have a choice of courses to fulfill the capstone seminar requirement, depending upon their interests and goals.

**Gateway Course** (3 cr.)
- L202 Literary Interpretation

**Concentration Core** (18 cr.)

**Critical and Historical Foundations—Britain** (6 cr)
- L301 English Literature I
  - And either
- L302 English Literature II
- L348 Nineteenth-Century British Fiction

**Critical and Historical Foundations—US** (6 cr)
- L351 American Literature I
- L352 American Literature II
- L354 American Literature III
  (L357 Twentieth-Century American Poetry or L358 Twentieth-Century American Fiction may be substituted for L354)

**Shakespeare** (3 cr)
- Choose One:
  - L220 Introduction to Shakespeare
  - L315 Major Plays of Shakespeare

**Diversity** (3 cr)
- Choose One:
  - L207 Women and Literature
  - L245 Intro to Caribbean Literature
  - L364 Native American Literature
  - L370 Black American Writing
  - L378 Studies in Women and Literature
  - L379 American Ethnic and Minority Literature
  - L382 Fiction of the Non-Western World
  - L406 Topics in African American Literature
  - L411 Literature and Society: South African Literature

**English Experience** (9 cr.)

**Language and Linguistics** (3 cr)
- Choose one:
  - Z206 Introduction to Language Use
  - Z301 History of the English Language
  - Z302 Understanding Language Structure: Syntax
  - Z310 Language in Context: Sociolinguistics

**Editing** (3 cr)
- Choose one:
  - W280 Literary Editing and Publishing
  - W365 Theory and Practice of Editing

**English Elective** (3 cr)
In consultation with your advisor, choose one English course at the 200-level or above from classes outside of Literature.

**Capstone Seminar** (3 cr.)
Choose one:

- E450 Capstone Seminar
- L433 Conversations with Shakespeare
- L440 Senior Seminar

**Online Teaching:** The Literature Program offers more courses online than any other concentration in the English Department. Several Literature Program faculty have developed online courses and have cultivated a school-wide reputation for excellence in online course design. Capped at 25 or 30 students to maintain a small class environment and control the burden on faculty, these courses predictably fill to capacity. We have disseminated our best practices not only through campus-wide symposia but also through regional and national conferences. We played a leading role in the fall 2011 English Department symposium on online teaching to foster a departmental conversation about the benefits and drawbacks of developing more online courses, and to create an option for an online English major.

We offer the following courses online once or twice annually:

- L105 Appreciation of Literature
- L115 Literature for Today
- L204 Introduction to Fiction
- L207 Women and Literature
- L220 Introduction to Shakespeare
- L213 Literary Masterpieces I
- L214 Literary Masterpieces II
- L376 Literature for Adolescents
- L390 Children’s Literature

Of these courses, only L220 specifically counts toward the requirements for literature majors, though they all satisfy a variety of requirements or electives for other programs and schools. Our online students come from other concentrations within English as well as from an array of schools across the University. We have found that our online courses are always the first to fill, regardless of instructor or topic. These online courses—primarily at the 100- and 200-level, join our traditional classes at those levels as recruiting grounds for English majors. We have resisted placing upper-level courses online because we feel that real-time classroom interaction provides the best opportunity for literature majors to reflect critically. However, we have offered our children’s literature survey (L390) online for several years and are developing our survey of adolescent literature (L376) in an online format to capture more education students from around the state.

We do have concerns about the representation of ranks among our online Literature faculty. Of the five faculty members who teach online courses, only two are full-time, permanent members of the faculty: one lecturer (McDonald) and one assistant professor (Musgrave). The balance of online literature courses are taught by a visiting assistant professor and Writing Program lecturers. No tenured faculty member has elected to teach online recently; however, an associate professor (Marvin) is developing a section of Introduction to Poetry (L205) to be offered in the 2013-14 school year.

We recognize an increasing demand for online course offerings from University administrators and students. In response, the Chair convened an **ad hoc** committee on online instruction, which recently concluded that to expand our online offerings, including those in Literature, we would need to create a departmental atmosphere that demystifies online teaching and encourages tenured/tenure-line faculty to get involved. To institute such a change, we would need substantial new resources for training, mentorship, professional development, and technical support—resources that our budget does not currently include. The faculty would require time and funding for curricular development, and the Department might consider prioritizing the hiring of tenure-line faculty with expertise in online pedagogy.
Assessment The literature faculty has established general goals for its undergraduate courses, spelling out a shared set of expectations for student achievement in eight categories: argumentation, critical thinking, intertextuality, cultural diversity, documentation, literary terms, extra-literary context, and appreciation. The literature course goals describe what is expected of students in 100-level introductory courses, 200-level genre courses, 200/300-level surveys and 300/400-level advanced courses, including the capstone. Decisions on how to assess student learning in these areas are left to individual instructors, but, since writing a sustained argument provides students with the best opportunity to demonstrate higher-order thinking skills, upper-division courses generally require extensive written work.

In 2011 the literature faculty developed a set of learning outcomes for liberal arts graduates who major in literature. These learning outcomes are cross referenced with the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs). They cover the knowledge that graduates are expected to acquire; the understanding of social diversity and complexity reflected in literature; and the ways of demonstrating and applying them effectively in the world after graduation.

With clear goals in place, the literature faculty has begun a process of insureing that our students understand our expectations and that they are achieving them. In March 2013 we initiated a series of meetings to assess student writing and to calibrate faculty standards. The faculty examined a range of essays written in undergraduate courses to determine whether our students are acquiring the skills necessary for post-graduation success and how we might best teach these skills.

New technology affords us additional means of assessment. Professor Buchenot has begun compiling a departmental archive of student writing in electronic form collected on Oncourse (the system that manages online and web-linked course materials and interactions). To assess student progress from the beginning of the major through the finale, he will analyze student essays from gateway and capstone courses. Such a database could extend to all literature courses, opening up new ways of assessing student progress both within and across courses, and of assessing our teaching strategies.

B. Graduate curriculum

In 2011 the literature faculty completed two related initiatives at the graduate level. The first was to revise the graduate program’s literature offerings to form a coherent, tiered, and regularly scheduled curriculum to help M.A. students further their careers as teachers and scholars of literature. The second was to design and offer a Graduate Certificate in Teaching Literature, a major new component that draws on our faculty’s strengths and positions us as a leading institution in literary pedagogy.

In response to student and faculty requests, the graduate literature offerings were revised to place more emphasis on graduate-level survey courses that give students a foundation in major texts and fields. Two British and two American literature surveys are offered in alternate semesters, allowing students to take all four in any given two-year span. New graduate courses in children’s literature, postcolonial literature, and literary and critical theory provide further advanced study in these important areas.

The graduate Certificate in Teaching Literature provides an opportunity for area teachers to begin work in a structured program and will enable the department to strengthen its professional mentoring objectives. In addition, the Certificate serves as a feeder program for the M.A. in English. While the Certificate does not automatically lead to a graduate degree, the credits earned can be applied toward the M.A. in English.

Two new courses on literary pedagogy were developed for the Certificate program and will be taught once each year beginning in fall 2013. L503, Teaching Literature, introduces graduate students to the practical and theoretical issues involved in teaching literature, including how to set teaching objectives, organize a course, and construct a syllabus. L508, Practicum in Teaching Literature, explores the practical applications of the teaching methodologies introduced in L503. Students teach under the supervision of a member of the English graduate faculty and complete a teaching portfolio and an action research project investigating a specific pedagogical issue. These two courses are open to all graduate
students, whether enrolled in the Certificate program or not. Together with the revision of the literature curriculum they represent a substantial new vision for the graduate literature program.

Students: IUPUI data collection does not allow us to offer a complete demographic profile of literature students. Approximately four-fifths of our students are women. We would like to attract and retain more students of color. Many English Education students take courses in the literature concentration, as do Liberal Arts students fulfilling the “Area III” requirement to take 15 hours of upper-level courses in departments outside their major.

In recent years, at least ten of our undergraduate concentrators have enrolled in the MA program, with a focus on teaching writing or teaching English as a Second Language. Some of our graduates—our full-time literature colleague Brian McDonald is one—have become lecturers in the Department after receiving their Master’s degrees. It is relatively rare for our students to continue into English PhD programs, but we have sent students to programs at the University of Michigan, Emory University, and the University of New Hampshire, as well as to Purdue and Ball State. We believe that the Teaching Literature certificate will help us attract more students to our graduate literature courses and program.

Beyond the academic world, our students find that their skills prepare them for a wide range of jobs: they work as lawyers, freelance writers, teachers, actors, editors, and business professionals. As is the case at urban campuses generally, many English majors are first-generation college students, and we take pride in introducing them to new ways of thinking and the sometimes intimidating new worlds that they must confront as they learn to read and interpret texts from diverse cultures and time periods.

Strengths and Opportunities

• We have a strong, diverse, and energetic faculty. Since 2010, literature faculty have generated seven books that are published or forthcoming, published at least twenty-two articles, and received over $280,000 in grants.
• Literature faculty have been leaders and innovators in online course development
• Because many of our faculty have expertise in the literatures of race and ethnicity, we plan to develop a track in the undergraduate literature major that emphasizes these courses. In 2009, subsequent to the appointment of Professor Bourus, we took on the New Oxford Shakespeare Edition (NOS), which hires two post-doctoral scholars and gives other students practical experience in a hands-on editorial project. We are working to link more lower-level literature classes to themed learning communities (TLC). In Fall 2013, a business school course on careers will be linked to an intro to lit section (L115) that focuses on working lives, and we hope eventually to link our literary masterpieces courses (L213 and L214) with corresponding History Department requirements in western civilization to give students the opportunity to integrate more fully their study of the liberal arts.
• Our Master’s Certificate in Teaching Literature went “live” in Spring 2013. In the first year of the certificate program, we are offering new courses in literary theory (L657) and on teaching literature (L503).
• In the hope of forging links with the campus and Indianapolis communities, we established Hoosier Bard Productions in 2010. It produces an Elizabethan drama annually, thus helping to train students in acting and theater production.
• We offer prizes to the best literature student annually and the Peter Bassett Barlow prize for the best graduate essay.
• As Liberal Arts phases out the Area III requirement, more English majors will be able to minor in the literature track, which gives us the opportunity for healthier enrollments.
• Ongoing revision of our departmental website gives us the opportunity to generate student interest through brief video clips and other audio and visual material, in addition to textual revisions and updates.
Weaknesses and Threats

• Workload: currently not all literature faculty regularly teach at least one section of our six British and American lit surveys. We are working to rectify this, especially since retirements over the next five years will create gaps in our ability to offer these surveys.

• Declining campus and School funding: On a campus that is becoming increasingly focused on the health sciences, in a School of Liberal Arts that has two new Ph.D. programs (Medical Economics and Communications Studies), the study of literature is perceived as inessential. Over a period of about eight years, the literature faculty lost five members (Davis, Kloesel, Touponce, Trotter, and Turner). We have been able to hire for two positions (Bourus and Musgrave) and half of another (Henry Anthony, shared with Africana Studies). We have not been able to offer a course in British modernism or a graduate course in post-modernism for more than five years due to hiring retrenchments. Because our literature offerings emphasize the western tradition since 1800 (with the exception of Shakespeare and the first part of the British survey), this is a position we would like to fill; students regularly request such courses.

• Declining enrollments: The crisis in secondary education has drastically affected our enrollments. As job opportunities for teachers have declined during the recession, the School of Education’s enrollments have fallen precipitously. As students in Education take the same courses as majors in their areas of praxis, our course enrollments reflect the decline.

• As the state system encourages our community college complex to take on more teaching of 100- and 200-level courses that are transferable to IUPUI, we lose a major recruitment venue for majors and considerable enrollment, particularly for intro to drama (L203) and intro to poetry (L205). To attract a wider range of students, we are working to create online versions of L203 and L205. We are attempting to slow the decline in these lower-level courses by developing Themed Learning Communities, especially for our L115 introductory literature course. We have begun marketing our courses through broadly disseminated advertisements. These efforts, however, have not usually resulted in preventing under-enrolled courses (of fewer than 15) from being canceled.

• Declining enrollments in literature courses nation-wide are largely the result of a broader societal shift toward a “market society,” in which higher education is valued for its perceived ability to provide students with well-paying jobs. In response to such a global shift in the perception of higher education, programs like ours are justifiably paying more attention to the instrumental value of literary study, calling for enhanced assessment and accountability of the teaching of literature and developing assessment tools that respect and accommodate the special features of literary study. At the same time, we need to be more deliberate and systematic in educating the public about the intrinsic value of literary study, helping them to understand that reading and discussing literature enriches lives, broadens perspectives, cultivates inquiry, and prepares citizens to live and actively participate in a democratic society.

A.5 Writing and Literacy

Overview: The Writing and Literacy concentration introduces students to the discipline of writing studies; the professional possibilities for writers; the public uses of writing; and the social issues implicated in language use. Writing and Literacy majors prepare for careers in publishing, editing, freelance writing, journalism, business and technical writing, digital literacy, and grant writing, in addition to (among other paths) graduate study in English, law, and library and information sciences. Writing and Literacy is complemented in the department by offerings in creative writing, writing about film, and linguistic analysis of writing, as well as outside the department by a program in technical communication housed in the School of Engineering.

Faculty: Faculty in Writing and Literacy include three professors (two associate and one assistant professor), five senior lecturers, and three lecturers; however, none of these faculty are able to devote
their full teaching load to Writing and Literacy courses, as they all teach in the Writing Program as well as doing Writing Program administration. One of the senior lecturers who has developed several important courses for the concentration is retiring in December 2013. One of the professors in the concentration may retire in three years. So we have highly qualified, committed faculty, but they are stretched too thin to meet the needs of a large Writing Program, a growing concentration, and a graduate program. It takes, for example, considerable time and energy for faculty to help students in our undergraduate concentration produce publishable work.

Curriculum: Our curriculum includes a growing set of courses covering the craft, theory, and analysis of writing in many different situations. Since 2010, majors in the Writing And Literacy Concentration have been expected to complete the following course of study:

**Gateway (3 credits)**
- W210 Literacy and Public Life

**Concentration Core (18 credits)**

**Understanding Literacy and Language (6 cr)**
Choose two courses from the following. At least one must be a W course.
- W262 Style and Voice for Writers
- W310 Language and the Study of Writing
- W366 Written Englishes: Living Cultural Realities
- W390 Topics: The Writer’s Notebook
- W390 Topics: Health Literacy
- W412 Technology and Literacy
- Z204 Rhetorical Issues in Grammar and Usage
- Z301 History of the English Language

**The Practice of Writing (12 cr.)** Choose at least one course from each group. No more than 6 credits may be TCM courses.

**Group 1: Writing in Context (at least 3 credits)**
- W313 The Art of Fact: Writing Nonfiction Prose
- W320 Advanced Writing in the Arts and Sciences
- W331 Business and Administrative Writing
- W377 Writing for Social Change
- W312 Writing Biography
- W398 Writing Internship: The News Bureau
- TCM 32000 Written Communication in Science and Industry
- TCM 34000 Correspondence in Business and Industry
- TCM 35000 Visual Elements of Technical Documents
- TCM 45000 Research Approaches for Tech. and Prof. Communication

**Group 2: Editing, Teaching, and Publishing (at least 3 credits)**
- W280 Literary Editing and Publishing
- W315 Writing for the Web
- W318 Finding Your E-Voice
- W365 Theory and Practice of Editing
• W400 Issues in Teaching Writing
• W426 Writing Nonfiction: Popular and Professional Publication
• W496 Writing Tutor Training Seminar
• TCM 425 Managing Document Quality

**English Experience** (9 credits) Film Studies or Literature (3 cr.) Choose one 200-400 level course. Linguistics (3 cr.) Choose one 200-400 level linguistics course, or: *if you have already taken a linguistics course as part of the core, do two electives in English.*

**Elective** (3-6 cr., see note above) Choose one (or two) courses, 200-400 level, from any of the following areas: Creative Writing, Film Studies, Linguistics, or Literature.

**Capstone** (3 credits) Choose one.

• E450 Capstone Seminar (every fall and spring)
• W490 Writing Senior Seminar (may be offered in the future)

**Minors:** Writing and Literacy offers two minors, one more general, the other focused on Business and Professional Writing. Only a handful of students have graduated with these minors; we believe they could attract more students if they were more widely known and promoted.

**Graduate Courses:** At the graduate level, Writing and Literacy offers a number of courses that students can take as part of the M.A. program and/or earn a Certificate in Teaching Writing (5 courses). We usually offer 2-3 courses per semester, including summer session, when we offer some two-week courses and the Hoosier Writing Project Summer Institute (13-15 days). Our courses emphasize theory and practice of teaching writing, as well as research. The courses include the following:

- W509, Intro. to Writing and Literacy Studies (core course)
- W500, Teaching Writing: Issues and Approaches
- W590, Teaching Writing: Theories and Applications
- W510, Computers in Composition
- W531, Designing and Editing Visual Technical Communication
- W605, Writing Project Summer Institute
- W697, Independent Study in Writing (Writing Project Advanced Institute)
- W600, Topics: Written Englishes
  - Qualitative Research
  - Basic Writing Pedagogy
  - Second Language Writing
  - Teaching Technical and Professional Writing

**Enrollments:** This program has set out to attract majors (and minors) who are interested in writing and language, enjoy studying literacy in all its dimensions, and seek practical knowledge and experience that will enable them to find fulfilling jobs and exercise their citizenship. As of spring 2012, there were 35 declared undergraduate Writing and Literacy majors. Total enrollment in undergraduate and graduate W & L courses has gone from 332 in 2008-09 to 471 in 2012-13. Enrollment in graduate courses has averaged 82 over the past 3 years, a 56% increase over the 2008-10 average.

**Strengths and Opportunities**

• We are one of a growing number of writing majors in U.S. English departments.
• We have a well-developed curriculum, with perhaps the most extensive and wide-ranging set of such courses in Indiana; our faculty continue to develop innovative, viable new courses (such as Writing
Our courses help students apply knowledge and abilities in many different areas, such as editing, freelance writing, web publication, organizational writing, grant writing, and teaching.

- We have strong faculty who bring research, teaching, and workplace experience and knowledge.
- We have collegial faculty who enjoy their work.
- Our faculty are also involved in the first-year Writing Program and the graduate program, thus integrating these different levels of writing in the department.
- Our majors and graduates are finding success in the workplace.
- We initiate majors in a challenging gateway course, W210.
- We challenge students to identify their writerly selves and develop internal motivation for writing.
- We help majors (and non-majors) connect writing and reading.
- We could communicate the powers and limits of literacy in public life and define literacy more broadly.
- We could develop a center to address university and local literacies; we have a draft proposal for such a center.
- We could explore possible partnerships with Communication Studies, Journalism, and New Media.
- Internship opportunities in the department have increased.
- The campus’s focus on critical thinking: writing is a powerful way of thinking.
- The university and community are paying attention to new digital literacies.
- We could promote our two minors to students across campus.

Weaknesses and Threats

- The coordination of the program is inconsistent because the Director has too many administrative responsibilities. (Note: Starting in fall 2013, the concentration has an Associate Director who plans to address some of these weaknesses and opportunities.)
- Advising in the concentration also suffers from lack of coordination. The Director is an experienced, effective advisor but cannot keep up with all the majors, and other faculty are stretched very thin with their many responsibilities.
- We need to build greater community among students in the concentration.
- Not enough students are doing internships or taking advantage of other experiential learning opportunities in the concentration, such as the News Bureau.
- Campus agencies do not acknowledge our experiential courses such as W398 or W426 as service learning because the courses serve the university instead of off-campus organizations.
- Our concentration’s faculty lack opportunities for professional development, partly due to the paucity of travel funds.
- We have an inadequate number of tenure-line faculty. One of our three tenure-line faculty may retire in 3 years.
- We lack development funding.
- Students at IUPUI are unfamiliar with “writing and literacy” as a field of study.

A.6 English Studies

Overview: English Studies touches upon a rich and distinctive group of approaches to the production and analysis of English texts and the linguistic and cultural traditions that shape them. Students pursuing the English Studies Concentration explore the range, complexity, and connections among literary study, creative writing, composition studies, linguistics, and film studies, as well as develop some sense of the field as a coherent academic discipline. As students complete this concentration, they will have acquired distinctive perspectives on the discrete areas of English and developed a cohesive overview of English and its connections to other academic pursuits. They also will have mastered the habits of building a unified vision of how language, imagination, and tradition create a body of work that rewards the deep appreciation and focused analytical attention English majors invest in it. English Studies students will be
able to identify the ways studying English constitutes a significant and helpful preparation for success in graduate and professional training as well as in careers in public, institutional, or business life.

Faculty: Thom Upton serves as the primary advisor for students who have declared the English Studies concentration.

Curriculum: The English Studies concentration is intended for disciplined and motivated students who will work with an advisor to design a coherent plan of courses from across the English curriculum that meets individual interests. An advisor approved plan of study is required.

The distribution requirements for the English Studies concentration were revised in 2010 (formally called the Individualized Concentration), and are now as follows:

**Gateway** (6 credits)
Choose ONE course from TWO of the following areas:
(a) L202 Literary Interpretation
(b) G205 Introduction to Language Structure, G206 Introduction to Language Use
(c) W206 Introduction to Creative Writing, W207 Introduction to Fiction Writing, W208 Introduction to Poetry Writing
(d) W210 Literacy and Public Life
(e) FILM C292 Introduction to Film

**English Studies Core** (24 credits)
In consultation with an English advisor, choose 24 credits of English department classes at the 200-level or above, including:
* at least three credit hours in at least four of the five different areas of English: creative writing, film studies, linguistics, literature, writing & literacy
* at least 15 credit hours at the 300-level or above

**Capstone** (3 credits)
E450,
Advisor approved E398 internship

Students: The English Studies concentration is the smallest concentration in the department in terms of majors. While the ideal is for students to plan the courses in this concentration from the very start with their advisors, many students declare this concentration after switching from English Education (School of Education) or transferring into the department from another university with a number of upper-level English courses.

**Table 12: Majors graduating (July – June) with concentration in English Studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Studies Majors</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently about six students are actively pursuing the English Studies concentration.

**Strengths and Opportunities**
- The concentration draws on all areas of the department and allows students to develop a focus or pursue a broader perspective that may not be addressed in our other concentrations.
• The concentration provides a fairly easy transition from or route to the English Education major in the School of Education; we have a specific advising sheet that maps the English Studies concentration to the English requirements of the English education major.

• Students who transfer into our department with a significant number of upper-level English credit can complete our major with a meaningful set of courses without having to fit their transfer courses into one of the specialized concentrations.

• The concentration makes it easier for majors to change their mind about pursuing one of the other concentrations; for example many want to start out in creative writing, but may find that this is not the best fit for them but still want to pursue other areas of the major.

Weaknesses and Threats

• Most faculty in the department are focused on their specific concentration areas (e.g., literature, creative writing) and the English Studies concentration is not viewed as a ‘preferred’ option by many.

B. Broader Curricular Components & Issues

B.1 The Capstone in English

The requirement for a “capstone” in the School of Liberal Arts allows departments and programs to create a variety of approaches:

Capstone Experience (1-3 cr.): The capstone course is generally taken in a student’s major as a cumulative integrating experience that addresses the Principles of Undergraduate Learning as well as values and ethics as they relate to a student’s major. The capstone may be an independent research project or study, a practicum, or a seminar or field experience building on students’ previous work. Special interdisciplinary capstones may also satisfy this requirement.

The English capstone course, ENG E450, was originally developed when the department decided to drop concentration tracks and simply offer the English Studies major, for which the only requirements were the common Gateway course E201, the capstone E450, and one upper-level course in each of these three categories: Writing/Creative Writing, Literature/Film, and Linguistics. In about 2000 we reinstated the six separate concentration options with the capstone, E450, as the only common course for the concentrations. (E201 is no longer offered.)

We envisioned two purposes for the capstone course (E450). First, it would give students an opportunity to rework a significant paper from a previous class, bringing new perspectives and improved skills to the new draft, and allow them to reflect on their development as writers and critical thinkers. Second, it would facilitate each student’s construction of a portfolio, making their disparate coursework in English into a coherent demonstration of their achievements as English majors and their potential to succeed in graduate/professional schools, business, and institutional careers.

In terms of assessment, the capstone portfolios are also intended to help faculty assess the majors’ mastery of the student learning outcomes that guided curricular development. However, many students who come to the capstone course have not retained work from previous courses and so are unable to compile meaningful portfolios of their undergraduate work, although this is not as common as it once was. In addition, IUPUI has many transfer students whose previous course work has not been conducted with a view to creating a portfolio or to connecting with IUPUI’s Principles of Undergraduate Learning. Furthermore, the portfolios and projects that are compiled and completed in the capstone course have not been collected and evaluated from a programmatic perspective in many years. Finally, some faculty who teach the capstone do not emphasize the development of a capstone portfolio. Simply put, there is no infrastructure in place to implement and oversee the evaluation of capstone portfolios as an assessment of the English major.
In 2009, five of the six concentrations were revised, with each allowing for the capstone requirement to be met through alternate means, such as a senior seminar in the concentration area. We do not, however, have clearly articulated expectations for what experiences or products (like a portfolio or a revised paper) should be included as part of a capstone experience for students doing a capstone other than E450, and the capstone experiences and assignments done outside of E450 vary greatly, and may not include a revised paper or a portfolio at all. For example, a student who does a service learning project/internship will do different work and write different texts than those required by a 400-level course in a track; this student might not assemble a capstone portfolio reflecting their work in the concentration. Furthermore, faculty who teach E450 have noted that students often enter the capstone with little understanding of its purpose, and it seems that faculty uninvolved with E450 often don’t themselves understand its value. As one recent E450 instructor noted, “A significant subset of our capstone students arrive in the course on the first night with the conviction that the course is not relevant to their tracks or to their futures.”

In summary, we have the following concerns.

1. We currently have a capstone requirement that can be met either by the capstone course (E450), that includes students from a variety of concentrations areas, or by a 400-level concentration-specific course, like a senior seminar course for literature majors. We have no clearly articulated set of expectations for what the capstone experience entails across these options. Faculty members teach E450 in sharply divergent ways. What should be the minimum expectations for a capstone project, including one in an internship or service learning experience, that would demonstrate our desired learning outcomes?
2. It is a challenge to excite faculty, beyond the three or four who currently teach it about teaching the capstone. Most of these faculty teach in the literature concentration, but most of the students who take E450 are in Creative Writing and Writing & Literacy. Faculty from one concentration area (e.g., literature) often feel uncomfortable in evaluating the work of students from another concentration area (e.g., Creative Writing or Linguistics).
3. Some students do not do their best work in the capstone because they do not understand or appreciate the purposes of the course.
4. As faculty have been stretched thin by always-growing responsibilities, we have not made a conscientious effort to collect and evaluate student work in the capstone to assist us in evaluating the major in general or the specific concentrations in particular. (See section on assessment.)

We welcome feedback on the following issues:

1. How do we best implement the capstone requirement: through concentration-specific courses or experiences, through a department-wide capstone course (E450), or some combination of both?
2. What should be the requirements and activities expected from all capstone course/experiences in English (including internships and service learning)?
3. How might we incorporate a relevant internship experience as a capstone option?
4. How can we better prepare students for the requirements and expectations of the capstone early in the major so that they see it as a culminating experience and not a hoop to jump through?

B.2 Online Instruction

The English department has recently offered or plans to offer (marked by underline) the following undergraduate courses in the five concentration areas, either in a hybrid format or completely online:

*Creative Writing Courses:*
  ENG W408, Creative Writing for Teachers (hybrid in the summer)

*Film Studies Courses:*
  FILM C292, Intro to Film (hybrid in the summer)
Literature Courses:
- ENG L105, Appreciation of Literature
- ENG L115, Literature for Today
- ENG L204, Intro to Fiction
- ENG L205, Intro to Poetry
- ENG L207, Women and Literature
- ENG L213, Literary Masterpieces I
- ENG L214, Literary Masterpieces II
- ENG L220, Intro to Shakespeare
- ENG L376, Literature for Adolescents
- ENG L390, Children’s Literature

Linguistics Courses:
- ENG Z205, Intro to the English Language (hybrid)

Writing & Literacy Courses:
- ENG W315, Writing for the Web
- ENG W318, Finding Your E-Voice
- ENG W331, Business & Administrative Writing (hybrid)

The English department was an early adopter of online and hybrid offerings, but several of the above online sections, including FILM C292, ENG L205, L376, and W408, were recently developed due to declining enrollments in the face-to-face sections of these courses. Our department is willing to make online education available to students who will benefit from that mode of delivery, but we wrestle with what the appropriate balance is between online and face-to-face sections.

Our Vice Chancellor, Nasser Paydar, has asked departments to consider whether we might offer online instruction “differently” to increase enrollments in sections without an overall increase in instructional costs/effort or decrease in quality; after long discussion within the department, we do not feel that is possible without compromising the integrity and quality of our work as educators, primarily because our department does not have PhD students to serve as graduate assistants, etc.

We have discussed whether based on the range of courses we currently offer online (see above), we might develop an online option for the English Studies concentration. Although we may be able to do this, the larger question is “should we?” Our concerns:

a. Both research and our faculty’s experience confirm that teaching online courses is more time-consuming than teaching face-to-face courses with the same number of students and comparable teaching methods; consequently, any increase in the number of courses and students we work with online would need to include an evaluation of appropriate (lower) enrollment caps for online courses.

b. We need better departmental support and mentoring for faculty who teach online so that ideas can be shared and faculty new to online instruction can learn from those who have experience. This is time-consuming, and there is little incentive. One possibility might be to have a (rotating) Online Coordinator position that would give an annual course release in exchange for overseeing online curriculum, mentoring new instructors, and assisting in the development of new courses.

c. It is challenging to appropriately evaluate online teaching.

d. Few tenure-line faculty are interested in doing the work required to put courses online.

e. We need a departmental policy regarding generation, ownership, and sharing of online course materials.

f. Should we consider identifying a “featured” course, such as “Intro to Shakespeare,” and offer it as a MOOC; if we did that, how would we compensate the instructor?
We welcome feedback on the following issues:

1. Should we consider developing a set of courses that would allow students to complete the English Studies concentration completely online?
2. Should we look at developing a MOOC for one of the courses that would showcase our department to a wider audience?
3. How should we balance the demand by (many) students for online courses with our own beliefs that the best English studies instruction occurs in face-to-face interactions?
4. How can we provide adequate support and training for faculty who teach online courses?

B.3. Internships

Students have multiple opportunities to receive credit for internship activity through the department. These include: ENG W398 Internship in Writing (1-3 cr, primarily used by students doing internships with *genesis*); ENG W496 Writing Fellows Training Seminar (3 cr); an internship in the University Writing Center; and ENG E398 Internship in English (3-6 cr). The administration of ENG E398 and W398 internship opportunities through the department was significantly modified during 2011. Prior to fall 2011, the department did not have a standard approval process or a standard curriculum for the course once English majors had secured internship positions; students had to approach individual faculty members to give them permission to enroll for credit, and faculty generated quite variable syllabi. In fall 2011, Hannah Haas (senior lecturer) coordinated the English Department Teaching Symposium session on internships, and in spring 2011, she received a course release to develop curriculum for the E398 and W398 internship courses. Haas also received a RISE grant to support the course redesign in Summer 2011. Haas now counts E398 as part of her annual course load whenever a minimum of 30 credit hours is generated for this course.

After meeting with staff in the IUPUI Solutions Center, who provided models of other departments’ internship applications, assignments, and assessment tools, Haas designed application forms to better communicate learning expectations to students and employers. She wrote model assignment guidelines for reflective assignments to ensure that students’ work was evaluated using the same criteria and created midterm and final evaluation surveys for that asked students and employers’ to evaluate their performance based upon IUPUI’s Principles of Undergraduate Learning. She also created an “Internship Information for English Majors” packet containing the application forms, syllabus and assignment guidelines, and evaluation forms for student and employer to use for midterm- and final evaluation.

Initially, we thought one of Haas’ major roles as internship coordinator would be to network with community businesses and organizations to identify possible internship positions, and meet with contact people from local nonprofit organizations. However, by Fall 2011, we found that although networking organizations was extremely valuable and should be continued, the number of educational internships being advertised by businesses and nonprofits in the downtown and general Indianapolis area exceeded the demand for internship positions from our majors, so Haas began to focus more on vetting internship positions already listed on JagJobs.org and IndianaIntern.net and advertising those positions to students via the English major listserv.

Since the re-design in Fall 2011 through Spring 2013, seventeen students have enrolled in for-credit internships (not counting students who held *genesis* literary journal or enrolled in the W496: Writing Fellows Training Seminar, which is considered a University Writing Center internship). Five other students held internship positions that the department advertised, but did not enroll for credit because the internship course counts “only” as an English elective, and they had already fulfilled all of their elective credits. Along with on-campus internships, students have held off-campus internships at the following sites: Sequoia Technologies IMS, Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra, Kurt Vonnegut Memorial Library, Indianapolis Monthly, Richard G. Lugar Center for Renewable Energy, Writers’ Center of Indiana, Ingersoll Rand (industrial company), Roudebush VA Medical Center.
CHALLENGE: We see internships as key to helping English majors make connections between the skills they are developing in their classes and employment opportunities after graduation. We are surprised by the overall lack of interest in internship opportunities by our majors despite strong efforts to advertise them. The primary obstacle we have identified is that internship credit is but one elective option among many for students pursuing the English major, and we do not promote internships as a ‘preferred’ option in our advising material. A second obstacle we have identified is that some employed students cannot invest the time required for an internship and/or cannot get to an off-campus internship. Should we move to making on- or off-campus internships an expectation or recommendation (but perhaps not a requirement) for the major?

B.4. Student Organizations/Activities

B.4.a. genesis

The Department of English sponsors IUPUI’s student literary magazine, *genesis*; having celebrated its 40th anniversary in the spring of 2012, *genesis* is the second oldest student activity on campus. The magazine releases one issue of about 64 pages each semester, containing poetry, fiction, creative non-fiction, and art. A recent issue included the magazine’s first screenplay, indicating the growing breadth of student interests and accomplishment. *genesis* is student-edited as well, with a staff typically ranging from eight to fifteen Senior Editors, all trained in the department’s W280 Literary Editing and Publishing course, which is offered each semester. One to three Managing Editors, often employed as work-study students, are responsible for bringing each issue to press. The magazine’s long life testifies to the continuing interest of our students in literary publishing. The addition of color pages of art has cemented the reputation of *genesis* with the campus artists’ community. Funding from the Office of Student Involvement has remained steady at $7000 per year for many years, and suffices, barely, to cover printing and award expenses. The magazine additionally pays for release events via its IU Foundation account, and for other organizational expenses through the SLA Student Council, which has contributed several hundred dollars in recent years. The department supports the magazine with work-study funds and supplies, and the School of Liberal Arts (which benefits by using *genesis* as a development tool) provides office space and a computer.

*genesis* has long strengthened the Creative Writing program and the whole department; the breadth and diversity of student roles as editors, writers, and artists showcases practical, real-world uses of skills in English. The significant number of awards received in the Indiana College Press Association’s annual literary category attests to the quality of the magazine’s content and design. That virtually all 1000 copies are distributed each semester suggests that interest continues in the magazine’s print format. In the past, *genesis* has produced a more or less annual Literary Editors Panel and hopes to conduct such a session, which gathers student editors from other campuses, in the fall of 2013.

*genesis* is weak, however, in adjusting to new technologies from the out-of-date web pages to the continuing failure to broaden the magazine’s reach with online content. Every semester students enthusiastically discuss an increased web presence, but the work of creating this presence while continuing print editing has proven to be beyond the staff’s abilities. Formats readily available through the IUPUI Libraries are not attractive to the editors, and investigations into outsourcing the work to other campus schools have so far proven fruitless. Perhaps when new faculty more attuned to internet publication begin to advise the organization, this frustrating situation will improve.

B.4.b. The IUPUI Student Readings Series

Since the late 1990s, the Department of English at IUPUI has hosted regular readings and open-mic nights featuring student writers, musicians, and spoken-word performers at various coffee houses, restaurants, and bookstores in the Indianapolis area. This has been an excellent opportunity for our student writers to present their polished work in a public forum, but it has also been an effective means
for creating a literary community centered around IUPUI and within the Indianapolis community. The readings are always open to the public, so community members and students from other campus have often participated, helping our majors connect with peers from around the city with similar artistic and literary interests. This is one of the major extracurricular events and social activities that our department coordinates, which has traditionally been a very essential activity on a commuter campus where students have limited interaction outside of the classroom and in the evening. Many students have continued to read their work from semester to semester and after they have graduated. Currently, our readings are held at Indy Reads Books, a used bookstore that supports the citywide literacy program Indy Reads. This has helped our students become more aware of literacy issues within the Indianapolis area, and it has connected our department’s activities with a very worthwhile community organization.

B.4.c. The English Collective

The English Collective (previously the English Club) has waxed and waned the past ten years. At times, it has been fairly active and staffed by student officers who planned events like trips to the Indiana Repertory Theatre, an Editors Panel discussion, book drives that benefitted the Indianapolis Salvation Army Women’s and Children’s shelter and the national organization Reader to Reader, and Edgar Allen Poe Outdoor Reading Day. When IUPUI’s class schedule included a common lunch break, meetings were scheduled then, and the club had approximately 20 members with about 14 regularly attending meetings. Several of the club’s officers served for two or more years, and the club coordinated the same events for several years in a row. Unfortunately, about seven years ago the common break had to be sacrificed to accommodate more courses. It became harder to find times for meetings, and membership began to drop. Many students with families or multiple jobs simply cannot participate in extracurricular activities.

The collective’s officers and faculty advisors have found it difficult to define the club’s role and attract members. In some years, the club has had a more social focus; in others, it has focused more on serving the department by coordinating programs of interest to students. Because recent membership has been low and few officers have served for more than one term, students and advisors have tried unsuccessfully to re-define the club. However, because the club has not been able to establish its purpose and activities, students have no motive to join.

The English Club was renamed the English Collective in 2009 and broadened to include students involved with the campus student literary magazine, *genesis*. While there were some initial student efforts to organize the English Collective, the student group is currently inactive and has no faculty advisor.

**CHALLENGE/QUESTION:** There is no real consensus about what the English Club/Collective’s identity and functions should be; the club should be student driven, but students do not seem to see the need or benefit of a student club within the major at this time. The Film Club is also currently idle. Student Readings and *genesis* continue to be vibrant and active as they have clear and focused mandates, but involvement is generally limited to students in the Creative Writing concentration. Should the department look at collapsing all of these activities under one umbrella organization in the hopes of encouraging broader student involvement across the major, as envisioned by the English Collective, or is it best for us to let the more narrowly focused, concentration-specific activities run independent of a larger student organization? *genesis* in particular hopes that the review team can suggest ways to better involve the magazine in the overall life of the department.

C. Assessment of Curriculum

See Section IV.
D. Graduate Programs

D.1. English MA

Overview: The English Graduate Studies Program at IUPUI offers an MA in English and four graduate certificate programs: TESOL, Teaching Writing, Teaching Literature, and Professional Editing. Designed to prepare students for careers in the analysis and production of “texts,” the program covers issues and skills in reading and writing, in the richest sense of these words, to prepare students to address these issues and to teach these skills. Our graduates are prepared for careers in teaching writing and literature; teaching English as a second language; writing for business and government; and other professions that use research and writing. Unlike traditional MA programs, which place heavy emphasis on literary history, the IUPUI program focuses on the application of English studies to contemporary situations and problems. With that goal in mind, the MA Program affords students considerable flexibility in fashioning a course of study that best suits their interests, aspirations, and goals. Students may choose either a thesis or non-thesis program of study, and within broadly defined programs, concentrate on literature, writing, or linguistics/TESOL. (For demographic data about students, see section “A.2 Graduate Students”)

Curriculum: Students may select one of the two options outlined below after consulting with the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) in English and/or other faculty advisors in English. Students then submit a brief written statement to the DGS that presents a rationale for their choice.

Three core courses (4 credit hours each) introduce three major areas in the discipline of English: linguistics/TESOL (G500 Intro to the English Language), writing (W509 Intro to Writing and Literacy Studies), and literature (L506 Intro to Methods of Criticism and Research). Students are required to take two of these courses, preferably early in their program.

Thesis Option: 36 credit hours
- Required Courses: two core course, 8 credit hours.
- Electives: Students choose six courses in consultation with a faculty advisor for a total of 24 credit hours. These 24 hours may include a third core course and up to 8 credit hours of Internship. The choice of electives and thesis topic comprises one’s area of concentration.
- Required: MA thesis. 4 credit hours.

Non-thesis Option: 40 credit hours
- Required Courses: two core courses, 8 credit hours
- Electives: Students choose eight courses in consultation with a faculty advisor for a total of 32 credit hours. These 32 credit hours may include a third core course and up to 8 credit hours of Internship. The choice of electives comprises one’s area of concentration.

In addition to regular course electives, students have three options for independent or supervised work outside the classroom: L695, Individual Readings in English; W609, Directed Writing Projects; and English L590, Internship in English. The first two are taken as tutorials with individual graduate faculty members and typically count for 4 credit hours. With the approval of the Director of Graduate Studies and graduate faculty members, students may take more than one independent study. An internship may be taken for four or eight credit hours by enrolling either once or twice in L590. An internship must be a supervised experience in the uses of language in a workplace, such as a company, a governmental agency, a nonprofit organization, or an educational institution (IUPUI or another). The internship experience is integrally related to one’s M.A. course work and/or thesis topic and normally requires 150 hours in the
workplace (for example, 10 hours a week for a 15-week semester). Students may do an internship in their current workplace, but the work completed for the internship cannot be a part of one’s regular job.

By the end of the second semester of study (for full-time students) or by the end of the third semester (for part-time students), students inform the Director of Graduate Studies of their area of concentration: literature, writing, or linguistics/TESOL. A literature concentration includes literary criticism, film criticism, and the investigation of how we read literary texts. A writing concentration focuses on theories of text production and composition in the classroom as well as workplace or technical writing. A linguistics/TESOL concentration examines areas such as discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, and English as a second language (ESL).

Certificate programs figure prominently in the overall curriculum of the MA Program, as any of the following four programs may be taken in conjunction with the MA.

- TESOL Certificate Program
- Certificate in Teaching Writing
- Certificate in Teaching Literature
- Professional Editing Certificate Program

Classes taken for the MA program may count toward the Certificate program as long as they are required or elective courses for that particular certificate. Students who choose this option must complete the certificate program before or simultaneously with the MA program.

Students: As of Fall 2013, the MA Program has 36 students, 17 of whom were admitted this Fall. Further information about enrollments and student accomplishments can be found in the Appendices. Appendix F includes a partial list of our active and accomplished MA graduates.

Assistantships: The MA Program has had considerable success in funding its students by establishing partnerships with various entities in the School of Liberal Arts. Our “seed money” comes from a yearly competitive application for Block Grant funds administered by the campus’s Graduate Office. Programs may receive up to 4 university fellowships per year and monies for assistantships based on that year’s budget. In 2013-14, we have two University Fellows in their second years.

By finding partners to match Block Grant monies for assistantships, the program is able to support a greater number of students. In 2012-13, we partner with the following organizations:

- Indiana Center for Intercultural Communication (ICIC)
- *The Journal of Teaching Writing* (JTW)
- New Oxford Shakespeare Project (NOS)
- English for Academic Purposes Program (EAP)
- Frederick Douglass Papers (FDP) or Santayana Project

During 2012-13, the program has just one Teaching Assistant, who teaches two classes in the English Department Writing Program, and whose stipend and tuition are provided solely by the English Department.

*Strengths and Opportunities*

- Our chief strength is our faculty, who are dedicated teachers and accomplished scholars and researchers.
- The option of the thesis and non-thesis routes to the MA has enabled students to move more purposefully and rapidly through the program. Those who select the thesis option can tailor their coursework to build toward the thesis. Those who select the non-thesis option can choose from a number of summer course offerings, making the goal of 40 credit hours attainable in two years or less.
- The program offers students a variety of research opportunities to work with scholars who are leading figures in their disciplines.
Our graduate certificate programs can be combined to fit the interests and/or professional aspirations of our students, particularly those in the non-thesis track. The certificate programs were designed to avoid overlap of courses. Thus, a student can complete the 20-credit Certificate in Teaching Writing and the 20-credit Certificate in Teaching Literature, thereby completing the 40-credit (non-thesis) MA in English.

Four ideas for growing our MA program

1. Enhance the MA by building a Non-Fiction Writing track, with the goal of ultimately developing an MFA. The track would draw on courses currently taught by the non-fiction writing faculty (faculty in Rhetoric and Composition and faculty in Creative Writing) and those that they could readily develop.

2. Develop a 5-year combined BA-MA in English, for a select few students interested in beginning their graduate studies during their final year as undergraduates.

3. Develop a concentration in Creative Writing, or perhaps a Graduate Certificate in Creative Writing.

4. Play a role in developing an intensive ESL program/institute in Liberal Arts, one that would offer a full curriculum of ESL courses on a year-round basis. Graduate students with a TESOL concentration could serve as TAs and/or RAs, benefitting them, the ESL program, and graduate studies in ESL, all within the English MA.

Weaknesses and Threats

- Without more faculty in literature, we are unable to cover certain periods and genres of literature
- Our lack of teaching assistantships hampers our ability to attract students.
- We lack staff and other support to develop new programs.
- Having to charge higher tuition to out-of-state students severely limits our ability to recruit international students and those from surrounding states.
- Budget cuts limit our ability to hire in tenure-track positions at the same time we will lose as a number of our faculty to retirement. (These retirements are virtually mandated by the terms of their hiring.)
- The state’s recent changes in merit-pay increases for Indiana teachers nearly eliminate public school teachers’ incentive to pursue graduate studies.
- The recession has decreased employment opportunities for graduates of English MA programs.

Graduate Courses (For descriptions, see https://www.iu.edu/~rgistra/course-descriptions/)

**Literature**

- L501 Professional Scholarship in Literature (4 CR)
- L503 Teaching Literature (4 CR)
- L 508 Practicum in Teaching Literature (4 CR)
- L573 Interdisciplinary Approaches to English and American Literature (3 CR)
- L606 Topics in African American Literature (4 CR)
- L625 Shakespeare (4 CR)
- L641 British Literature before 1900 (4 CR)
- L643 Readings in Colonial and Postcolonial Literature (4 CR)
- L649 British Literature since 1900 (4 CR)
- L650 American Literature before 1900 (4 CR)
- L655 American Literature Since 1900 (4 CR)
- L657 Readings in Literary and Critical Theory (4 CR)
L666 Children’s Literature (4 CR)
L678 Literature and Medicine (4 CR)
L680 Special Topics in Literary Study and Theory (4 CR)
L681 Genre Studies (4 CR)
L695 Individual Readings in English (1-4 CR)

**Linguistics Courses**

G500 Introduction to the English Language (4 CR)
G541 Materials Preparation for ESL Instruction (4 CR)
G625 Introduction to Text Linguistics/Discourse Analysis (4 CR)
G652 English Language Sociolinguistics (4 CR)
LING L532 Second Language Acquisition (3 CR)
LING L535 TESOL Practicum (3 CR)
LING T600 Topics in TESOL and Applied Linguistics (3 CR)
LING T600 Topics in TESOL and Applied Linguistics: Second Language Learning and Technology (3 CR)
LING T600 Topics in TESOL and Applied Linguistics: English Teaching Internship (3 CR)
LING T660 Contrastive Discourse: Readings in Linguistics (3 CR)
LING T690 Advanced Readings in TESOL and Applied Linguistics (1 - 4 CR)

**Graduate Writing Courses**

W510 Computers in Composition (4 CR)
W525 Research Approaches for Technical and Professional Writing (4 CR)
W531 Designing and Editing Visual Technical Communication (4 CR)
W532 Managing Document Quality (4 CR)
W590 Teaching Writing: Theories and Applications (4 CR)
W600 Topics in Rhetoric and Composition: Qualitative Research in
W600 Topics in Rhetoric and Composition: Basic Writing Pedagogy (4 CR)
W600 Topics in Rhetoric and Composition: Written Englishes: Living Cultural Realities (4 CR)
W600 Topics in Rhetoric and Composition: Teaching Technical and Professional Writing (4 CR)
W605 Writing Project Summer Institute (3-6 CR)
W609 Individual Writing Projects (1-4 CR)
W697 Independent Study in Writing: Writing Project Advanced Institute (1-3 CR)

**Graduate Creative Writing Courses**

W508 Creative Writing for Teachers (4 CR)
W511 Graduate Fiction Writing (4 CR)
W513 Graduate Poetry Writing (4 CR)
W615 Graduate Creative Nonfiction Writing (4 CR)

**Other Graduate Courses**

L590 Internship in English (4-8 CR)
L699 Thesis (4 CR)
D.2. TESOL Certificate Program

Overview: The English Department offers a one-year, 21-credit hour TESOL Graduate Certificate, which educates students to become teachers of English for diverse populations of adult non-native speakers. In an increasingly more globalized world, the TESOL Certificate prepares graduates to meet the complex linguistic, discursive, pragmatic, sociocultural, and communicative needs of adult learners who are facing literacy challenges in linguistic, educational, professional, and sociocultural environments that are completely distinct from those in which they learned their first languages. Applicants must have a baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution. The English Department also offers a Master of Arts Degree with a concentration in TESOL. (See section on English Graduate Program for more information on the MA.) Students pursue the TESOL concentration of the MA in English by combining the course work for the TESOL Certificate with additional courses to meet the requirements of the MA in English; all credits from the TESOL Certificate can be applied to the MA in English with a TESOL emphasis.

Faculty: The faculty who regularly teach courses that meet requirements for the TESOL Program include 5 tenured faculty, though one has just become a dean and will thus not be teaching.

Curriculum: The curriculum for the TESOL Program is changing. We are in the process of proposing a new MA in TESOL, which will also lead to changes in the TESOL Certificate. A description of the proposed MA in TESOL is provided in Appendix XXX. We hope/anticipate being able to offer the new MA and revised Certificate no later than Fall 2014 or 2015. These changes will include the addition of new courses as well as the renaming and renumbering of several current courses.

Students, Enrollments, Advising: Students are admitted into the English Department TESOL Program in two ways. Most are admitted first into the TESOL Certificate; many then apply for and are admitted into the English MA to pursue the TESOL concentration. Some students are admitted directly into the English MA and choose to pursue the TESOL concentration concurrently with the MA.

Admission requirements for the TESOL Certificate are as follows: 1) BA from an accredited institution; 2) Undergraduate GPA of 3.0 or above; 3) Score of 100 or above on TOEFL iBT for non-native speakers of English; 4) Completed application; and 5) Approval of admissions committee. Admission requirements for the English MA are given in that section of the self-study. Decisions on admission into the TESOL Certificate are made by the Program Director; decisions on admission into the MA are made by the department Graduate Committee, chaired by the Director of Graduate Studies.

Advising: The Director of the TESOL Certificate provides initial advising to incoming students.

Table 13 gives the number of students who graduated with the TESOL Certificate from 2002 - 2012 by academic year.

Table 13: TESOL Certificate Graduates by Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TESL CRT Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrollments: The graduate TESOL Certificate and the TESOL Concentration in the English MA program have had modest enrollments each year, although the number of students focusing on these degrees has
declined in recent years. As shown in Table 13, the TESOL certificate has seen a decline in actively enrolled students from 12 in fall of 2007 to only 5 in 2012, a 58% drop over six years. As shown in Tables 14 and 15 as well as Figure 3, enrollments in required TESOL courses have also declined 40% from a high of 85 students in 2009-10 to 51 students in 2012-13. Most of the courses in the TESOL Program are also taken by students pursuing other credentials, including students from the School of Education pursuing the Certificate in English as a New Language or the MA in Language Education. Fewer students from the School of Education now choose to take our courses. Currently, most TESOL courses are offered cross-listed with undergraduate numbers; students taking undergraduate numbers are generally from the School of Education.

Table 14: TESOL Certificate Students Enrolled in Fall Semester Courses: 2007-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level/Year</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G500</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L532</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L534</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L535</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G541</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T600/T690/G625</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*G652 and other elective courses, including L695 individualized readings, are not included; topics courses created for the TESOL Program are included.

^The academic year is considered Summer-Fall-Spring.
Figure 3: Enrollment Totals in Required TESOL Courses: 2008-2013

Strengths and Opportunities

- The relationships with the English for Academic Purposes Program and the Indiana Center for Intercultural Communication provide excellent teaching and research opportunities for students in the TESOL Program.
- Opportunities for community involvement abound, including teaching Adult ESL courses for the Indianapolis Public Library and at St. Mary’s Church in downtown Indianapolis.
- We have a competitive “Teach Abroad” study abroad agreement with the Peking University Health Science Center in Beijing, China. One student per year is awarded a paid internship that includes housing and airfare to teach EAP part-time with faculty in the Department of Linguistics at the PKHSU for one semester.
- TESOL Faculty members have gained national and international recognition for their research and publications in the field.
- Faculty expertise in language learning and technology, intercultural communication, pragmatics, and English for Specific Purposes provides students with unique content, which distinguishes the program from other TESOL programs. Development of a stand-alone MA TESOL will make our program more attractive to potential students because it highly atypical for students in this field to earn an MA in English. Many students do not consider our program for this reason. Most employers in TESOL are looking for graduates who have the standard and internationally recognized MA TESOL.
- Development of a stand-alone MA TESOL will allow students to train in a more coherent curriculum and to take much-needed courses in language learning and technology that will increase their marketability.
- The one-year TESOL Graduate Certificate is not a common offering in the field of TESOL. Establishment of the typical MA TESOL degree will bring our departmental offerings in line with disciplinary expectations and international standards.
- Development of an MA TESOL degree will also bring our department in line with the curricula of our designated peer institutions, 75% of which offer MA- or PhD-level degrees in TESOL or related fields.
Weaknesses/Threats

- Three faculty members in the TESOL program have heavy administrative duties that divert their attention to other programs/concerns. Further, these administrative duties carry multiple annual course releases, which necessarily decreases faculty involvement in the execution of the TESOL Program. Their reduced teaching loads also shift the bulk of the teaching of the TESOL courses to a smaller number of TESOL faculty.
- TESOL Program faculty members do not meet regularly to assess the program or discuss curricular or student issues.
- The TESOL core courses, LING L532, L534 and ENG G541 are all cross-listed with undergraduate sections because we do not have strong enough enrollments to run the grad sections on their own, which is problematic for both undergraduate and graduate students.
- With just a one-year TESOL Graduate Certificate and no stand-alone MA TESOL, the English Department at IUPUI currently ranks at the bottom of its institutional peers with respect to graduate degrees offered in TESOL.

D.3 Teaching Writing Certificate Program

Overview: The goals of the certificate program are for students to

- understand language and literacy from a theoretical and historical basis;
- acquire a reflective, research-based approach to major issues in teaching writing; and
- develop and articulate an informed, practical pedagogy for teaching writing.

The Certificate program offers students the perspectives and resources of several strong programs: the first-year Writing Program, which offers six courses and employs around 60 full-time and part-time faculty; the University Writing Center, which offers graduate students the opportunity to study Writing Center theory and practice and work in the Center; the Hoosier Writing Project, a site of the National Writing Project, which offers an invitational summer institute and advanced institutes that can be taken for program credit; and the Journal of Teaching Writing, where program students can do internships to learn about the process of producing an academic publication.

A program like ours provides teachers with the resources to become well-grounded professionals who practice with a heightened awareness of their theoretical principles, who understand the challenges of a diverse and tech-savvy population of students, and who can engage in teacher research within their own classrooms. Such teachers can also critique the “packaged” curricula, superficial school reform efforts, pressures to standardize and narrow assessments, and limited, ahistorical views of literacy that mark today’s educational landscape. Because current education policy tends toward not rewarding teachers for graduate degrees, a certificate program can seem more practical and doable as an initial step for busy teachers. Admission into a certificate program may be less difficult (our program does not require the GRE or recommendation letters, for example). Once teachers begin taking courses in a certificate program, they may realize that such graduate work is rewarding, that it does benefit their teaching and fulfill their curiosity and intellectual drive. In other cases, a teacher may already have a master’s degree, but would like the certificate in teaching writing to complement that degree and show specialized expertise.

We know from the growing number of applicants and graduates that our program is meeting a need. By the end of 2011, a total of 38 students were enrolled in the certificate program, 16 of them in the certificate alone and 22 of them also enrolled in the M.A. As of August 2012, a total of 28 students are enrolled in the certificate program, 15 of them in the certificate alone and 13 also enrolled in the M.A. The total number has fluctuated between 28 and 38 as students complete the program and new students are admitted.
Faculty: Our certificate students benefit from the range of faculty in the program, faculty committed to pedagogy as a theory-based, classroom-tested enterprise. Currently our faculty include two associate professors, one assistant professor, three senior lecturers in English, and one associate professor in Technical Communications. The program’s growth should help us continue to make the argument for hiring more faculty in composition and rhetoric.

Curriculum: This 20-hour program of study provides both theoretical and practical knowledge for teachers of writing as well as opportunities through internships. The program is designed broadly to meet the varying needs of our students, whether they be middle school or high school teachers, adjunct faculty in English and in other disciplines, or adjunct and full-time college teachers in the state community college system.

The program requires that students take one required course (W509) and four electives courses that align with their particular interests and career plans. We offer courses in the theories and methods of teaching writing; the nature of the “writing process” and how it can be effectively taught; understanding linguistic diversity as a means of teaching effective communication; uses of technology in writing as a process and product; social aspects of writing development; non-fiction writing; writing assessment; and teacher research.

Three closely aligned courses are sequenced to provide students with a well-rounded understanding of theory, application, and the practice of teaching writing. We explain them to students on our website as follows:

- **W509/Introduction to Writing and Literacy Studies** is one of the gateway courses in the English M. A. (along with an introduction to linguistics and an introduction to literary theory) and is the required core course for the Certificate in Teaching Writing. It prepares students to be critical readers of academic writing, and it introduces them to possible research directions.

- **W500/Teaching Writing: Issues and Approaches** looks at one of the mainstays of teaching writing—the process of writing—and the issues that arise in writing classrooms as well as the approaches that have been used to resolve such issues. As with W509 and W590, the course examines the theories that converged to produce process pedagogy, but the emphasis of the course is on the practical aspect of teaching writing: structuring class time, organizing peer groups, constructing writing assignments, the teaching of grammar, evaluation and grading, and language differences. Thus, the course looks beyond the application of theory (W590) to the more practical concerns of implementing theory-based ideas systematically and effectively.

- **W590/Teaching Writing: Theories and Applications.** Learning how to apply theory to a classroom setting in a conscious, deliberate way is the mark of an informed teacher. This course identifies basic theoretical assumptions in the design of classroom practices.

Among other courses offered as part of the certificate are the following, grouped in general categories for the purposes of this report:

- **Genre courses** include W508 Graduate Creative Writing for Teachers, developed by Indianapolis author and workshop leader Barb Shoup; and W615 Graduate Creative Non-Fiction.

- **New media courses** include W510 Computers in Composition, whose somewhat outmoded title might best be translated as Digital Literacies in Composition; and W531 Designing and Editing Visual Technical Communication.
• **Topics courses** include Written Englishes—Living Cultural Realities, a course on language, dialects, and the teaching of writing; Qualitative Research and Basic Writing Pedagogy

• **Focused pedagogy courses** include W500, Teaching Writing: Issues and Approaches; W596 Writing Tutor Training Seminar, developed by former University Writing Center Director Tere Molinder Hogue; W600 Teaching Technical and Professional Writing; and two courses offered by our National Writing Project site, W605 Writing Project Summer Institute and W697 Independent Study in Writing (Writing Project Advanced Institute).

(1) Course offerings:

• Are we able to offer both required and elective courses as needed?

• Should we offer (more) online sections of particular courses?

**Students:** One powerful benefit of our certificate courses is the opportunity for teachers to study, write, and research with teachers from a variety of schools, levels, and subject areas. Our students include many adjunct and full-time faculty teaching writing at our state community college; middle and high school teachers of English, social studies, and ELL; and university instructors of writing, literature, creative writing, ESL, Spanish, political science, and philosophy; and Second Language Writing. Cross-disciplinary conversations and collaboration in certificate courses have the potential to promote WAC/WID initiatives in secondary schools and on university campuses. A Spanish instructor in our program used what she was learning to begin planning an advanced course in writing in Spanish, and she also took our Writing Center training course and thought of ways to possibly develop a Spanish Writing Center.

Several of our certificate graduates and current students attest to the value of working in a cross-level program like ours. College writing instructors learn from middle and high school teachers what kind of writing instruction their students might have experienced at that level; as one certificate graduate notes, “getting a glimpse into what our students experienced coming to college can be helpful as we develop assignments and as we talk to students about what they're bringing to the classroom” (Donhardt). Another college instructor learned useful approaches from secondary English teachers and was also inspired to continue such collaboration through professional organizations:

> When taking my classes for the CTW, I had the privilege of learning with high school and middle school teachers. In various classes, as we presented class projects or worked on group projects together, I was exposed to different ways of developing curriculum ideas. The high school teachers spoke of literature and technology that appeals to the younger students who are preparing to enroll or have just enrolled at our university. The information I got as a result of working with these practitioners made me not only better prepared for the next class I taught at IUPUI (as far as subject matter and teaching strategies that would grab and hold my students' attention), but it also encouraged me to join a couple of professional organizations like NCTE, so that I can start reading articles and posts from other teachers who teach on all grade levels. (Hampton)

In spring 2012, in his W590 Composition Theory course, Professor Fox had a lecturer from the Spanish department at IUPUI, a graduate student who has taught introduction to political science courses while pursuing his master’s in political science, a graduate student who teaches introduction to philosophy at IUPUI, a developmental reading instructor who teaches online for a California college (she and her family moved to Indiana a couple years ago), and a longtime veteran of public radio looking for a second career.

**Assessment:** Recently, certificate faculty have begun assessing more closely the effects of our program in the teaching lives of our certificate students and alumni. Do we have a means to assess whether our students are learning what we want them to learn other than by grades? What evidence do we have that the curriculum we offer and the instruction we do is having an impact on students?
We started with a survey, administered in April 2012, to be followed soon by exit interviews. The survey asked students about their perceived learning in the three broad outcomes of the program: knowledge about writing’s major theories, historical perspectives, pedagogical issues, and philosophical foundations; understanding of writing—its contexts, genres, research, and practical pedagogy; and applications of writing, including thinking critically, arguing persuasively, writing effectively, giving/receiving feedback, and adapting to linguistic and cultural differences. Students reported growth in all three areas, and those who had taken four or more courses in the certificate program reported gains of two or more levels and saw themselves as strong or very strong in these outcomes. Obviously we would like to develop additional assessments, including evaluation of representative student work and surveys of graduates’ employers. Those who interview applicants for part-time positions in our writing program have begun to notice that applicants from our certificate program demonstrate impressive knowledge and thoughtful ideas about composition pedagogy. Currently, we are working on a method of conducting exit interviews and have generated a list of interview questions, each including several prompts, and data from these interviews will be useful in future planning as well as in program review.

**Strengths and Opportunities:**

- Changes in K-12 teaching: Increasingly, literacy is being touted as essential for twenty-first-century citizens and workers, and schools and colleges are under pressure to enhance student literacy, with writing especially emphasized as the “neglected R.” The changing demographic in classrooms and the need to honor students’ linguistic differences while also teaching editing American English have posed particular challenges to teachers. Many practicing K-12 teachers and college instructors have never taken a course on writing pedagogy, much less a range of such courses.

At the same time, the incentives for teachers to do graduate work are being undermined by school reform efforts in some states, including Indiana. State policymakers argue that license renewal and pay raises should be more closely tied to student achievement and school improvement goals, and that teachers’ professional development plans should be approved by their principals. Simply taking courses or earning graduate degrees is not in itself valuable, such reformers argue. They would rather see professional development provided within a district or school and targeted at “student achievement,” and they claim that such professional development will save teachers from paying university tuition. Whatever the flaws or merits in these arguments, laws and policies have been passed that have teachers unsure about how they will be rewarded and even how they will keep their jobs in some cases.

Many are still motivated to do graduate work, especially if it helps them to stay intellectually challenged, develop their reading and writing abilities, and improve their classroom teaching. Indeed, teachers may read this set of circumstances as all the more reason to continue their education with a sharper focus on course work that will positively impact their teaching and their students’ learning. Regrettably, some are disillusioned by the forces that increasingly rob teachers of their professionalism, and they seek out intellectual spaces in graduate programs to renew and rebuild their knowledge and reboot their pedagogy (and for some, even their self-esteem).

- Strong Assessment program (see above)

**Weaknesses and Threats:**

- Online courses: We do not offer online courses. Occasionally, students inquire about online courses, and we refer them to the IU-Richmond program, which is similar to ours but completely online. We do accept up to four credits from another university. However, for students who want to study in our program but cannot because they live a good distance away, it makes very good sense to offer some courses online. This is an area we could develop, provided we had faculty to devote time to developing the online courses.
D.4 Teaching Literature Certificate Program

Overview: This 20-hour graduate certificate in teaching literature is a structured program designed for licensed middle school and high school teachers; it is wending its way through IUPUI’s approval process, though some courses are already being offered.

Faculty: Faculty are a subset of those who teach graduate courses in literature.

Admission to the certificate program requires one of the following:

1. State certification in middle or high school teaching;
2. Current enrollment as a graduate student at IUPUI;
3. Successful completion of an M.A. degree or higher at an accredited university;
4. Successful completion of a B.A. with a minimum GPA of 3.0 (on a scale of 4.0) or the equivalent from an accredited institution.
5. To better mesh with the schedules of middle and high school teachers, courses are offered on weekday evenings and during the summer.

Curriculum: Students earn the certificate by satisfactorily completing five graduate courses, or a minimum of 20 credit hours. These five courses consist of two core courses and three additional courses chosen from a list of approved electives. Topics include methods of literary research and study; theories of literary analysis and the teaching of literature in middle school, high school, and college; surveys of American and British literature as well as adolescent literature, multicultural literature, post-colonial literature, and more. Up to four graduate credits may be taken at another accredited institution with approval by the program director.

Core courses (8 credits/2 courses)
- L503 Teaching of Literature in College
- L506 Introduction to Methods of Criticism and Research

Elective courses (12 credits/3 courses)
- L508 Practicum on Teaching Literature in College
- L553 Studies in Literature
- L606 Topics in African American Literature
- L625 Readings in Shakespeare
- L635 Readings in American Ethnic Literature and Culture
- L638 Readings in Contemporary Literature
- L643 Readings in Colonial and Post-Colonial Literature
- L657 Readings in Literary and Critical Theory
- L666 Survey of Children’s Literature
- L680 Special Topics in Literary Study and Theory
- L695 Individual Readings in Literature (1-4 CR)

Other courses may be added as approved by certificate director.

Students: Current M.A. students, and part-time faculty and lecturers in any subject area who want to expand their knowledge of literature and enhance their professional teaching careers are the enrollment pool for this certificate. Credits earned in the Teaching Literature Certificate can be applied directly to the M.A. in English upon acceptance into that degree program.

Students confer with their graduate certificate advisor in planning their selection of elective courses. Student learning outcomes are assessed in individual courses on the basis of reflective writing.
assignments, formal research-based papers, and the creation of original teaching materials informed by best practices in the field.

E.1. English for Academic Purposes Program

Overview: In 2012 the program underwent an extensive review. Its self-study, reviewers’ report, EAP’s response to the report, and the EAP Handbook are in Appendix D.

The English for Academic Purposes, founded in 1985, specializes in teaching English for Academic Purposes to non-native English speaking students enrolled at IUPUI. The EAP Program’s mission is to provide non-native speakers of English with English language support so that they can more fully participate in their academic courses of study, to offer to all departments uniform testing of English language proficiency of incoming students who are nonnative speakers of English, and to conduct oral English proficiency screenings and instruction for potential international teaching assistants (ITAs).

The February 2012 external review has commended the Program for its overall professionalism, willingness to collaborate with other campus units on solutions for improving the experiences of international students at IUPUI, and its connections to the English Department and the School of Liberal Arts. Following the review, the Program has begun exploring updating its curriculum (including by increasing the use of technological and service learning applications in EAP courses), and collaborating with other campus units – University College, the Office of International Affairs, the School of Liberal Arts and the Indiana Center for Intercultural Communication – on improved early support for international students with low admission scores.

Faculty: The Program’s teaching staff consists of four full-time lecturers and a tenure-track faculty who directs the Program, as well as 6-10 associate (part-time) faculty each semester. The Program has one administrative secretary who also completes secretarial tasks for the English Department at large.

Curriculum: The Program’s curriculum includes English language classes which focus on reading, grammar, speaking, listening, and writing (at the undergraduate level); speaking, writing, and teaching skills for international TAs (at the graduate level); and English for legal purposes (also graduate).

Students: Arabic and Chinese students constitute the majority of the Program’s undergraduate student population. Most graduate students are from China and India. Given the campus’s mission to internationalize, the number of international students enrolled at IUPUI and therefore in the EAP Program, is expected to grow in the near future.

EAP Program enrollments constitute 9% - 11% of the English Department enrollments. In the Fall’12-Spring’13 academic year, the Program had 834 students enrolled in its undergraduate courses and 72 in its graduate courses.

E.2. First-year Writing Program

The Writing Program’s mission is to provide IUPUI students in their first and second years with an understanding and experience of writing as a powerful form of symbolic communication and deep learning, which will help them be more insightful, curious, and capable lifelong learners who can use writing for personal, vocational, and civic reasons.

The Writing Program offers six different Gateway writing courses (ENG W130, W131, W132/W270, W231, W140, and W150) and maintains a partnership with the University Writing Center. During the 2012 – 2013 academic year, the Writing Program staffed over 200 sections, enrolling over 4,300 students, contributing over $3 million in tuition dollars to the School of Liberal Arts. For fall 2013, the Writing Program added 11 sections of W131 and hired 9 new part-time instructors to meet a record new
enrollment of first-year students at IUPUI. Writing Program enrollments constitute about 50% of total English Department enrollments.

All IUPUI students are required to take and pass (with a C or better) W131 (or W140) or transfer in an equivalent course. (Students with a score of 4 or 5 on the AP Language and Composition exam are granted W131 credit.) Each school or major determines additional writing requirements, if any.

The Program’s teaching staff consists of three tenure-line faculty, ten full-time senior lecturers, seven full-time lecturers, and thirty-nine associate (part-time) faculty. The Program is administered by a tenure-line Director, a senior lecturer as Associate Director, and a Writing Coordinating Committee of senior lecturers and one associate faculty representative. The Program has one administrative secretary who also completes secretarial tasks for the English Department at large.

The February 2013 external review commended the Program for “the near universal satisfaction of faculty and consultants with program, leadership, and professional development opportunities. Many faculty—even those in part-time positions—teach for the IUPUI Writing Program and serve as consultants in the Writing Center because of the community fostered, the curriculum and programming, and leadership.” The reviewers recommended that the School convert many part-time faculty positions to full-time lecturer positions. Following the review, the Program has examined its administrative structure; converted W132 to W270; continued assessment plans; offered an August workshop focusing on a rhetorical view of teaching writing; continued its observation of experienced part-time faculty; and continued working on alignment of W131 with Ivy Tech Community College.

E.3. University Writing Center

The UWC completed a self-study in January 2013 (see Appendix C) in preparation for the external review team that came in February 2013 The UWC has developed this response to that review report.

Funding: SLA’s “almost single handed funding of the UWC is increasingly untenable.” Alternative: cut back on services.

Changes/Goals:

1. Revise mission statement, website.
2. Re-educate schools, faculty, students regarding UWC expectations.
3. Support writing and literacy programs by articulating UWC as a sire for developing literacy, support as students adapt to diverse rhetorical situations – not as proofreading service.
4. All consulting sessions (undergraduate and graduate) 45 minutes long (more support for funders, less for schools, graduate and professional programs not funding UWC; will study in fall – may discontinue support of graduate and professional schools).
5. Refocus professionalism on establishing boundaries; engage in less student accommodation.
6. Expand Zonline (synchronous online consulting), as planned, for undergrads in Fall 2013.
7. Consult with Academic Affairs (via University College’s Office of Student Employment) concerning matching funds for increased student consultant hours.
8. Consult with University College concerning “joining” UC ‘s array of services: concern – UWC grounded in disciplinarily based, has established training agendas for working with writers, contrasting “missions”?
9. Open to TAships – but wondering where $$ will come from.
10. Re-establish UWC outreach efforts by revising faculty roles.

11. Establish research/scholarship agenda; encourage more conference presentations and evidence-based publication.

12. Stop working with faculty; refer international faculty to ICIC, scholarship applications to respective schools, resumes, etc., to Career Center.

13. Continue support of international students: they confront enough marginalization, etc., etc.

14. Close UWC for regularly scheduled in-service/consultant development meetings; value these efforts over killing staff to meet campus demands.

15. Return to consultant evaluations, goal-setting, and reflective consulting practices.

_UWC Consultant Spaces:_ Despite marked growth in UWC traffic, space is threatened. University Library 2125 is not UWC space, and the room could be repurposed any time. The University Library will charge technical fee beginning July 2013 and the UWC is concerned that additional costs may follow. Cavanaugh Hall 008H: space not as well-designed for writing center use as the previous space in Cavanaugh Hall 425 has less square footage, two fewer consulting stations, bad acoustics, no storage, lack of wifi access, lack of space for UWC storage and furniture, and HVAC issues. Isolated in the basement, some UWC staff feel unsafe on weekends.

_Other responses:_

1. Collaboration among/between student and faculty consultants is our UWC’s strength.

2. UWC staff favors collaborative governance.

3. UWC staff (PT-AF, FTPT, students) appreciates scheduling flexibility – flexibility enabling the UWC to be open 50+ hours a week in two locations.

4. Director should consult: sees issues “on the floor” requiring trouble-shooting, problem-solving, revision of policies and procedures, consultant development opportunities.

5. Recommendation for tenure-track UWC director – don’t see it happening soon.
SECTION IV: Assessment of Student Satisfaction and Learning Outcomes

Recent efforts at assessment in the English Department have been focused by the Student Learning Outcomes statements, written in 2010. Coupled with a new, Spring 201, survey of students in Capstone Experiences, new pictures of student satisfaction and Learning Outcomes are just beginning to emerge. Even though we value the snapshot that numerical data supply, our approach is to couple that with the students’ own representations of achievement and with direct evidence in the work they produce. Students, by and large, express high levels of satisfaction with the opportunities and challenges that the faculty and courses offer. These assessments help us to recognize that advising is the category we need to give the most attention, and that even in areas where they acknowledge success, the outliers offer legitimate concerns.

A. Assessment of Undergraduate Programs

1. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Undergraduate Program

Below are the student learning outcome statements for the Bachelor’s degree in English; more specific outcomes statements for each concentration within the major are included in Section IV.

Students completing the English B.A. program will achieve the following:

- **Demonstrate** importance and power of reading/thinking critically and writing with clarity and purpose
- **Define** basic concepts, terms and theories in at least two areas of English studies (creative writing, film studies, language and linguistics, literature, writing and literacy).
- **Read** analyze, synthesize, evaluate, and interpret language and texts critically.
- **Construct** and write a reasoned argument integrated public/expert and personal voices.
- **Recognize** the importance of diverse perspectives and specializations in English studies.
- **Analyze** and evaluate the impact of culture, diversity, and time on texts and ideas as well as language use and structure.
- **Describe** and discuss the interdisciplinary context of English as a field of study and its connection to other disciplines.
- **Explain** how language influences intellectual and emotional responses.

Concerns about the kinds and levels of work as well as the sequencing of work in a meaningfully sequenced undergraduate program have long bothered faculty and annoyed students in the Indiana University system, which for administrative convenience has maintained an all-day smorgasbord rather than sequence of planned meals. This approach has contributed to some extent to the problems our department has faced in offering effective and efficient advising. But it has also muddied the waters of what we think an undergraduate education should look like, in the general sense, and how it adds up to a coherent experience marked by growing achievement, through specific learning activities. As a result, assessment of programs is neither simple nor direct, especially when it comes to what students actually do and are asked to do.

The initial way IUPUI has addressed these issues has been through the adoption of the Principles of Undergraduate learning, but as principles they do not directly address what happens in the curriculum. The Student Learning Outcomes provide a useful second step, but to take the need for coherence one step further (both for faculty and for students), we have identified “Categories of Expertise” that we expect our students to work toward. The chart below lists those categories and supplies guidance (for program administrators and faculty member proposing or revising courses) that clarifies how our teaching can more intentionally direct students toward our stated outcomes. They articulate goals for courses at and across course levels (100-400); this chart synthesizes separate statements from the specific concentrations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Expertise</th>
<th>100 level</th>
<th>200 level</th>
<th>300 level</th>
<th>400 level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXTS</td>
<td>Integrate aesthetic experience of literature and film with social, moral, political dimensions of texts; recognize basic elements of rhetorical context (persona, purpose, audience); begin to recognize the specialized vocabulary of English studies</td>
<td>Explore the production and reception contexts of a work; develop and practice strategies for writing in appropriate rhetorical contexts</td>
<td>Understand historical periods and events as they shape and explain texts</td>
<td>Distinguish between implied and actual readers: connect capstone work with prior work as an English major and future work in a career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGUMENTATION</td>
<td>Develop the ability to make text-based arguments; practice the appropriate use of experience and observation as evidence</td>
<td>Recognize and pursue a range of tenable interpretations and points of view; increase emphasis on text- and observation-based arguments</td>
<td>Develop an ability to formulate an independent critical argument, and to incorporate a range of tenable interpretations into one’s arguments</td>
<td>Develop an ability to integrate public and personal voices in framing an argument; demonstrate the ability to produce a sustained analytic paper using adequate secondary sources to support an independent critical argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICAL THINKING</td>
<td>Move from an expressive to a critical mode through analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of written, oral, and visual text.</td>
<td>Analyze, synthesize, and evaluate text (one’s own and others) in relation to conventional characteristics of form and genre.</td>
<td>Analyze, synthesize, and evaluate text in relation to historical contexts, different critical approaches, cultural and ideological perspectives, or diverse and more complex rhetorical</td>
<td>Anticipate, value, and situate within a relevant theoretical understanding a wide array of critical perspectives or approaches to analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERTEXTUALITY</td>
<td>Develop an ability to distinguish among genres; increase awareness of language varieties.</td>
<td>Envision texts as parts of a generic tradition, emphasizing comparison based on genre characteristics.</td>
<td>Explore forms of influence and innovation, historical “schools” and groups of writers; recognize individual writing as a response to other texts.</td>
<td>Explore works in relation to other works defined by the topic of each course. Recognize the connections among kinds of reading and writing in English studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Diversity</td>
<td>Recognize basic concepts of cultural diversity and perceive validity of cultural perspectives outside students’ own. Explore the range of cultures represented in language, film, fiction, and nonfiction both by reading, viewing, and producing texts.</td>
<td>Analyze the ways certain genres, written, oral, film conventions may be specific to cultures or cultural groups through interaction with texts, students’ own experiences and observations, and writing them. To value diverse cultural representations of texts.</td>
<td>Evaluate the ways in which diverse cultures produce and interact with text. Explore internal variations of viewpoint and ethnicity within students’ own and other cultures.</td>
<td>Understand cultural diversity as a viable approach text analysis. Re-examine reading, writing and viewing experiences in light of cultural identities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Process</td>
<td>Become familiar with writing as a process. Learn strategies for starting, drafting and revising. Develop awareness of.</td>
<td>Understand the adaptability of process to rhetorical situation. Learn to articulate reasoned argument about</td>
<td>[Learn to articulate students’ own writing process#]. Recognize the diversity of appropriate strategies for</td>
<td>Adapt comfortably to diverse rhetorical situations. Approach rhetorical situations from uniquely developed perspectives. Voice positions on textual interactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Learn basic skills and rationale for working with other students in groups.</td>
<td>Learn to listen to and value other students’ perspectives.</td>
<td>Learn to evaluate diverse perspectives and make reasoned judgments about them.</td>
<td>Apprehend, evaluate and synthesize diverse perspectives gleaned from collaboration with peers and apply them to readings, writings, viewings, as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventions and Style</td>
<td>Identify and correct major surface errors; recognize basic conventions and styles; recognize and manipulate own style, appreciate variety</td>
<td>Increase appreciation of styles; expand stylistic repertoire; understand conventions of specific discourse communities</td>
<td>Recognize relativity of conventions and stylistic options; increase awareness of language varieties</td>
<td>Master editing and style; reflect on diversity of conventions and the rhetorical situations to which they are appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCUMENTATION</td>
<td>Evaluate and use sources effectively in writing assignments; employ basic research strategies and the basics of MLA citation.</td>
<td>Use research strategies for specialized purposes, employing genre-specific documentation and citation conventions.</td>
<td>Refine research strategies for specific purposes, and expand familiarity with MLA or other appropriate documentation style.</td>
<td>Master MLA documentation; employ a wise range of research strategies both textual and virtual; reflect on limitations and further possibilities in research-based projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>Use Oncourse for communication, interactive assignments.</td>
<td>Use Oncourse/web for collaborative work and looking up</td>
<td>Use web to find sources for specialized research; location and use</td>
<td>Use web to conduct advanced research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHICS AND VALUES</strong></td>
<td>Recognize and Begin to Practice the University &quot;Ethic of Examination&quot; Which Requires Facing the Challenges to One's Academic, Moral Social, Political, or Aesthetic &quot;Comfort Zone&quot; Which May Be Posed by Texts or the Giving and Taking of Critical Feedback in Interaction with Instructor or Other Students in a Group Settings.</td>
<td>Balance Subjective Response With Objective Analysis So That One's Subjectivity Becomes He Means of Adding to the Rich Range of Tenable Interpretations of Texts Rather Than a Means of Distorting or Avoiding Them. As Part of This Awareness Recognize How Viable Interpretations Must Negotiate the Gulf Between Culture-Specific World Views in a Text and One's Own Experience.</td>
<td>Become Aware of How the Historical or Cultural Particularity of Texts Becomes an Opportunity for Moral and Social Reflection As the Text Is Brought Into a Dialogue With One's Own Experience, Increasing Understanding and Expanding One's Awareness.</td>
<td>Develop Capacity to Tease Out the Underlying Vision of the &quot;Good Life&quot; Which Lies Behind a Particular Texts, Authors, or Cultural Contexts—and Develop the Capacity to Compare, Contrast, or Synthesize That Vision With Others or One's Own.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Information on the Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs)

Along with awarding grades on course work, each faculty member is asked to rate students on their progress toward achieving the PULs. Each course has associated with it a PUL of major emphasis and, in some cases, a PUL of moderate emphasis. Faculty rate undergraduate student performance on the PULs associated with their courses: The data below have been provided to us by IMIR; it is organized by course level (100, 200, 300, and 400) and includes all students enrolled in that course level, not only majors. As a result, the data, collected over six semesters from Spring 2010 to Fall 2012, do not clearly represent progress by students who have declared the English major (Tables 17-21).

Depending upon the course or the faculty member’s interpretation of the PUL rating process, a particular rating is based on a particular assignment associated with the PUL or a general assessment of overall performance in the course. Both are allowed for in the instructions provided to faculty members. At the same time, faculty members may or may not take the course level into account in making the rating; for example, at the 100-level, students take W131 with an emphasis on written communication and achievement in that level may or may not represent the fuller achievement of effectiveness on that PUL one might expect at the 300- or 400-levels.

More specifically, as an example of the trend in achievement we see, we are also providing the level-specific PUL reports from courses in the Literature concentration (Tables 22-25).

We have not collected PUL assessment data that are course or assignment specific, and we realize this is an area we need to consider. Nonetheless, the data below shows, overall, increased achievement of the PULs at higher course levels. We will soon be able to bring PUL data together with other course and program assessments, such as from the Buchenot study described below in “C. Assessment through Student Writing from Undergraduate and Graduate Courses.” What we hope might emerge is a clearer picture of the data from ratings in relation to meeting our course outcomes statements.
Table 17: English Faculty Ratings of English Student Performance on PULs with Major Emphasis, 100 Level & Lower

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUL – Major Emphasis</th>
<th>Mean²</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1A. Written, Oral, &amp; Visual Communication Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 4,194</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 474</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = 3.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>% = 11.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1B. Quantitative Skills</strong></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1C. Information Resource Skills</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Understanding Society &amp; Culture</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total¹</strong></td>
<td>6,352</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>2,449</td>
<td>2,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Combined number of student ratings in all 100-level courses sampled in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Fall 2011, Spring 2012, and Fall 2012. A student may be evaluated more than once if he or she is taking more than one 100 level course.

### Table 18: English Faculty Ratings of English Student Performance on PULs with Major Emphasis, 200 Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUL – Major Emphasis</th>
<th>Mean (^2)</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1A. Written, Oral, &amp; Visual Communication Skills</strong></td>
<td>N = 2,052</td>
<td>N = 106</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M = 3.26</td>
<td>% = 5.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Integration and Application of Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>509</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Intellectual Depth, Breadth, and Adaptiveness</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Understanding Society &amp; Culture</strong></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (^1)</strong></td>
<td>3,754</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>1,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Combined number of student ratings in all 100-level courses sampled in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Fall 2011, Spring 2012, and Fall 2012. A student may be evaluated more than once if he or she is taking more than one 100 level course.

\(^2\) Scale: 1 = “Not Effective”, 2 = “Somewhat Effective”, 3 = “Effective”, 4 = “Very Effective”
Table 20: English Faculty Ratings of English Student Performance on PULs with Major Emphasis, 300 Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUL – Major Emphasis</th>
<th>Mean²</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A. Written, Oral, &amp; Visual Communication Skills</td>
<td>N = 470</td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M = 3.29</td>
<td>% = 6.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C. Information Resource Skills</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Critical Thinking</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Integration and Application of Knowledge</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intellectual Depth, Breadth, and Adaptiveness</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Understanding Society &amp; Culture</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Values and Ethics</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ¹</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>1,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Combined number of student ratings in all 100-level courses sampled in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Fall 2011, Spring 2012, and Fall 2012. A student may be evaluated more than once if he or she is taking more than one 100 level course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUL – Major Emphasis</th>
<th>Mean(^2)</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A. Written, Oral, &amp; Visual Communication Skills</td>
<td>N = 164</td>
<td>N = 5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M = 3.26</td>
<td>% = 3.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.23)</td>
<td>(5.5)</td>
<td>(9.9)</td>
<td>(40.9)</td>
<td>(43.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Critical Thinking</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.23)</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
<td>(11.6)</td>
<td>(41.2)</td>
<td>(42.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Integration and Application of Knowledge</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.43)</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
<td>(5.8)</td>
<td>(37.8)</td>
<td>(53.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intellectual Depth, Breadth, and Adaptiveness</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.37)</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>(9.6)</td>
<td>(35.0)</td>
<td>(52.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Understanding Society &amp; Culture</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.34)</td>
<td>(4.9)</td>
<td>(11.6)</td>
<td>(28.6)</td>
<td>(54.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (^1)</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Combined number of student ratings in all 100-level courses sampled in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Fall 2011, Spring 2012, and Fall 2012. A student may be evaluated more than once if he or she is taking more than one 100 level course.

\(^2\) Scale: 1 = “Not Effective”, 2 = “Somewhat Effective”, 3 = “Effective”, 4 = “Very Effective”
Table 22: Faculty Ratings of ENG-L Student Performance on PULs with Major Emphasis (100 Level & Lower)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUL – Major Emphasis</th>
<th>Mean ²</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Critical Thinking</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ¹</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Combined number of student ratings in all 100-level courses sampled in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Fall 2011, Spring 2012, Fall 2012, and Spring 2013. A student may be evaluated more than once if he or she is taking more than one 100 level course.

Table 23: Faculty Ratings of School of ENG-L Student Performance on PULs with Major Emphasis (200 Level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUL – Major Emphasis</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Critical Thinking</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Integration and Application of Knowledge</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Understanding Society and Culture</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>1,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Combined number of student ratings in all 200-level courses sampled in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Fall 2011, Spring 2012, Fall 2012, and Spring 2013. A student may be evaluated more than once if he or she is taking more than one 200 level course.

2 Scale: 1 = “Not Effective”, 2 = “Somewhat Effective”, 3 = “Effective”, 4 = “Very Effective”
Table 24: Faculty Ratings of ENG-L Student Performance on PULs with Major Emphasis (300 Level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUL – Major Emphasis</th>
<th>Mean ²</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Total ³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1C. Information Resource Skills</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Critical Thinking</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intellectual Depth, Breadth, and Adaptiveness</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Understanding Society and Culture</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ¹</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>1,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Combined number of student ratings in all 300-level courses sampled in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Fall 2011, Spring 2012, Fall 2012, and Spring 2013. A student may be evaluated more than once if he or she is taking more than one 300 level course.


Faculty Ratings of ENG-L Student Performance on PULs with Moderate Emphasis (300 Level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUL – Major Emphasis</th>
<th>Mean ²</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Total ³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Intellectual Depth, Breadth, and Adaptiveness</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (^1)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Combined number of student ratings in all 300-level courses sampled in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Fall 2011, Spring 2012, Fall 2012, and Spring 2013. A student may be evaluated more than once if he or she is taking more than one 300 level course.

\(^2\) Scale: 1 = “Not Effective”, 2 = “Somewhat Effective”, 3 = “Effective”, 4 = “Very Effective”
**Table 25: Faculty Ratings of ENG-L Student Performance on PULs with Major Emphasis (400 Level)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUL – Major Emphasis</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Intellectual Depth, Breadth, and Adaptiveness</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Understanding Society and Culture</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined number of student ratings in all 400-level courses sampled in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Fall 2011, Spring 2012, Fall 2012, and Spring 2013. A student may be evaluated more than once if he or she is taking more than one 400 level course.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[1 \text{ Scale: } 1 = \text{“Not Effective”}, 2 = \text{“Somewhat Effective”}, 3 = \text{“Effective”}, 4 = \text{“Very Effective”}\]
Derived from open-ended questions raised in the survey given to juniors and seniors in the Capstone Experience, the word cloud above adopts a technique of ‘distant looking.’ In this re-presentation of the language our students use to express their experiences in the major, “writing” takes a prominent place—and not surprisingly so, since “writing” sometimes refers in the students’ comments to the Creative Writing and Writing and Literacy concentrations. More significantly it emerges as the most dominant academic practice our students comment on, and it is written work that we are pursuing to collect evidence of student learning across the major. In addition to writing, students clearly value the department’s foregrounding of critical thinking through engagement with texts (including each other’s) and the significant, intentional embedding of diversity in the English curriculum.

To accompany each chart reporting survey data, we have reproduced comments that represent the range—and to some extent, frequency—of answers received in the survey. We have included more extensive comments on Advising because as an area of particular challenge, it is more fully discussed as a separate item entitled “Focus on Advising” a bit further down in this section on Assessment. We imagine these selections to be used both for getting an overall impression of the survey results and for looking at one or two sections of the reviewers’ interest to see the issues more closely.
How did you choose your track?

I decided to be an English major on my own.
I'm a "mature" returning student, and writing was what I was already doing.
I have a very specific desire and idea how I combined literature and creative writing and was firm on my decision to do both.
English was always my strongest skill and I enjoyed writing creatively.
I found out in college classes I was good at English and really enjoyed the writing process.
After a year as an Early Childhood Education major, I realized that I should be studying something I love, Creative Writing. I knew that I wanted to write novels and figured creative writing was the way to go.
I like writing. It was a bit random but W&L seemed like it could work for me.
Film has always been a passion of mine. I thought film studies was the best way to obtain a deeper knowledge and understand film as not just art but as pieces of history, and even mediums for ongoing social/political change.
This concentration was a great replacement for the degree in Secondary English Education. I was unhappy in the school of education for many reasons so I made the switch to accommodate my own needs by using the credit I already earned.
Took enough English courses, and most of them best fit under linguistics.
I fell into it. I was originally working in creative writing, but moved into Writing and Literacy as I felt it held more promising options.
I want to teach English Lit. at the college level.
Seemed I had more Lit. classes than most because of my transfer credits.
It's what I'm good at.
My major prepared me to enter the work force or to further my education by enrolling in a MA program.

I believe that it has helped me somewhat in terms of skill set, however I would have liked more organization and distinction in terms of applying to the MA/MFA program.

The critical thinking skills and the attention to detail I have learned have been a great help.

My English experience is leading me towards an MA in English, concentrating on editing.

I use what I learned in working with clients (young adults) having conversations motivating them to open up and seek assistance for life struggles. My writing helps with the communication in my field.

I feel like I'm better able to express myself than many other graduates and I can more readily research and adapt to different situations/tasks.

My capstone class has helped me to see what options I might have for career or grad program and our internship coordinator is constantly finding several new diverse opportunities.

While a degree cannot guarantee that I will become a published author, it has given me the skills I need to excel at whatever I do, be it teaching or continuing my education.

I feel that a beginning seminar in general for English majors could be helpful and then the capstone would bring everyone back together for a check-up or concentration specific capstone could be more helpful. However, I did get to do many different types of writing that allowed me to see different options for a career. I still feel the capstone comes too late in a college career.

I think that my major has prepared me but I don’t expect to find a job as easily as a business or economics major, but that does not mean I’m less prepared. I feel that I have a deeper understanding of people and communication.

I’ll end up with a job that does not necessarily fit my major. At least in the beginning. As for Masters – I’d agree I’m prepared.

Through the internship credit option, I've made many connections and learned more real-life skills.

I don’t know what to expect for a grad program, but feel as if I have very little real world experience. (i.e. knowledge of what writers experience in their field in 2013/14).
Overall, I am satisfied with the advising I received in the Department of English.

X has always been willing to advise me anytime on what classes to take and when, etc. X also makes himself available to help students.

I feel like my advisor is available for questions when I need it. She's responded quickly by email, too.

It took a year to have it explained to me by someone not even a part of the IUPUI staff how to register for my major and thus learn who my advisors were supposed to be. Once this happened the advisors have given me endless trouble in transferring credits from another university which were already on the core transfer sheet and just didn’t transfer automatically, making the advisors extremely reluctant to transfer them manually. My advisor has also tried to advise me to enroll in a class I do not wish to take. After learning that they are the one who teaches the class, I can only conclude that the advisor is biased and does not have my best interests at mind when she is advising me.

I have never had a sit down meeting with my advisor, not once. I have had wonderful insight offered from some faculty members, but as I said… I have never with an advisor. I'm a senior.

None told me who my advisor was and it was not listed on OneStart. Once I discovered it was not X I had no problems.

What advising? No one wanted to take the role. I used the online tools to build my degree, hoping all the way it was correct.

I feel I have been jerked around and given outdated information when I have been given any in the first place.

The advice that’s available to me comes from my fellow students and professors. There is no other means to figure out my schedule or plans after graduation. The actual advisors either never respond to my inquiries, or they are only available over email, which I’d had bad experiences with. Miscommunication, poor help. So I find my stuff out from professors and other students.

I felt neglected and like I was a burden on my advisor's schedule (who I only met with three times ever since transferring).

Almost no advising, difficult to get schedules to line up.
Advising is mostly on your own, not possible to do in person. Advisors are knowledgeable if you can meet with them.

My assigned advisor was not helpful at all. As a transfer student during my first semester at IUPUI, I was required to meet with an advisor in order to schedule my classes for the next semester. There was a hold on my records. After several attempts at scheduling a meeting with professor X, all of which he cancelled—some last minute—I had him call the registrar to lift the hold and I met with a general liberal arts advisor. Other students I have talked to had a very similar issue with the same advisor.

Once I took the initiative to find an advisor that worked well with me, I was more than happy. That being said, I did most of the planning myself, so I did not need much help.

My advisor was helpful but a bit laid back. This both took pressure off and stressed me out. They tried but I didn’t feel the need to follow up on most things they said because it didn’t seem that necessary—just optional.

X has been nothing short of extraordinary when it comes to academic advising. He kept me updated on requirements and opportunities.

Unlike the advisors in the School of Education the advisors in the Department of English helped me establish a specific path towards my degree. They are always helpful in any way they can be.

Although wasn’t my actual, advisor who helped me most, I was well advised by others in the Liberal Arts Department.

I transferred here, I wasn’t assigned an advisor. When I was assigned an advisor and tried to meet with the one I was told by that person that they were not my advisor. This happened three times before receiving the advisor I have I have today, and I still don’t feel that I’m getting the help I need.

My advisor worked with me as best as he could, given my hectic work schedule - including several phone/online advisement "meetings."

X [is] excellent at encouraging me on what classes to take and helped move my electives around to fit my degree best.

When I asked for help, I received it satisfactorily.

It’s been clear to this point.

I have an overwhelming 1st semester at IUPUI and to be honest I needed advising then. I failed my first semester, but to have to see an advisor before enrolling again was very helpful regardless of the fact it was a requirement.

My advisor is across campus and underground somewhere, making it very difficult to meet. Her hours of avail. are also incompatible.

It has been helpful when a teacher suggests what classes I pursue.

It was alright
My advisor(s) were knowledgeable, accessible, and provided useful information regarding my concentration and the major.

Some of my professors/lectures were/are helpful. (very helpful in fact). Again, this question is barely applicable because, I essentially have no advisor outside of the Dept. Handbook.

No I said, I feel like I have ho advisor. Only other students and my professor. The English office and the Liberal Arts office aren't usually helpful. I always feel rushed and leave with none of my questions answered.

I really didn't ask an advisor - I found most things online.

They know their job, but maybe not their students.

I have not had a consistent advisor.

My advisor was an English professor who taught creative writing, which made him a great help in deciding what I could do with my credits, whether I should minor in literature, etc.

My advisor did know a lot about English and my concentration. They helped me to select classes I might find interesting that I may have overlooked.

He always helped me find the classes I both wanted and the ones I needed.

My advisors were exactly as described. They were able to answer all of my questions concerning courses I had previously taken and classes I was going to take.

The people (not so much my appointed advisor) in the Lib. Arts Dept. were very helpful.

X was great in helping me take what courses were best for me.

X always available to help me.

I never met with my English advisor, but other teachers helped advise me and they were very knowledgeable.

Not accessible at all.
My experience in the Department of English has prepared me for my chosen profession.

My chosen profession is writer, specifically novels, and my craft and understanding has grown, but I’d love to have 300 or 400 level class on novels and developing characters, theme, opening chapters, and structure.

Since I have started taking classes at IUPUI, my skills as a writer have drastically increased.

I want to write, to make a profession as a writer. The Department has helped greatly.

What should I do when I grow up? I don't know.

I think the communication aspect will have, but as far as English-specific work, I can't say.

I am prepared for my MA, which will combine with my undergraduate experience for my profession.

I'm not certain what exactly my field will even be.

I have developed critical thinking and writing skills.

I feel confident in my skills and opinions when it comes to editing a piece of writing.

I have learned a fair deal about the art of creative writing—from composition to criticism. The only thing I could have learned more about was how to go about getting my works published.

I have skills but no leads to how to pursue a career. They all say teach or something to the equivalent of work retail and wait.

I want to go into the film industry so there is only so much preparation that I could be given here, but what I did get helps me better understand film and the industry and its methods, history, etc.

I currently want to get into writing or editing and all of my courses have strengthened my knowledge in these areas.

I have always wanted to teach so being at IUPUI and with the experience I have had in the English Department, I am more confident I can achieve this goal.
My instructors were open and respected my ideas.

My instructors helped me make my own ideas better.

Some of, if not the best professors I've had at this university.

Some were, some were not. Strongly dependent upon the teacher.

The faculty here is amazing. They always give over 100% and are engaging and challenging.

Workshops and class discussions are always open to new ideas.

I felt encouraged to have my own ideas/opinions and explore them, especially in my literature courses.

Liberal Arts is just that. Instructors are free to discussions and debates over various ideas and interpretations of class materials. I do not feel that my ideas were ever shot down or degraded/belittled.

I was never shut down on any of my ideas and was always able to explore through writing new things and what interested me.

Most of my professors were great and open to debate/discussion/questions. X was one that I loved to have class because I always felt that everyone was welcome to their opinions, and I never felt people's opinions were held against them in his class.

In every course you are expected to form your own ideas about a topic or debate. As long as your ideas don't pose a threat or put down others and their beliefs they are respected.

I only had one English department professor who didn't make me feel this way

X and X like my ideas, gave me more initiatives to investigate my ideas further.

They never objected, and helped me as far as I could ask.

I feel comfortable opening up in class and sharing my ideas in class.

Every class, every time.

They usually disagreed, but respected my views.
The courses, course material, and sequencing, of courses were well designed and well suited for my area of concentration.

Though there are countless opinions that refute my own on this matter, I maintain that many of our courses I, and really all college students have to take are university wallet padding that do more to distract students from their work in the few classes that actually help them rather than make us "well rounded individuals." But it's the piece of paper at the end that gets you the job you need to make a living, so you just have to play the game.

I would make one caveat. It would be nice if the progression from 200 to 300 to 400 was more strenuously monitored. I am never sure of my own progress.

Very well designed. My only complaint: Playwriting is only a communications course and is not associated with creative writing. Why not? Screenwriting is, and they are the same things. Just different mediums. Make playwriting work for writing students!

The prerequisites for most of my course have been helpful in developing my writing as well as my argumentative skills.

In regards to my creative writing and literature courses, yes. I feel that all of the English classes I have taken have helped me become a better writer.

In W&L courses I took I was able to read and write new types of documents besides just academic papers. I learned what literacy means and that there are many different types.

The only thing I wish this school did differently would be mesh the New Medias Video and audio courses (such as Adv Narrative Film, N453) w/ film studies courses and communication studies to have an actual film major, that blends study with technique.

Quite a few semester, I had to take extra electives for linguistics courses that weren't available.

The gateway course helped tremendously in regards to knowing what courses I'd be best suited for.

I honestly can't picture how they'd be much different.

I wish there weren't so many gen. ed. courses. I felt as if I was in high school till I got to my senior year. We should dive right in; experience is a key factor in success.
Instructors valued diversity by seeking opportunities to embrace multiculturalism, accepting individual differences, and offering diverse readings and perspectives of texts.

If IUPUI doesn’t strive for valuing diversity, it strives for nothing. One of our instructors is so bent over for culture that he instructs his students to read ten different novels from different regions and eras for his 100 level history course.

Not too diverse of classes.

I often felt like teacher were seeking their opinions and ideas through the students’ works.

Mostly. X only had us reading black literature, which was fine, but became monotonous, with nothing else to compare and contrast.

Again this mostly applies to my literature courses, but the selected readings used as examples or my writing and even editing courses have all been unique and very diverse, which I appreciated.

While our variety of texts was broad, the interpretation/reading of the text was not always as diverse. Of course, it is hard to remain unbiased in such a subjective field.

Many of my classes had me read things I had not seen before. This exposed me to ideas I had never considered. This is one aspect that really stands out to me.

There were some teachers who would be too adamant about using materials that supported only their political opinions, which made it somewhat difficult if you didn’t agree with them.

This was very apparent in reading, writing, and especially in class discussion.

Most of them didn't talk about it, but at the same time didn’t put international students on the spot, either. Which was nice.

I learned about several cultures aside from my own at IUPUI. It has been a great experience.

They seemed so to me, but I can't account for the experiences of other students.

I read works by all walks of life. Multiracial too,
Overall the courses I have taken in English helped me to develop my ability to express ideas and facts to others effectively in writing.

Revision is great!

I would strongly agree due to my outstanding creative writing instructors. However, my literature instructors ruin it by forcing me to knock it down a peg. The overwhelmingly dominant descriptor for literature instructors at IUPUI is pretentious. There were not one literature course I took at IUPUI in which any and all class discussion and interpretation of texts was inevitably led by the instructor toward their own interpretation of everything. The only ideas they have taught their students to express are their own.

Yes, isn't this the point? This has definitely developed my written voice and I hope to translate that into a career.

I have been taught and encouraged to be clear, direct, and confident in all of my writing. One of the biggest things we learned in all of my writing courses is that everything you include in a piece has to have a purpose and everything has to relate to topic, theme, or focused argument. I have since applied this to all of my writing, no matter the type.

My writing has improved vastly in quality and clarity over the years. I feel that I can provide a more polished expression of my views to others now.

By having so many opportunities to write and read different documents I learned what is expected from certain groups and what I can do that is different but effective.

As an English major I have definitely learned how to read, analyze, study, research, and write more effectively.

My writing skills could be stronger. I was required to write in very class but I feel my writing skills could be greatly improved.

My writing has improved the most it ever has in the last 2 years.

I have had good opportunities, but have not felt challenged enough.

The English courses I have taken, I have used ideas and techniques for other courses.
I have taken courses in English that helped me to develop my ability to comprehend, interpret, analyze, and evaluate ideas and facts in a disciplined and principled way.

I feel I have developed and analytical mind!

I feel strongly in the opinion that I was not taught to comprehend and interpret ideas.

The literature courses made me look closely at historical events, human emotion and various aspects that make up the world we live in.

Literary analysis, and any literature course prepares and develops students well to look at and understand text.

As an English major, I would say the number one skill that I have truly honed was critical thinking.

These are the core principles of English classes. From the intro level, I have been developing my abilities to comprehend and analyze text across several fields of study.

Through this major I have learned to question many conventions and dissect the things I read and write. This led me to be skeptical and have a better understanding of how things are presented.

Every English course I took I feel that I got substantial value on terms of what is listed above. All classes I’ve taken have taught me how to interpret, analyze, and evaluate ideas though various mediums.

I have learned to find an answer to all of my questions no matter the subject. The one skill I acquired is the skill of researching and being able to break down what I have read to form my own opinion of the correct answer.

Critical thinking was always dealt with. Unless it was math courses.

My courses have worked my critical thinking skills to the extreme.

Gateway course was a tremendously positive requisite in enhancing my critical thinking skills and making me think over and beyond.

I have opened new pathways in my approach to thinking.

Generally, the courses have been set up in a well thought out, structured way, which has facilitated this.
The courses taken have been remarkable. I believe the failure is the advisement. I have been lost more than I have been clear.

Interpretation is not always fun, but it can be insightful

I think it would be good if Creative Writing majors were encouraged to take literature courses, to at least minor in lit, and to take a wide range of lit courses to experience the different types of writing.

Esp. 401 fiction- a lot of "close reading" and 305 creative non-fiction. (haven' taken the 400-level CNF)

The work I wrote before attending IUPUI doesn't even compare to the work I have produced while attending IUPUI. This, I cannot deny.

They certainly gave me a frame for a foundation. I think I have to reevaluate what I have learned. Moral of my undergrad story: read a lot and evaluate.

I do feel a better writer after these years, but perhaps that is due to practice and not so much instruction.

With critical thinking comes critical writing.

Once again these are skills that have been taught and reinforced in all of my English classes through research papers, analytical papers, and creative pieces.

Writing so much made me practice focus and to develop skills that help to support my ideas in convincing ways and ways that help them stand out and be memorable.

I very much believe, as an English major, I’ve become a much better writer than I thought I’d ever be but I have learned a lot on how to write with purpose, poise, and proficiency.

Again, my writing skills could be stronger. I still have a difficult time preparing a thesis and supporting it well.

Yes, I’m better at following thoroughly with what I want to say, or explain.

I do feel I’m able to be more clear and concise in my academic writing.

Exposure to how others explain their own ideas has led to a greater understanding of my own thought processes.

I believe the English Dept. can push their students harder in regards to developing focused papers, but the reading in literature classes have been helpful.

With their (the professor’s) comments and the faculty in the writing lab, I am better.

Some felt like filler assignments to waste time, most had a purpose though.
4. Focus on Advising

The Department of English intends that our majors be advised by faculty within the particular student’s concentration: Creative Writing, Film Studies, Language and Linguistics, Literature, or Writing and Literacy. All tenured faculty members are charged with advising as one of their service requirements. (In Writing and Literacy some Lecturers also have some limited advising assignments.) The permanent advisor for each major with a declared concentration is assigned by the appropriate Program Director shortly after the student enters the department. The Program Director then informs the new major and English Advising so appointments may be arranged and records updated. When the permanent advisor is assigned, the work study amends information in both the Advising Management System and SIS OneStart records.

Typically, students who enter through the School of Liberal Arts will declare a concentration clearly and quickly. But many students, especially transfer students, come into IUPUI directly through Admissions or University College without necessarily working with SLA and declaring a concentration before their records are established in OneStart; in these cases, the system automatically assigns the Lead Advisor for the new major. Our work study student, through the English Advising e-mail account, contacts such students to encourage them to make contact with the Lead Advisor to discuss their concentration and other steps toward success in the department. Transfer students also report any significant hours they are bringing in, since placing credit for those must often be negotiated. All new majors are encouraged to review a copy of Undergraduate Advising Guide for English Majors.

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats:

The department’s advising process seeks to connect students to advisors who know best the requirements of the concentration the students are pursuing. The Program Directors and the Lead Advisor can provide students with dependable advising and serve as a resource to department faculty who have questions about advising. Our Undergraduate Advising Guide for English Majors is quite useful and readily available; we update it as needed. Our relatively new annual Advising Fair provides an additional opportunity for students, especially those who are unaware of their permanent advisor, to receive advising. The recently completed coding of our “new” 2010 requirements in the SIS system promises to clarify the efforts of our students and faculty with advising.

We do less well in reaching students who fail to declare concentrations (though they may think they have one), who have academic difficulties of which we’re unaware, or who are not knowledgeable about career avenues for those who achieve a degree in English. Our process for connecting a student with their permanent advisor can prove cumbersome if the student does not follow instructions for declaring their concentration. Administrative difficulties remain which stem mainly from the variant, unwieldy processes of the School of Liberal Arts infrastructure through which students enter the English major.

Of additional concern is the quality of advising that some students get from faculty in the department. While many faculty see advising students as a priority and take the time and effort to learn graduation requirements and advising systems, some faculty do not see student advising as a priority, do not make a strong effort to stay current on advising requirements, and do not spend time learning the (admittedly complex and confusing) advising tools. These mixed priorities can be seen in the ‘Capstone’ student survey that we administered to senior English majors in the department during spring 2013 as reflected in Tables 26 and 27 below, which are slightly contradictory. While Table 26 shows 73 percent of the junior and senior English majors surveyed (19/26) were less than satisfied with, or undecided about, the advising they received from the department, and Table 27 indicates that 65% (17/26) felt advisors were knowledgeable and accessible. (As noted above, 65% in the Graduating Senior Survey rated their advisors ability to provide them with accurate and helpful information about their major as Excellent.)
Table 26: Overall, I am satisfied with the advising I received in the Department of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SA = strongly agree, S = agree, U = undecided, D = disagree, SD = strongly disagree

Table 27: My advisor(s) were knowledgeable, accessible, and provided useful information regarding my concentration and the major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SA = strongly agree, S = agree, U = undecided, D = disagree, SD = strongly disagree

When the next cohort of students answered these survey questions in Fall 2013, the raw numbers show improvement. (See charts in section IV.A.3.) Nonetheless, the student comments still express the need for continued effort to advise students early and often and accurately as a part of the experience of completing our degrees, rather than as a burden merely added on to other duties.

Our strengths and weakness in advising offer opportunities for improvement. We continue to build on our relationship with the Student Affairs Office in the School of Liberal Arts; this essential relationship can be improved further to smooth the entry of our majors into departmental advisement. We can use the annual spring Advising Fair and revised correspondence with our majors to increase their cooperation with our advising process. We can further reach out to those majors without declared concentrations and better encourage regular advisement. We can work more closely with the retooled School of Liberal Arts Career Center to improve our communication with majors about their futures.

As reflected in Tables 26 and 27 above and the student comments from the Fall 2013 survey results, we need to work as a department on providing better advising for our majors in our one-on-one appointments. It is clear that some of our majors are not finding faculty who are willing to meet with them, or are finding that faculty are not well prepared to provide accurate academic advising.

We welcome feedback from the review team on ways to more effectively and efficiently advise our majors.
B. Assessment of Graduate Program

1. Student Learning Outcomes in the Graduate Program

Master of Arts in English (M.A.)

The graduate English program has been designed to prepare students for careers in the analysis and production of texts. The program covers issues and skills in reading and writing, in the richest sense of these words—in order to prepare students to address these issues and to teach these skills. Graduates of the program should be prepared for such careers as teaching writing and literature; teaching English as a second language; and writing for business, government, and other professions. In contrast to traditional M.A. programs, which place heavy emphasis on literary history, the IUPUI program focuses on the application of English studies to contemporary situations and problems. Students completing the English M.A. curriculum will be able to:

- Identify and define fundamental concepts, terms, and theories in two areas of graduate-level English studies (writing, creative writing, literature, linguistics).
- Critically read, write about and evaluate issues in English Studies.
- Demonstrate advanced skills in reading, writing, and evaluating issues in the discipline of English Studies.
- Apply various critical perspectives to a wide range of texts, including historical, theoretical, and literary material.
- Demonstrate a working knowledge of the cultural diversity of language and literatures.
- Plan and present coherent, persuasive, and original oral and written arguments.
- Design and conduct independent research.
- Produce through a reflective writing process manuscripts suitable for publication.

Graduate Certificate - English-Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)

Students completing the TESOL certificate will able to:

- Describe the features of both second language and first language discourse.
- Explain the theoretical principles of second language learning from linguistic, psychological, and social perspectives.
- Explain the principles, strategies, and features of second language teaching in a variety of contexts.
- Describe how learning a second language differs from learning one's first language.
- Exemplify the theory-to-praxis connection in second language teaching in a variety of contexts, modes, and genres.
- Devise and use instruments for adequately and appropriately assessing language learners’ educational needs and language development in diverse contexts.
- Design and implement pedagogically-sound lesson plans, teaching materials, courses, and curricula for second language learners in a variety of contexts with respect to reading, writing, listening, speaking, and culture.
- Evaluate and refine (one's own) teaching practices on the basis of second language learning research and specific students’ learning outcomes using the tools of self-reflection and classroom observation.
Graduate Certificate - Teaching Writing

Students completing the certificate in teaching writing will be able to:

- Recognize and define major theories and historical perspectives in the teaching of writing.
- Analyze the complexities of writing and its uses in personal, public, and professional contexts.
- Create, design, and produce effective evaluations of writing assignments and supporting activities.
- Demonstrate knowledge of a reflective, research-based approach to major issues in the teaching of writing.
- Articulate an informed, practical pedagogy for the teaching of writing.
- Write a clear and persuasive research-based argument that adheres to conventions of documentation.
- Evaluate impact of culture, gender, race, and history on texts and ideas as well as language use and structure.
- Demonstrate an ability to accept and offer critical feedback to and from peers.

Graduate Certificate - Professional Editing

Students completing the Professional Editing certificate will:

- Know the techniques and consequences of traditional editing procedures, learn how corrupted texts of the past can be recovered and disseminated for readers today, and explore how these procedures are evolving in reaction to the rapidly changing technical communications environment of the information age.
- Understand that editing is an historical discipline.
- Be able to examine how texts have been edited in the past;
- Be able to recognize the steps involved in editorial procedures, analyze and categorize the various types of errors that are the result of hand press and machine press printing;
- Be able to demonstrate their understanding of book production by writing analytical and descriptive bibliographies, reconstruct textual genealogies of the transmission of a work, evaluate current editions of the same work; and
- Be able to discern what paradigms of editing held sway in different historical periods, analyze and respond to arguments about the best ways to present to the modern reader both public and private documents of historical significance, and design ways to present and preserve document quality in electronic environments.

2. Emerging Assessments in Graduate Programs

Recently, Writing Certificate faculty have begun assessing more closely the effects of our program in the teaching lives of our certificate students and alumni. We started with a survey, administered in April 2012, to be followed soon by exit interviews. The survey asked students about their perceived learning in the three broad outcomes of the program: knowledge about writing’s major theories, historical perspectives, pedagogical issues, and philosophical foundations; understanding of writing—its contexts, genres, research, and practical pedagogy; and applications of writing, including thinking critically, arguing persuasively, writing effectively, giving/receiving feedback, and adapting to linguistic and cultural differences. Students reported growth in all three areas, and those who had taken four or more courses in the certificate program reported gains of two or more levels and saw themselves as strong or very strong in these outcomes.
We would like to develop additional assessments, including evaluation of representative student work and surveys of graduates’ employers. Those who interview applicants for part-time positions in our writing program have begun to notice that applicants from our certificate program demonstrate impressive knowledge and thoughtful ideas about composition pedagogy. Currently, we are working on a method of conducting exit interviews and have generated a list of interview questions, each including several prompts, and data from these interviews will be useful in future planning as well as in program review.

C. Assessment through Student Writing from Undergraduate and Graduate Courses

One of our colleagues, Andy Buchenot, has been developing a project to explore how digital technologies might be used to augment evidence used in assessment and to complicate claims made in assessment reports. The study began in 2011 when he studied the feasibility of collecting student writing from multiple courses through Oncourse, our Learning Management System. This preliminary work earned him a Turner-Davis Faculty Boundary Crossing Award in early 2012. Shortly after receiving this award, he began collecting student writing from the English department’s gateway and capstone courses. Notably, this project provided the first plan for systematic collection of student work for assessment from across all the department’s programs. Preliminary results were presented at the Thomas R. Watson Conference on Rhetoric and Composition. Shortly afterward, Buchenot began collecting student writing from all English courses and entering them into a secure database. Currently, there are 1,547 student documents in the database indexed by course, semester, document type, and several other features. Buchenot is able to collect student writing based on any of these variables (for instance, critical essays written in L202 during spring semesters) for the purposes of conducting directed assessment.

Future plans for this project include examining critical writing from gateway and capstone classes, then having a trained team of readers evaluate the essays against the PULs. Another future application is to explore the possibilities of “machine assessment” as a method for augmented conventional reading. The goal of this application would not be to replace human readers but to facilitate their reading using corpus analysis. Buchenot plans to continue this study for several years in an effort to create a representative sample of what and how students write in response to changing curricular assumptions.