

WSU Five-Year Program Review
Self-Study



Department/Program: English

Semester Submitted: Fall 2015

Self-Study Team Chair:

Dr. Hal Crimmel, Chair, Department of English

Self-Study Team Members:

Dr. Gary Dohrer, Dr. Siân Griffiths, Brooke Kelly, Dr. Mark LeTourneau, Sylvia Newman, Dr. Sally Shigley, Dr. Shelley Thomas, and Dr. James Young.

Contact Information:

Dr. Hal Crimmel
Professor and Chair, Department of English
Elizabeth Hall 435
1395 Edvalson St Dept. 1404
Ogden, UT 84408-1404
hcrimmel@weber.edu
P: 801.626.8044
F: 801.626.7760
Email: hcrimmel@weber.edu

Brief Introductory Statement

The Department of English is one of the largest departments at Weber State University, with 37 full-time faculty members, 3 full-time staff and 88 adjuncts. The department offers classes in fall, spring and summer semesters. These encompass a full suite of programs, including a Master of Arts Degree in English, a Bachelor of Arts in English, a Bachelor of Arts in English Teaching, an English Teaching Minor, a Professional and Technical Writing Minor, an emphasis in Professional and Technical Writing, a Professional and Technical Writing Institutional Certificate, an English minor, a Linguistics Minor, a Creative Writing Emphasis, a Bachelor of Integrated Studies degree in English, and English Departmental Honors. The English Department also participates in the Asian Studies and Environmental Studies Minor Programs, and teaches ESL classes. Many faculty also teach in the University's Honors Program and broadly for the Bachelor in Integrated Studies Program.

The Department is also home to the Developmental English program, which annually serves over 900 students in nearly 50 sections, and to the Composition Program, offering state-mandated English 1010 and English 2010 courses. Annually, the composition program offers over 330 sections and serves over 6000 students. The department also serves the university by offering roughly one dozen general education literature and creative writing courses per semester.

Additionally, the Department oversees, in conjunction with Continuing Education, 50 Concurrent Enrollment Sections of English 1010 in area high schools. Beginning Spring 2016, English 2010 will also be provided as a Concurrent Enrollment option in area high schools.

The Department publishes *Weber: The Contemporary West*, a professional interdisciplinary humanities journal with an international scope, *Metaphor*, a student-run literary journal under the supervision of a faculty advisor, as well as *Aelerus*, a journal overseen by the Master of Arts in English Program.

The Department is home to the National Undergraduate Literature Conference, now in its 31st year. The event attracts students from across the country and hosts nationally and internationally-known major literary figures. As such, the department is actively engaged in encouraging and supporting undergraduate research.

Administration: Dr. Hal Crimmel was appointed to a three-year term as Department Chair effective July 1, 2015, by Dr. Madonne Miner, Dean of the Lindquist College of Arts and Humanities, following a department referendum. The previous Department Chair, Dr. Kathy Herndon, served for eight and one-half academic years. Effective January 1, 2015, Dean Miner appointed Professor Catherine Zublin, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities, to be interim Department Chair while Dr. Crimmel was on sabbatical in Germany.

Organization: The Department utilizes Program Directors for Composition, Creative Writing, Developmental English, Linguistics, Literary and Textual Studies, the Master of Arts in English Program, Professional and Technical Writing, and Teacher Education. Program Directors report to the Department Chair.

Following is a five-year program review of the Department of English.

Standard A - Mission Statement

Revised December, 2013

Current for the 2015-16 Academic Year

The Department of English Language and Literature prepares students to become critical readers and writers through the study of literature and language in English. Moreover, the Department serves the University community by providing students with reading and writing skills integral to their academic and career success.

Standard B - Curriculum

Curriculum Map: Creative Writing Emphasis

KEY: 1= introduced, 2 = emphasized, 3 = mastered, NA=Not Applicable

Core Courses in Department/Program	Department/Program Learning Outcomes					
	Learning Outcome 1	Learning Outcome 2	Learning Outcome 3	Learning Outcome 4	Learning Outcome 5	Learning Outcome 6
	Produce polished original work in one of traditional genres.	Demonstrate critical self-awareness.	Demonstrate editorial proficiency.	Demonstrate a practical knowledge of the publication process.	Demonstrate a confidence in their own work.	Create a portfolio of their writing.
Critical Approaches: ENGL 3080	NA	3	2	NA	2	NA
Writing: ENGL 3250, 3260, 3270, 3280	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA
Language: ENGL 3010, 3030, 3040, 3050	2	NA	1	NA	NA	1
American Literature: ENGL 4520, 4530	NA	2	2	NA	NA	NA
American Literature: ENGL 4540, 4550	NA	2	2	NA	NA	NA
British Literature: ENGL 4610, 4620, 4630	NA	2	2	NA	NA	NA
British Literature: 4640, 4650, 4660	NA	2	2	NA	NA	NA
World: ENGL 3510, 3730, 3880, 4750, 4760	NA	2	2	NA	NA	NA
Studies in Genre: ENGL 3350 (choice between different titles)	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA

Core Courses in Department/Program	Department/Program Learning Outcomes					
	Learning Outcome 1	Learning Outcome 2	Learning Outcome 3	Learning Outcome 4	Learning Outcome 5	Learning Outcome 6
	Produce polished original work in one of traditional genres.	Demonstrate critical self-awareness.	Demonstrate editorial proficiency.	Demonstrate a practical knowledge of the publication process.	Demonstrate a confidence in their own work.	Create a portfolio of their writing.
Workshop: ENGL 4920, 4940, 4960	Varies	Varies	Varies	2	2	Varies
Electives: 2100, 2200, 2220, 2240, 2250, 2260, 2290, 2510, 2710	Varies	Varies	Varies	Varies	Varies	Varies
Portfolio & Public Reading	3	3	3	3	3	3

Curriculum Map: English (BA)

KEY: 1= introduced, 2 = emphasized, 3 = mastered, NA=Not Applicable

Core Courses in Department/Program	Department/Program Learning Outcomes				
	Learning Outcome 1	Learning Outcome 2	Learning Outcome 3	Learning Outcome 4	Learning Outcome 5
	Read, explicate & analyze texts within their cultural, historical, & critical contexts.	Research using a variety of methods & sources & document sources.	Apply relevant critical theories.	Write effectively about texts for varied purposes & audiences.	Demonstrate knowledge of writers, works, genres & periods.
Critical Approaches: ENGL 3080	3	2	3	3	2
Writing: ENGL 3100, 3210, 3250, 3270, 3280	Varies	Varies	NA	3100 (1) 3210(1)	NA
Language: ENGL 3010, 3030, 3040, 3050	1	NA	1	1	NA
American Literature: ENGL 4520, 4530	3	3	1	1	3
American Literature: ENGL 4540, 4550	3	3	1	1	3
British Literature: ENGL 4610, 4620, 4630	3	3	1	1	3
British Literature: ENGL 4640, 4650, 4660	3	3	1	1	3
World Literature: ENGL 3510, 3730, 3880, 4750, 4760	3	3	1	1	3
Electives: ENGL 2100, 2200, 2220, 2240, 2250, 2260, 2290, 2510, 2710	2	2	1	1	2

Curriculum Map: English Teaching (BA)

KEY: 1= introduced, 2 = emphasized, 3 = mastered, NA=Not Applicable

Core Courses in Department/Program	Department/Program Learning Outcomes							
	Learning Outcome 1	Learning Outcome 2	Learning Outcome 3	Learning Outcome 4	Learning Outcome 5	Learning Outcome 6	Learning Outcome 7	Learning Outcome 8
	Write & read in multiple genres.	Discuss, share, & evaluate a wide range of literature.	Plan a coherent curriculum for teaching language arts.	Engage students & teach students to read & write.	Integrate reading, writing, & language instruction.	Use appropriate formal & informal assessments.	Revise instructional plans & gather & evaluate professional resources.	Articulate a professional & coherent philosophy of language arts instruction.
Critical Approaches: ENGL 3080	1	2	NA	NA	2	1	NA	NA
Methodology Block: ENGL 3020, 3400, 3410, 3420	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Writing: ENGL 3100, 3210, 3250, 3270, 3280	2	NA	NA	NA	3210(1)	1	NA	NA
American Literature: ENGL 4520, 4530	2	2	NA	1	1	1	NA	NA
American Literature: ENGL 4540, 4550	2	2	NA	1	1	1	NA	NA
British Literature: ENGL 4610, 4620, 4630	2	2	NA	1	1	1	NA	NA

British Literature: ENGL 4640, 4650, 4660	2	2	NA	1	1	1	NA	NA
World Literature: ENGL 3510, 3730, 3880, 4750, 4760	2	2	NA	1	1	1	NA	NA
Electives: ENGL 2100, 2200, 2220, 2240, 2250, 2260, 2290, 2510, 2710	1	1	NA	1	1	1	NA	NA
Student Teaching	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Curriculum Map: Professional and Technical Writing Emphasis, English (BA)

KEY: 1= introduced, 2 = emphasized, 3 = mastered, NA=Not Applicable

Core Courses in Department/Program	Department/Program Learning Outcomes					
	Learning Outcome 1	Learning Outcome 2	Learning Outcome 3	Learning Outcome 4	Learning Outcome 5	Learning Outcome 6
	Apply theories of technical communication in a variety of genres.	Write a variety of documents that reflect application of cognition.	Perform substantive editing.	Rhetorical approach to document design.	Construct documentation projects.	Develop a portfolio.
Critical Approaches: ENGL 3080	NA	2	1	NA	NA	NA
Prof & Tech Writing: ENGL 3100, 3140, 3190, 4100, 4120, 4110	1 (all)	2 (3100, 3140, 3190, 4100)	3 (3140)	3 (all)	3 (4110)	3 (4120)
Language: ENGL 3010, 3030, 3040, 3050	NA	NA	2	2	NA	1
American Literature: ENGL 4520, 4530	NA	1	1	NA	NA	NA
American Literature: ENGL 4540, 4550	NA	1	1	NA	NA	NA
British Literature: ENGL 4610, 4620, 4630	NA	1	1	NA	NA	NA
British Literature: ENGL 4640, 4650, 4660	NA	1	1	NA	NA	NA
World Literature: ENGL 3510, 3730, 3880, 4750, 4760	NA	1	1	NA	NA	NA

Curriculum Map: English Minor

KEY: 1= introduced, 2 = emphasized, 3 = mastered, NA=Not Applicable

Core Courses in Department/Program	Department/Program Learning Outcomes				
	Learning Outcome 1	Learning Outcome 2	Learning Outcome 3	Learning Outcome 4	Learning Outcome 5
	Read, explicate, & analyze texts within their cultural, historical, & critical contexts.	Research using a variety of methods & sources & document sources.	Apply relevant critical theories.	Write effectively about texts for varied purposes & audiences.	Demonstrate knowledge of writers, works, genres & periods.
Critical Approaches: ENGL 3080	3	2	3	2	2
Writing: ENGL 3100, 3210, 3250, 3270, 3280	3210 (1)	NA	NA	NA	1 (3210, 3250, 3270, 3280)
Language: ENGL 3010, 3030, 3040, 3050	1	NA	1	NA	NA
American Literature: ENGL 4520, 4530, 4540, 4550	2	2	1	2	3
British Literature: ENGL 4610, 4620, 4630, 4640, 4650, 4660	2	2	1	2	3
Electives	Varies	Varies	Varies	Varies	Varies

Curriculum Map: Professional and Technical Writing Minor

KEY: 1= introduced, 2 = emphasized, 3 = mastered, NA=Not Applicable

Core Courses in Department/Program	Department/Program Learning Outcomes					
	Learning Outcome 1	Learning Outcome 2	Learning Outcome 3	Learning Outcome 4	Learning Outcome 5	Learning Outcome 6
	Apply theories of technical communication in a variety of genres.	Write a variety of documents that reflect application of cognition.	Perform substantive editing.	Rhetorical approach to document design.	Construct documentation projects.	Develop a portfolio.
Prof & Tech Writing: ENGL 3100, 3140, 3190, 4100, 4110, 4120	1 (all)	2 (3100, 3140, 3190, 4100)	3 (3140)	3 (all)	3 (4110)	3 (4120)

Curriculum Map: English Teaching Minor

KEY: 1= introduced, 2 = emphasized, 3 = mastered, NA=Not Applicable

Core Courses in Department/Program	Department/Program Learning Outcomes							
	Learning Outcome 1	Learning Outcome 2	Learning Outcome 3	Learning Outcome 4	Learning Outcome 5	Learning Outcome 6	Learning Outcome 7	Learning Outcome 8
	Write & read in multiple genres.	Discuss, share, & evaluate a wide range of literature.	Plan a coherent curriculum for teaching language arts.	Engage students & teach students to read & write.	Integrate reading, writing, & language instruction.	Use appropriate formal & informal assessments.	Revise instructional plans & gather & evaluate professional resources.	Articulate a professional & coherent philosophy of language arts instruction.
Critical Approaches: ENGL 3080	2	2	NA	2	2	1	NA	NA
Methodology Block: ENGL 3020, 3400, 3410, 3420	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Writing: ENGL 3100, 3210, 3250, 3270, 3280	2	NA	NA	2	1	1	NA	NA
American Literature: ENGL 4520, 4530, 4540, 4550	2	2	NA	1	NA	1	NA	NA
British Literature: ENGL 4610, 4620, 4630, 4640, 4650, 4660	2	2	NA	1	NA	1	NA	NA
Student Teaching	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	NA

Standard C - Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Updated: March, 2013

Current for the 2015/16 Academic Year

Measurable Learning Outcomes

DEPARTMENTAL OUTCOMES

At the end of their study at WSU, students in this program will:

1. Read, interpret, and analyze language and texts.
2. Compose, revise, and edit their writing.

PROGRAM-SPECIFIC OUTCOMES

Literary/Textual Studies
1. Read, explicate, and analyze texts within their cultural, historical, and critical contexts.
2. Research using a variety of methods and sources and document sources according to standard guidelines.
3. Apply relevant critical theories to the interpretation and production of texts.
4. Write effectively about texts for varied purposes and audiences across multiple genres and media.
5. Demonstrate knowledge of major writers, works, genres, periods, and literary histories of texts.
Composition
1. Demonstrate an ability to read and understand texts of a variety of genres, styles and complexity.
2. Identify connections between and among texts and their ideas
3. Compose writing that is structurally coherent and unified
4. Compose writing assignments with a clear thesis or main idea
5. Compose documents using the writing process of invention, drafting, peer review, revision, and editing.

6. Control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling
7. Use sources to make arguments
8. Paraphrase, summarize, and use quotations appropriately
9. Use MLA and introduce one other citation method (preferably APA).
Creative Writing
1. Demonstrate ability to produce polished original work in at least one of the traditional genres: poetry, fiction, nonfiction, creative nonfiction.
2. Demonstrate critical self-awareness of the development of their own original work within the context of their peers as well as the larger professional writing community.
3. Demonstrate editorial proficiency through critique, revision, and editing of their own original creative work as well as the work of their peers.
4. Demonstrate a practical knowledge of the publication process by researching, preparing, and/or submitting selected pieces of their original work to magazines, journals, or other appropriate publications.
5. Demonstrate a confidence in their own work by participating in at least one featured public reading.
6. Create a portfolio of their writing.
Developmental English
1. <i>Reading and Thinking Skills</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students will identify the main points and supporting details in texts. 2. Students will summarize and paraphrase texts. 3. Students will identify and make logical inferences.
2. <i>Writing Skills</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Students will synthesize and compare themes and details from multiple texts. 5. Students will organize their writing with adequate transitions and clear patterns of order. 6. Students will adequately credit sources for quoted or paraphrased materials. 7. Students will edit writing to correct spelling, grammar, and mechanical errors.

English Teaching
1. Write and read in multiple genres and respond appropriately to others' writing.
2. Discuss, share, and evaluate a wide range of traditional and contemporary YA literature.
3. Plan a coherent curriculum for teaching the language arts in a variety of genres for diverse audiences and purposes based on the Common Core Standards.
4. Engage students in a variety of reading and writing strategies that teach them how to comprehend, appreciate, interpret, and generate various texts, both literary and informational.
5. Integrate reading, writing, and language instruction seamlessly into the curriculum.
6. Teach students to read and write in a variety of media technologies.
7. Use appropriate formal and informal assessments to inform instruction and verify student learning.
8. Revise instructional plans based on student performance and teacher reflection.
9. Gather and evaluate professional resources and research in the field of teaching English.
10. Articulate a professional and coherent philosophy of language arts instruction based on current best practices and the connections between reading and writing processes.
Linguistics
1. Students explain and illustrate, from English or another language, why at least <i>two</i> of the following five statements about language (first four) and linguistics (last) are true, depending on the particular course taken: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The set of sentences in a language is unbounded, that is, infinite (creativity). ● Languages consist of an interlocking levels that consist of units and rules (systematicity). ● Anything expressible in one language is expressible in another (parity). ● All languages change through time. ● Linguistics is a form of empirical (scientific) inquiry.
2. Students use step-by-step procedures of analysis to arrive at well-founded conclusions about language at these levels: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Phonology – sound structure 2. Morphology – word structure 3. Syntax – sentence structure
3. Students analyze the meaning (semantics) of words, sentences, and texts and their use in classroom discourse and real-world linguistic communication (pragmatics).

4. Students in ESL endorsement courses apply the preceding outcomes in pedagogy and assessment.
Professional & Technical Writing
1. Students should apply theories of technical communication in a variety of genres demonstrating theoretical and practical foundation of the Professional and Technical Writing minor and emphasis.
2. Students should write a variety of documents that reflect application of sophisticated levels of cognition in addition to mastering basic concepts in the discipline
3. Students should perform substantive editing in both hard copy and electronic copy
4. Students should demonstrate a rhetorical approach to document design by thoroughly analyzing situational audience, purpose, and context
5. Students should construct documentation projects using single-sourcing and modular-writing principles
6. Students should develop a portfolio of their best work containing a variety of documents created throughout the entire program; the portfolio may be in hardcopy, online, or a combination of media

Five-year Assessment Summary

Annual assessment reports can be found at http://weber.edu/oie/departments_results.html.

--No department-wide assessment report was done in 2013-14. The most recent was in 2012-13.

-- On November 3rd, 2015, the Department of English completed a 53-page Assessment Report for 2014-15 that is available for review.

-- In sum, the department needs to do a better job of providing Evidence of Learning. We have significantly improved our collection and storage of artifacts, but need to specifically identify thresholds of evidence of student learning, report the results of that assessment, explain how those findings are interpreted, and describe the course of action to be taken based upon the interpretation.

Below is a summary of the report, including information about Evidence of Learning.

- 1) Reflecting on this year's assessment(s), how does the evidence of student learning impact your faculty's confidence in the program being reviewed; how does that analysis change when compared with previous assessment evidence?

--Most of the Department's programs are doing a solid job of assessment; naturally there is room for improvement. Literary and Textual Studies will need to quickly bring its assessment efforts up to speed. The LTS Director position is only in its second year, (other programs have had program directors in place for many years) and having this position should allow us to tackle some of the remaining issues in this area of the Department's portfolio of programs.

--The last assessment report was submitted 11/15/2013. The current report provided here represents a significant improvement over the assessment efforts reported in 2013, when there was no assessment plan report from Creative Writing, Developmental English, Linguistics, Literary and Textual Studies, Professional and Technical Writing, or Teacher Education.

--This document contains reports from all of these areas. In that regard it would be safe to say that we have greater confidence in our programs being reviewed in comparison to 2013.

--Our curriculum grids indicate areas where we are succeeding and where there is room for improvement; the programs using a portfolio approach to assessment or some other model, such as that employed by Teacher Education, also suggest that programs are meeting their learning outcomes.

--Clearly, there is a mismatch between some learning outcomes and required courses in a program. For instance, the Linguistics classes offered within the context of the Professional and Technical Writing Program do not match up particularly well with all of the PTW learning outcomes. This is not a reflection of the quality of the Linguistics courses, but rather should point back to the two Department-Wide Learning Outcomes valid across all programs.

2) With whom did you share the results of the year's assessment efforts?

--Answers to this vary by program, but in general the results of the various program assessment efforts have been shared with the faculty teaching in the program. Across the board—as in shared with the entire Department—this step has been sporadic at best.

- 3) Based on your program's assessment findings, what subsequent action will your program take?
- A. Program Directors will need to be held accountable for overseeing and following through on each program's assessment process and reporting.
 - B. We need to do a much better job setting Evidence of Learning Thresholds, identifying Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes, providing an Interpretation of Findings, and using these to identify and implement Action Plans. Currently,
 - C. In general across the English Department, the individual programs can strengthen their assessment efforts as described in this report.
 - D. We may need to try and agree on ten learning outcomes (or perhaps even eight) relevant to all the department's programs (excluding MENG) and build our assessment efforts around these shared outcomes.
 - E. For program-by-program specifics, please see the sections marked "intended actions" as found in each program's discussion of their assessment efforts.
 - F. The department advisor and chair can play an important role in qualitatively assessing programs by conducting exit interviews with graduating students.
 - G. Ongoing student surveys and data collection provide a baseline for determining whether student needs are being met.

Standard D - Academic Advising

Advising Strategy and Process: Overview

Currently, the advising strategy for the English department consists of an English department faculty advisor, Dr. John Schwiebert, who advises prospective and declared English majors and minors on program requirements, emphasis options and opportunities within the English department. Each of the English emphasis areas – Creative Writing, Professional and Technical Writing and Teaching have English faculty who advise students on the particular emphasis areas and different requirements and course sequencing required.

The Lindquist College of Arts & Humanities employs two college academic advisors, Debbi Murphy and Janneca McClellan, to advise students declared in all arts and humanities majors, and perspective students, on the general education requirements, university degree requirements (diversity, BA and credit hour requirements), general overview of majors and pre-major course requirements. The college advisors are located within the physical space of the English department and English majors have easy access to the advisors.

English majors who attend the new student orientation sessions are advised in a group setting on the general education and university degree requirements by the college advisors, and then they have the opportunity to meet as a group with either Dr. Schwiebert or the department chair, Dr. Hal Crimmel, regarding the English major options, requirements and opportunities.

The English department has a mandatory advising requirement of all declared English majors to ensure a student meets with a department advisor at least once prior to graduation. Students are encouraged by the department's faculty members and staff to meet with both the department advisor and college advisors frequently to make sure they stay on track to graduation.

Our catalog states that “English majors are required to meet with a faculty advisor at least twice annually for course and program advisement. If this requirement is not met, students may not be allowed to register for classes within their major.” (Historically, however, this has not been enforced).

Advising Strategy and Process Specific to Department Advisor

Dr. Schwiebert meets with students on both an appointment and walk-in basis. During 2013 and 2014, about 30% of his advises were walk-ins; during fall of 2015 most have come by appointment—a change attributable in part to their being able, as of fall 2015, to book appointments with me electronically using the “youcanbookme” software. During my first two years as advisor Dr. Schwiebert concentrated on helping students identify the courses they needed to take to progress towards their B.A. degree and on familiarizing them with the Cat Tracks

system. In addition, he took some time to inform students about extracurricular opportunities associated with the English Department. He encouraged students to become involved in one or more of these opportunities as a way of forming friendships with students of like interests, helping others, and developing literacy-related skills for post-graduate study or job-seeking.

Students meet with Dr. Schwiebert at all stages of progress towards their degrees. If they are still completing their General Education requirement he refers them to the College of Arts & Humanities advisor, Debbi Murphy. Once they have chosen an area of emphasis he refers them to the appropriate area director within that program (Creative Writing Emphasis, Professional and Technical Writing Emphasis, and English Teaching Emphasis). Dr. Schwiebert does the advising for students seeking the English Major with Literature Emphasis.

While continuing of course to advise students on progress towards their degrees, during the summer and fall semesters of this year (2015) he gives much greater emphasis to the extracurricular aspect. He has prepared handouts that enable students, at a glance, to see all opportunities available and that offer practical suggestions for keeping a file of “skills and things done” that will prepare them for resume writing and successfully transitioning from “student” to “graduate.”

As another part of “strategy and process” he has been informally canvassing students to find out:

- Why they have chosen English as a major (and why, within the major, their particular area of emphasis);
- What, if any, long-term goals they have for after graduation; and
- What kinds of support are most helpful—or would be most helpful—to them now as they are working towards their degree. Findings, though informal, have been interesting. Students are majoring in English because they like to read and write; they are drawn to particular areas of emphasis by motives of career (notably those who choose Professional and Technical Writing), simple interest or “passion” (especially students who choose the Creative Writing emphasis), and a combination of career and personal passion (students who emphasize English Teaching). The department has recently conducted a formal survey of currently declared English majors that appears to support my own informal findings. In response to the question, why did you choose to major in English? Most respondents cited some version of the words “love,” “passion,” and “interest” as their leading motives, with future career also being a concern. As part of our departmental “strategy and process” for securing and retaining majors, it makes sense that we appeal to all of these various kinds of students.

Effectiveness of Advising

The College Advisor, Debbi Murphy, feels the advising provided within the English department, and the advising done by the college advisors provides effective academic advising for our students. The addition of a second college academic advisor and Dr. Schwiebert's advising schedule allows for students to be seen quickly. The college advisors and the faculty advisors communicate often regarding students and refer students as needed to the appropriate advisor based on the student's needs.

The English department participates in the college's academic standing warning system. When an English major's cumulative G.P.A. drops below a 2.0, the student is notified of their academic standing change. They are then required to complete an online workshop which provides information regarding the implications of their academic standing, what they can, and should do to improve their academic standing and information on campus resources to help them be successful. The student is then required to meet with the college academic advisor to discuss specific goals and plans for the student to be successful. Students who do not complete the online workshop and meet with the college academic advisor are prevented from registering for a subsequent semester. This program allows our advisors to identify and reach out to those students who are at risk of academic failure and provide them with the information and resources available to help them be successful.

We currently have some 370 declared English majors. One good measure of the effectiveness of advising is the figure of numbers of students advised, which has risen substantially since last year. The Department Advisor has seen 64 students during the first five weeks of fall semester, which is slightly lower than the number (75) seen during all of fall semester 2014. There is still a long way to go. Realistically, he would like to meet with at least half of declared majors this year, with a longer-range goal of meeting with every single student.

The overall number of students seeking advisement is up. Word is spreading among students that advising is helpful. Increasingly, students tell Dr. Schwiebert that they have scheduled appointments because friends who are also English majors have recommended it.

Another aspect of "effectiveness" is student satisfaction. Dr. Schwiebert needs a mechanism (an exit interview; see "Past Changes and Future Recommendations) for measuring student satisfaction with advising.

Past Changes and Future Recommendations

Past Changes

In addition to discussing with students what they can do with an English degree after graduation (*What they can do in the future*), Dr. Schwiebert encourages them to keep records of “things done and skills demonstrated” (*What they can do now*) in order to better plan their futures. To this end, as indicated above, he has begun providing advisees with two printed handouts when they meet with him:

- a. “Extracurricular Opportunities” (described in “Advising Strategy and Process,” above).
- b. “Build an Identity; Create Your Future,” which offers guidelines for collecting two kinds of information:
 - Notes of “things done and skills demonstrated” which can help students develop confidence and furnish data for eventual use in resume-writing; and
 - Notes of thoughts, observations, to do lists, and other materials that can foster habits of attention, provide materials for further development (into academic papers, projects, etc.), and help students develop a sense of personal identity.

Future Recommendations

As a future recommendation, the College Advisor, Debbi Murphy, suggests consideration of requiring students to seek career counseling in addition to the mandatory academic advising. A career counselor can help English majors articulate the connection between the many desired employer skills and the skills they have mastered as an English major. Many English majors do not have the job seeking skills or knowledge to market themselves to the business community. This could be accomplished through a senior or junior seminar course required for all English majors.

College Advisor Ms. Murphy also recommends some form of internship requirement be added to the English major and emphasis areas that do not currently require an internship.

Department Advisor Dr. Schwiebert’s general goal: to get students to see advisement as personally advantageous rather than only as something they “have to” do.

- Make the handouts on “Extracurricular Opportunities” and “Build an Identity; Create Your Future” available online, so that all prospective and declared English majors can obtain them at any time electronically.

- Revise the department advising webpage. This is a current priority of the whole department and a process of particular interest to Dr. Schwiebert, who serves as our designated department liaison with the College of Arts and Humanities Marketing director, Christie Denniston. Dr. Schwiebert has met with Christie several times, and the department is considering diverse options for making the major (and hence advisement) more attractive to students. These include options for a combination of video clips by faculty and verbal information on topics relevant to students (e.g., “Why Major in English” and other education-related topics). The department “advising” page is already under reconstruction.
- Pursue a more aggressive program of recruiting students to be English majors. For example, the Literary and Textual Studies program within the department has been charged with the task of preparing a presentation on the English major for area high schools. As department advisor, Dr. Schwiebert will be involved in carrying out this charge.
- Pursue an aggressive program of getting majors in for advisement. At mid-semester Dr. Schwiebert will solicit names of outstanding students from instructors of our composition and general education classes and strive to meet individually with each nominated student.
- Create and begin administering an exit interview for all graduating majors. While students graduating with the Creative Writing emphasis are already doing exit interviews, the interview process needs to be extended to all majors. Dr. Schwiebert’s goal is to begin administering the interview to students who are graduating in fall 2015.

Standard E - Faculty

Faculty Demographic Information

Full-Time Faculty (Tenured, Tenure-track, Instructors)

22 Female / 15 Male

- Includes one visiting female faculty member from Germany.
- The key to abbreviations is found beneath the tables.

Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

(To preserve privacy we are not listing ethnicity).

Name	Gender	Ethnicity	Rank	Tenure Status	Highest Degree	Years of Teaching	Areas of Expertise
Russell Burrows	M		P	T	Ph.D.	30+	American Literature, Composition
Christy Call	F		A1	TT	Ph.D.	10+	Teacher Education, American Literature
Tim Conrad	M		A2	T	Ph.D.	35	TESOL, Intercultural Communications
Hal Crimmel	M		P	T	Ph.D.	20	American Lit, Comp., Enviro Humanities
Gary Dohrer	M		P	T	Ph.D.	35	Teacher Education, YA Literature
Judy Elsley	F		P	T	Ph.D.	35	British Literature, Creative Writing
Becky Gesteland	F		P	T	Ph.D.	25	American Literature, PTW
Siân Griffiths	F		A2	T	Ph.D.	18	Creative Writing, American Literature
Kathy Herndon	F		P	T	Ed.D.	40	Teacher Education, World Literature
Janine Joseph	F		A1	TT	Ph.D.	7	Creative Writing, Post-Colonial Literature
Mark LeTourneau	M		P	T	Ph.D.	30	Linguistics
Susan McKay	F		A2	T	Ph.D.	30	Linguistics, British Literature
Madonne Miner	F		P	T	Ph.D.	30	Literature
Karen Moloney	F		P	T	Ph.D.	30	Irish Literature, British Literature
Julia Panko	F		A1	TT	Ph.D.	7	Digital Media, Brit. & Irish Literature
Vicki Ramirez	F		P	T	Ph.D.	30	Creative Writing, American Literature
Scott Rogers	M		P	T	Ph.D.	18	Composition, British Lit, Cultural Studies
John Schwiebert	M		P	T	Ph.D.	30	American Literature, Writing
Sally Shigley	F		P	T	Ph.D.	30	British and American Literature
Mali Subbiah	M		P	T	Ph.D.	35	World Literature, Cultural Studies, PTW
Shelley Thomas	F		A2	T	Ph.D.	25	Professional and Technical Writing
Mikel Vause	M		P	T	Ph.D.	35	British and American Literature
Michael Wutz	M		P	T	Ph.D.	26	American Literature, Media Studies
Jim Young	M		P	T	Ph.D.	35	Teacher Education, American Literature

A1=Assistant Professor

A2=Associate Professor

C= Contract Faculty

I=Instructor

P=Professor

TT=Tenure-track

T=Tenured

V=Visiting

Instructors

Name	Gender	Ethnicity	Rank	Tenure Status	Highest Degree	Years of Teaching	Areas of Expertise
Becky Marchant	F		I	C	MA	10	Composition, Development English, TW
Brooke Kelly	F		I	C	MA	12	Composition, Development English, TW
Eric Howerton	M		I	C	Ph.D.	10	Composition, Literature, Creative Writing
Gail Yngve	F		I	C	MA	22	Composition, Literature, Creative Writing
Jan Hamer	F		I	C	MA	12	Composition, Literature, Creative Writing
Jose Otero	M		I	C	MA	2.5	Composition, Literature
Kyra Hudson	F		I	C	MA	25	Composition, Literature
Laura Stott	F		I	C	MFA	11	Composition, Literature, Creative Writing
Nathalie Aghoro	F		I	V	MA	5	Literature
Sarah Vause	F		I	C	MA	10	Composition, Literature
Sylvia Newman	F		I	C	MA	21	Composition, Literature
Toni Asay	F		I	C	MA	11	Composition, Developmental English
William Pollett	M		I	C	MA	13	Composition, Literature, Creative Writing

A1=Assistant Professor
A2=Associate Professor
C= Contract Faculty
I=Instructor
P=Professor
TT=Tenure-track
T=Tenured
V=Visiting

Adjunct Faculty

54 Female / 34 Male = 88 Total

(To preserve privacy we are not listing ethnicity).

Name	Gender	Ethnicity	Highest Degree	Years of Teaching	Areas of Expertise
A Luper	F		MA	9	Composition
Adam Webster	M		MA	1	Composition
Allison Copier	F		MA	4	Composition
Angela Choberka	F		MA	5+	Composition
Angela Kelson-Packer	F		MA	2	Composition
Ashley Szanter	F		MA	2	Composition
Benjamin Johnson	M		BA	1	Composition, Secondary Education
Brad Roghaar	M		MA	32	Composition, Poetry, Literature
Brad Wojciechowski	M		MA	8	Composition
Brigitte Smith	F		MA	15	Composition
Brittney Hicken	F		MED	1	Composition, Developmental English
Bryson Newhart	M		MFA	7	Composition, Creative Writing
Buck Kolz	M		M	4	Composition, Developmental English
Byron Borup	M		MA	31	Composition
Carl Porter	M		MA	23	Composition, Literature
Carolyn Olsen	F		MA	3	Composition
Chelsea Adams	F		BA	1	Composition
Cheyney Wheelwright	F		BA	7	Composition
Chris Carter	M		MA	1	Composition
Christy Techmeyer	F		MA	4	Composition
Claire Hughes	F		MA	9	Composition & Learning Theory, Develop.
Crystal Nelson	F		MA	14	Composition, Literature
Darron Coray	M		MA	8	Composition
David Rummler	M		MA	2	Composition
Debbie Hansen	F		MA	1	Developmental English
Debi Sheridan (Sirideain)	F		MA	16	Composition, Dev. English, Literature
Deborah Davis	F		MA	8	Composition
Donald Carper	M		MA	15	Composition
Eleanor Olson	F		MA	15	Composition, Teacher Education
Elizabeth Gillis	F		BA	1	Composition
Elizabeth Jones	F		BA	1	Composition
Elizabeth Robison	F		BA	1	Composition

Name	Gender	Ethnicity	Highest Degree	Years of Teaching	Areas of Expertise
Emily Whitby	F		MA	6	Composition
Hillary Finder	F		MA	8	Composition
Holly Hirst	F		MA	9	Composition
Jessica Richards	F		MA	1	Composition
Jim James	M		MA	21	Composition
Joan Triplett	F		MA	21	Composition
John Beal	M		MA	18	Composition
Jolynn Drott	F		MA	??	Composition
Jonathan Evans	M		MA	3	Composition
Kamri Goff	F		MA	9	Composition
Kaydee Summers	F		MA	13	Composition
Kimberly Strickland	F		MA	3	Composition
Kristin Friederichs Champi	F		MA	5	Composition
Laura Long	F		MA	4	Composition
Lauren Nall	F		MA	2	Composition
Lesli Unrein	F		MA	2	Composition
Les Wade	M		MA	25	Composition
Linda Tobias	F		MA	4	Composition
Logan Mickel	M		MA	2	Composition
Lynda Guiver	F		MA	1	Composition
Maria Georgiou	F		BA	1	Composition
Marilee Mason	F		MA	8	Composition
Marilyn Diamond	F		MA	9	Composition
Matthew Winters	M		MA	3	Composition
Melody Navarro	F		MA	1	Composition
Merci Rossmango	F		MA	1	Composition
Michael Handy	M		MA	??	Composition
Michael Hatch	M		MA	1	Composition
Michael Wojciechowski	M		MA	4	Composition
Mike Wason	M		MA	1	Composition
Moana Patterson	F		MA	??	Composition
Natalie Leavitt	F		MA	6	Composition
Nathanael Myers	M		MA	15	Composition
Nicole Butler	F		MA	3	Composition
Nicole Thompson	F		BA	1	Composition
Patricia Thorpe	F		MA	8	Composition
Prasanna Reddy	F		MA	39	Composition

Name	Gender	Ethnicity	Highest Degree	Years of Teaching	Areas of Expertise
Rachel Bryson	F		MA	1	Composition
Robert Macdonald	M		MA	4	Composition
Rodney Marchant	M		MA	11	Composition
Ryan Evans	M		MA	3	Composition
Sara Layton	F		MA	4	Composition
Scott Forman	M		MFA	14	Composition
Shaun Conner	M		MA	3	Composition
Stacie Egan	F		MA	14	Composition
Stacie Nye	F		MA	2	Composition
Steven Ludlow	M		MA	5	Composition
Steven Shurtleff	M		MA	6	Composition
Sunni Wilkinson	F		MFA	10	Composition
Susan Houtz	F		MA	23	Composition
Todd Schwartz	M		MA	4	Composition
Tonia Wilson	F		MA	1	Composition
Tyler Barnum	M		MA	3	Composition
Tyler Chadwick	M		MA	1	Composition
Walter Prothero	M		MA	38	Composition, Literature, Creative Writing
Wanda Heaton	F		MA	2	Composition

Programmatic/Departmental Teaching Standards

The Department employs a range of strategies to encourage a high standard of teaching. These include encouraging faculty attendance at Teaching and Learning Forum events on campus, encouraging attendance at other campus-wide teaching-related events, and supporting travel to conferences and workshops.

In terms of evaluation of teaching, all tenured and tenure-track faculty must have two courses evaluated each year. The evaluations are administered by Chi Tester, an online program. The shift away from paper evaluations took place several years ago. The weakness with the Chi Tester model is that not as many students participate in the evaluation process as was the case with the paper evaluations. However, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has indicated that despite the lower total number of respondents, the results are still statistically valid. All fulltime instructors and adjunct must have all courses evaluated each semester, using the same process in Chi Tester.

Class sizes are capped at the following:

Composition Courses (ENGL 1010 and 2010, Face-to-Face): 24 students

Composition Courses (ENGL 1010 and 2010, Online): 26 students

Creative Writing Classes (Face-to-Face; 2000 and 3000-level): 20 students

Developmental English (Face-to-face): 20 students

Developmental English (Online): 30 students

--The Department Chair and the Developmental English Faculty are experimenting with a reduction in the online class size to 20 students to see if outcomes can be improved and attrition reduced.

Linguistics Classes (Face-to-Face): Ranges from 20-25-30 students

Literature Classes (2000-level Gen Ed, face-to-face): 30 students

Literature Classes (2000-level Gen Ed, online): 35 students

Literature Classes (ENGL 3080, required of all Majors): 20 students

Literature Classes (4000-level, Face-to-Face): 20-25-30-35 students (all have 5 seats reserved for 5000-level grad students). The disparity in class sizes has to do with different classroom capacities in Elizabeth Hall.

Teacher Education Classes (Face-to-Face): 10 Students

Professional and Technical Writing Classes: (Face-to-Face): 22 students

Professional and Technical Writing Classes: (Online): 22 or 24 students

Action Item: Consider standardizing 4000-level class sizes.

Observation of Teaching (see also “Evidence of Effective Instruction”)

Tenured faculty have their teaching observed at the following intervals:

- 11th year: Eligible for full-professor promotion or post-tenure review, as described in the WSU Policies and Procedures Manual (PPM).
 - includes evaluation of written materials related to teaching such as syllabi, assignments and summary course evaluations. In-class teaching observations are conducted by a peer review committee or a Department Review Committee.
- Post-tenure review: Every five years.
 - includes evaluation of written materials related to teaching such as syllabi, assignments and summary course evaluations. In-class teaching observations are conducted by a peer review committee or a Department Review Committee.

Tenure-track faculty have their teaching observed at the following intervals. These intervals and process are governed by the WSU Policies and Procedures Manual (PPM).

- 2nd year: Peer review of teaching by committee and Department Chair.
--includes in-class observations.
- 3rd year: Formal tenure rank and evaluation committee review
-- includes evaluation of written materials related to teaching such as syllabi, assignments and summary course evaluations. In-class teaching observations are conducted by a peer review committee or a Department Review Committee.
- 5th year: Peer review of teaching by committee
-- includes evaluation of written materials related to teaching such as syllabi, assignments and summary course evaluations. In-class teaching observations are conducted by a peer review committee or a Department Review Committee.
- 6th year: Formal tenure rank and evaluation committee review
-- includes evaluation of written materials related to teaching such as syllabi, assignments and summary course evaluations. In-class teaching observations are conducted by a peer review committee or a Department Review Committee.

Instructors have their teaching observed at the following intervals:

- Contract faculty are reviewed (including their teaching) in the first year of employment and subsequently every three years. Per PPM 8.7.II the review is conducted by a faculty committee, “consisting of one faculty chosen by the contract faculty member, one faculty chosen by the chair, and at least one faculty elected by the department.” The committee observes the faculty member’s teaching, and includes this evaluation in the faculty member’s third-year review materials.

Adjuncts have their teaching observed at the following intervals:

- Each semester, the Assistant Director of Composition (ADoC) reviews a total of four adjuncts. The ADoC writes up observations, identifying strengths and areas for improvement, and then shares them with the Adjuncts individually.
- Teaching Assistants teaching in the Composition Program are observed twice annually by the Director of Composition (DoC). The observations total 10 per semester, on average. The DoC writes up observations, identifying strengths and areas for improvement, and then shares them with the TAs individually.

Faculty Qualifications

The Department has 20 Tenured Faculty, 5 Tenure-track faculty, 13 Instructors, and 88 adjuncts, including 8 Teaching Assistants in the Master of Arts in English Program.

For tenure-track faculty, please see the following website for links to detailed qualifications: <http://www.weber.edu/MAEnglish/Facultylisting.html>

For instructors, we are working on building out the website for all full-time faculty members to include a link to faculty CVs.

For adjuncts, we keep a copy of CVs on file in the English Department office.

Faculty & Staff (current academic year)

	Tenured	Untenured but tenure-track	Contract	Adjunct
Number of faculty with Doctoral degrees	20	4	1	0
Number of faculty with Master's degrees*			12	80***
Number of faculty with Bachelor's degrees				8 (TAs)
Other Faculty				
Total**	20	4	13	88***

*Including two MFAs

**Includes faculty on sabbatical & Family Leave

***Includes Concurrent Enrollment Adjuncts

Evidence of Effective Instruction

i. Regular Faculty

Faculty members are held to the Lindquist College of Arts & Humanities teaching standards and policies and procedures for tenure and promotion (per PPM 8-11). The department chair reviews faculty in their second year. Peer review committees review faculty according to policy, and department and college ranking tenure and evaluation committees review faculty also according to policy. Additionally, all faculty are required to submit a yearly annual report to the Dean of the College.

Results of end of course/instructor evaluations conducted in Chi Tester are reviewed by the Department Chair immediately after each semester. When necessary, the Department Chair speaks individually with or emails faculty to share concerns and develop a timeline for improvement.

ii. Adjunct Faculty

All adjunct faculty are required to have each course they teach evaluated by students using the online Chi Tester system.

Results of end of course/instructor evaluations conducted in Chi Tester are reviewed by the Department Chair immediately after each semester. Issues or concerns about individual adjuncts are shared with the Director of Composition and Assistant Director of Composition. The Director then contacts the instructor to discuss the issue. A pattern of student concerns that the instructor fails to address typically results in dismissal.

Mentoring Activities

Prior to academic year 2014-15, new faculty mentoring activities were provided on an informal basis. Starting in 2014-15 Dr. Judy Elsley established an ad-hoc mentoring committee to help new faculty with the tenure and promotion process and to assist with integrating them into university life at WSU.

In 2015-16, Dr. Hal Crimmel formally established a Mentoring Committee as a standing English Department committee. The committee has a small budget and 5 members, including the Department Chair. The committee will take untenured faculty to lunch, continue to provide them with guidance on the tenure and promotion process and help to acculturate them to the university. The Department wants our new hires and those on the tenure-track to succeed and wants to communicate that message to our new faculty.

Diversity of Faculty

Compared to other regions of the United States, our faculty has minimal racial and ethnic diversity. The college, department, and program aspire to have a diverse faculty but have not been particularly successful in this regard. The majority of the Department's faculty are Caucasian. The department's full-time faculty consists of 21 women and 14 men.

Ongoing Review and Professional Development

Ongoing Review

Tenure-track and tenured faculty:

Tenure-track faculty members are reviewed according to WSU PPM schedules. The typical schedule after hire as a tenure-track assistant professor is:

- 1st year: informal discussion with Department Chair
- 2nd year: peer review of teaching by committee and Department Chair review
- 3rd year: formal tenure rank and evaluation committee review
- 5th year: peer review of teaching by committee
- 6th year: formal tenure rank and evaluation committee review
- if tenure and rank advancement was granted:
 - 11th year: eligible for full-professor promotion or post-tenure review
 - Every five years: post-tenure review

Contract faculty:

Contract faculty are reviewed (including their teaching) in the first year of employment and subsequently every three years. Per PPM 8.7.II the review is conducted by a faculty committee, "consisting of one faculty chosen by the contract faculty member, one faculty chosen by the chair, and at least one faculty elected by the department." The committee observes the faculty member's teaching, and includes this evaluation in the faculty member's third-year review materials.

Adjunct Faculty:

Each semester, the Assistant Director of Composition reviews a total of four adjuncts. The ADoC writes up observations, identifying strengths and areas for improvement, and then shares them with the Adjuncts individually.

Adjunct faculty primarily teach in the composition program; others teach in the Developmental English Program. Adjuncts also teach 2000-, 3000, and 4000-level

classes for which full-time faculty are unavailable, unqualified, or unwilling to teach.

The total of these classes taught by adjuncts is typically about thirty per academic year, as detailed below.

Fall 2015: (10 sections)

2200 online	Prasanna Reddy
2240 ftf	Brad Roghaar
3100 online	Janeice Luper
3100 online	Stacie Egan
3100 online	Stacie Egan
3100 I.S.	Stacie Egan (I.S. = Ind. Study)
3100 ftf	Logan Mickel
3270 ftf	Walt Prothero
3300 ftf	Eleanor Olson
4410 ftf	Debi Sheridan

Summer 2015: (9 sections)

2200 online	Prasanna Reddy
2220 ftf	Susan Houtz
2250 ftf	Eric Howerton
3100 online	Janeice Luper
3100 online	Stacie Egan
3100 online	Stacie Egan
3100 I.S.	Stacie Egan
3270 ftf	Walt Prothero
3300 ftf	Eleanor Olson

Spring 2015: (9 sections)

2200 online	Prasanna Reddy
2250 ftf	Eric Howerton
3100 I.S.	Stacie Egan
3100 online	Janeice Luper
3100 online	Stacie Egan
3100 online	Stacie Egan
3270 ftf	Walt Prothero
3300 ftf	Eleanor Olson
4450 ftf	Debi Sheridan

Adjunct faculty are hired and trained and supervised primarily by the Director of Composition and the Assistant Director of Composition. Other adjuncts fall under the responsibility of the Department Chair.

New adjunct faculty are hired in two ways. The first is the traditional hiring process—people interested in teaching apply through Human Resources. The Composition Director can access their resumes and cover letters online. The Director reviews these applications, giving teaching experience in the college setting the highest priority after minimum qualifications have been met (an MS or MA in English). Once two or three applicants have been selected, the director and assistant director interview the applicants and, if desired, the department chair can meet with them as well.

Adjuncts Teaching in Concurrent Enrollment in the High Schools: These instructors are full-time high school teachers with Master’s Degrees. They are supervised by Eleanor Olson, a long-time public school teacher and WSU adjunct also serving in the role of English Liaison to Concurrent Enrollment. Instructors in this category are developed and reviewed in the following manner:

- Meet with Composition Director to coordinate expectations and assignments.
- Approve applications of high school teachers.
- Give an orientation to all approved teachers, typically 3-4 annually.
- Schedule and observe each teacher at least once and evaluate their teaching and their students’ work.
- Read at least 3 summaries and 3 literature reviews from all first and second year teachers to make sure they are grading on a college level and requiring the work that they list on their syllabus.
- Have teachers who have taught at least two years submit 3 summaries and 3 literature reviews to make sure they are following their syllabus and grading on a college level.
- Meet with any teacher who is having a problem with a particular student, parent, or administrator.
- Answer questions about requirements and how to grade, how to simplify grading, how to use canvas, how to use “turnitin.com” to check for plagiarism.

Teaching Assistants: TAs are considered adjunct faculty members as well. But they must be enrolled in the master’s program (MENG), which select promising MENG applicants to be teaching assistants (TAs). TAs are selected by the Composition Director, the Writing Center coordinator and the MENG program director in concert with the MENG Steering Committee.

Training

The TAs take MENG 6822: Teaching College Writing the semester before they begin teaching English 1010 and MENG 6823: Teaching Practicum during the semester that they teach for the first time. Both courses are taught by the program director. In MENG 6822, they are taught theory and practice of teaching

composition, and in MENG 6823, they reflect on their experiences with each other and the program director in addition to observing two experienced faculty and being observed twice by the program director.

All adjunct faculty, including TAs, are required to come to the composition program's annual adjunct faculty retreat in August, generally held two weeks before the semester starts to facilitate any necessary changes to their syllabi, and another adjunct training retreat sponsored by the Teaching Learning Forum, this year in October.

At these retreats, program, departmental and campus policies are reviewed; changes to curriculum, policies and practices are explained; and training is given in variable topics from teaching with specific technologies to syllabus development, from incorporating rubrics to classroom management, from FERPA to current trends in composition theory and practice.

During fall and spring semesters, the program sponsors four (usually two per semester) workshops (Composition Conversations) each where issues concerning the teaching of composition are covered—taught by guest speakers, full-time faculty, the director or assistant director, and, often, adjunct faculty members.

As a program, we also have an English 1010 and 2010 Resource page on Canvas available to all adjunct and composition faculty that includes samples courses, syllabi and assignments; a list of recommended textbooks; a rationale for the 1010 curriculum, and links to many other campus and teaching resources.

Supervision

Each semester, the Composition Director collects the syllabi from all adjunct faculty via the cloud storage program Box where it can be accessed by the department chair, program director and assistant director. This permits review of syllabi to see if adjunct faculty are following program protocols. It also allows access to an instructor's syllabus in the event a student comes to the program director with a complaint or concern.

Each semester, the assistant director observes four adjunct faculty and reviews their syllabi, textbooks and other course assignments and materials to ensure that program policies, curriculum and outcome goals are being met or addressed. After the observation, the assistant director writes up the observation with praise for what was being done well and suggestions for improvement if necessary. Then the AD meets with the adjunct faculty member (or converses via email) to discuss the observation and whether any significant changes need to be made to the syllabus, course assignments, textbooks and/or classroom management and conduct. Once this is done, the AD, program director and adjunct faculty sign the written observation, and it is placed in their file. The same process is followed with observation of the TAs by the program director, but TAs are observed twice.

Action Item: Provide a Budget for the Composition Program.

The Director and Assistant Director are operating with an unfunded mandate. They are asked to train and supervise the substantial number of adjunct faculty with no money to do so. Though both positions receive course release, which assures that they have sufficient *time* to carry out our charge, they still do not have sufficient money. Composition needs money for workshops—since adjunct faculty are not paid to attend, the programs likes to provide lunch at the August adjunct training session and, possibly, snacks at workshops during the semester.

Composition would also like the ability to bring in speakers on occasion for the August event and semester workshops.

Two years ago, Composition created two awards for adjunct faculty—excellence in teaching and innovation in teaching. At the time, money was available to award (\$500 in each of the first years and \$250 each in the second). Those funds have dried up. The program would like to reinstate the award because it is a boost to instructor morale.

With a budget, the Director and/or Assistant Director could also travel, every other year to the Writing Program Administrators annual conference or other conferences to keep up to date on composition pedagogy and best practices in Composition Program Administration.

Given that the Composition Program serves the university as a whole (over 6000 students annually), and that composition is state mandated, it would be helpful to have money added to the English Department budget earmarked for Composition. A minimum \$4000-5000 annually would provide adequate funds for helping to continue to train and incentive adjuncts for the important work they perform for the university. This seems a most modest and reasonable request.

Action Item: More Frequent Adjunct Reviews?

Discuss whether adjuncts should have their teaching reviewed more regularly. (Currently only 8 are reviewed annually). If so, a mechanism needs to be created to make this feasible given the workload of the Composition Program.

Action Item: Hire for Professional and Technical Writing

Could English hire a full-time faculty member to help cover the ENGL 3100 class, of which 12 sections were taught by adjuncts in the last calendar year?

Professional Development

The university, college, and department provide funds via various sources such as the Research, Scholarship, and Professional Growth Committee to attend conferences, present papers or creative work, develop new courses, acquire new technology (e.g., 50 iPads for instruction), perform research or develop creative work.

Faculty are encouraged to attend conferences and English departmental monies are allocated to individual faculty each year. The faculty attend teaching workshops on campus provided by the Teaching and Learning Forum. In fall 2015, for instance, TLF offered a new program for scholars interested in research focused on teaching and learning. As needed, the faculty also attend trainings offered through WSU Training Tracker, such as Google Apps and Chi Tester.

Standard F – Program Support

Support Staff, Administration, Facilities, Equipment, and Library

Adequacy of Staff

i. Ongoing Staff Development

The Department Chair encourages staff to take advantage of the numerous professional development opportunities on campus. Staff qualify for Staff Development monies through the WSU's Staff Development Committee. The committee has 3-4 sessions throughout the year that give the WSU staff a chance to apply for money to attend conferences, make presentations, facilitate seminars, and/or other events to increase Staff career endeavors.

WSU Training Tracker advertises on-campus workshops during the semesters. These include learning about Excel, Microsoft Word, CPR/First Aid, FERPA, Suicide Prevention, Financial Basics, Ergonomics, Chi-Tester, and many more selections.

Administrative assistants would like more opportunities to attend off-campus events specifically designed for them.

Staff say that "Weber State University has been an encouraging environment for non-exempt and exempt staff."

Previous examples of completed staff development have included:

Genevieve Bates, Administrative Specialist III

2014-15 Professional Development:

The Art of Negotiation & Consensus Building 09/15
StaMats Adult Students TALK Research Webinar 7/15
Student Development Theory 6/15
Paw Place E-Procurement Intro 6/15
Program of Study Dashboard 5/15
Gallup State of the American Manager: Analytics and Advice 5/15
Utah Women in Higher Education Network at DSU, Spring 2015
StaMats Top 10 Marketing Mistakes that Colleges Make 3/15
StaMats Maximizing the Return on your Institutions Website Investment
3/15
WSU Social Media Guidelines 3/15
The Latest Internet Safety Skills 3/15
Utah Women in Higher Education Network at UVU, Spring 2014
Institutional Research Dashboard
Pcard Travel Training
Pcard Reconciler Training
StaMats Webinar 2014 TeensTALK Report

Kim Webb, Administrative Specialist III

1. Preventing Workplace Violence
2. Nonviolent Crisis Intervention
3. Emotional Intelligence
4. Strength Quest
5. Connections: Practice for excellence, path to success
6. Four Commitments of a Winning Team – Mark Eaton
7. Balancing Mind, Body and Work
8. Art of Internal Customer Service
9. Life Must Be Lived as Play: Enjoy the Journey
10. Team Communication: Colour Blind
11. Disney Leadership Institute: LOYALTY
12. Start your Engines with the “Motor-vator”
13. Flying Cows, Floating Rocks and Creating a Totally Cool Customer
Service Culture
14. Character Code

Robin Scott, Administrative Secretary II

1. PAW Place E-Procurement
2. Jackson Carter (The Biggest Loser)
3. A Healthy Way To Start Your Day: Keys to a Healthy Breakfast
4. Healthy Lunches That Work!
5. Meditation
6. 2014 Civil Rights Update
7. Registrar's Workshop
8. Violence Prevention: PPM 3-67
9. Enhancing the Customer Experience: Each of Us Can Make a Difference!
10. Signature Customer Service

Adequacy of Administrative Support

As the department has grown in size and complexity over the last five years, and as increasing amounts of work are being pushed down to departments from various campus entities (bookstore, registrar, P-card, purchasing, assessment, travel, complying with various state and federal laws), at certain times of the year our support is fairly tight in the English Department. Fortunately our staff know their jobs well and are efficient in executing their tasks. Other institutions seem to have more Administrative Support for a department this size, and it does seem to me as chair that our staff work hard.

Perhaps this is also the place to make note that as currently structured, the position of English Department Chair comes with only a 50% reassigned time from teaching. The department is large and complex, yet the English Chair receives no more reassigned time than any other chair on campus, even though English is in many cases double, triple, or quadruple the size of other departments. The workload poses a challenge for any English Chair to maintain a research and scholarship agenda. The previous attempt at rectifying this issue was to create a position of Assistant Chair. This was previously unsuccessful, perhaps because so many aspects of the department are intertwined and another layer of administration did not help to streamline processes.

To assist in running the various programs within the department, Program Directors receive reassigned time (as do others in the department). Please see table below for details.

Release Time for Other Assigned Duties			
Position	Name	Fall Hours	Spring Hours
Department Chair	Hal Crimmel	9*	9*
Creative Writing Director	Siân Griffiths	3	6
Interim Composition Director	Sylvia Newman	6	3
Interim Associate Dean	Becky Jo Gesteland	6	6
Community Engaged Learning Series Coordinator	Becky Jo Gesteland	6	3
LTS	Sally Shigley	3	3
P&TW	Shelley Thomas	3 Fall or Spring	No Reassigned
Developmental English	Brooke Kelly	No Reassigned	No Reassigned
MA Director	Mali Subbiah	6	6
Weber: The Contemporary West	Michael Wutz	6	6
Honors Director	Judy Elsley	6	6
Department Advisor	John Schwiebert	3	3
Linguistics Minor	Mark LeTourneau	3	No Reassigned
Interim Assistant Composition Director	Jose Otero	3	3
Wasatch Writing Project	Christy Call	3	3
New Faculty Release	Christy Call	3	No Reassigned
Teacher Supervision	Gary Dohrer	3	3
Teacher Supervision	Jim Young	3	3
Total Hours		75	63

***2015-16 only.**

Adequacy of Facilities and Equipment

The English Department offices are in Elizabeth Hall, a modern, four-story building equipped with smart classrooms (internet-equipped computer, LCD projector, DVD, Document Reader, and Audio). Wireless internet is available across campus and in the building. Generally (see chart below for specific data) 75% of the department's classes take place in Elizabeth Hall on the Ogden Campus. The other 12% take place on WSU's Davis Campus, a 10-minute drive away or at WSU West Campus. 13% of the department's classes are online. The Davis campus consists of two modern buildings, with the newest completed in 2013. Currently there are no classroom shortages, but if university-wide enrollment projections are accurate, space will be at a premium in 10 years.

Spring 2015	Fall 2015
75% of classes were held in Ogden	75% of classes were held in Ogden
13% of classes were held in Davis	11% of classes were held in Davis
12% of classes were online	14% of classes were online

Adequacy of Library Resources

The Stewart Library services multiple WSU campuses. Print, electronic including databases, and audio-visual materials are provided in adequate titles. Hours of operation are extensive and met student and faculty needs. The library website (<http://library.weber.edu>) assists with meeting 24/7 needs. The library assigns a librarian to each college. The librarian has an annual budget to provide current resources for the college. Additionally, the librarian meets with classes when invited. The resources adequately meet the program, faculty, and student needs. When a resource is not in the library, the interlibrary loan process enables access to most materials. Compared to the print holdings at the University of Utah, the WSU Stewart Library has limited holdings. However, a well-managed interlibrary loan program and the proximity of the University of Utah, Utah State and Brigham Young University simplify student and faculty research.

Standard G - Relationships with External Communities

Description of Role in External Communities

National Undergraduate Literature Conference	Connects with various community entities in Ogden Area.
Ogden School Foundation	Supports Ogden public schools.
<i>Metaphor & Weber: The Contemporary West</i>	Journals that reach a wide audience at WSU, locally, statewide, nationally and internationally.
Weber School District	Teacher Education Program places student teachers and provides the Weber Writes Program.
Community Education and Concurrent Enrollment	Community education classes and English 1010 taught in public high schools.

Additionally, the English Department is well represented at the University level, with faculty members on Faculty Senate, serving on the University Rank and Tenure Review Committee, the Search Committee for the new Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities, previous chair of the Environmental Issues Committee, Director of the Honors Program, Head of the National Undergraduate Literature Conference, as well as service on other university committees, such as Research, Scholarship and Professional Growth, Curriculum, Environmental Issues, and so forth.

Summary of External Advisory Committee Minutes

The Department Chair plans to convene and pilot working with an external advisory group in spring 2016.

Currently, no external committee minutes are kept because there is no committee.

Standard H – Program Summary
 Results of Previous Program Reviews

As described in the 2011 Program Review:

Problem Identified	Action Taken	Progress
Issue 1: Assessment, specifically minimal evidence of assessment data and analysis.	Previous 5 Year Program Review: 2011	The department has been making progress on assessment, but no report was done in 2013-14. The 2014-15 report, however, shows significant improvement across the department. More work needs to be done in analysis of data.
	Year 1 Action Taken:	
	Year 2 Action Taken:	
	Year 3 Action Taken:	
	Year 4 Action taken:	
Issue 2: Department sees itself as a collection of programs rather than a cohesive unit.	Previous 5 Year Program Review: 2011	This became a significant problem in 2013-14. In fall 2015 a new committee system was put into place that cross-listed faculty members with various programs outside their own area of expertise. Goal was to increase cross-pollination and to avoid Balkanization of the department and its programs. Revisiting the mission statement and learning outcomes can also help.
	Year 1 Action Taken:	
	Year 2 Action Taken:	
	Year 3 Action Taken:	
	Year 4 Action taken:	
Problem Identified	Action Taken	Progress
Issue 3: Master of Arts in English (MENG) Program Issues.	Previous 5 Year Program Review: 2011	Issues identified were addressed in the last three years and culminated in a successful
	Year 1 Action Taken:	
	Year 2 Action Taken:	
	Year 3 Action Taken:	

	Year 4 Action taken:	BOR Program Review for MENG in 2014.
Issue 4: Support Staff is overloaded.	Previous 5 Year Program Review: 2011	
	Year 1 Action Taken:	As a response to the 2011 report, a ¾ staff position was authorized, but never hired. Better allocation of staff skills and more-web-based programs probably have addressed the issue.
	Year 2 Action Taken:	
	Year 3 Action Taken:	
	Year 4 Action taken:	

Problem Identified	Action Taken	Progress
Issue 5: Advisement is not required.	Previous 5 Year Program Review: 2011	
	Year 1 Action Taken:	Advisement is required but there is no enforcement mechanism. Better communication with students and a new full-time advisor we hope will address the issue. See discussion under “Standard D”.
	Year 2 Action Taken:	
	Year 3 Action Taken:	
	Year 4 Action taken:	
Issue 6: No prerequisite system of courses.	Previous 5 Year Program Review: 2011	
	Year 1 Action Taken:	Three years ago we added prerequisites for our 2000-level literature classes which caused enrollment to decline significantly. We are abolishing those prerequisites effective this academic year. In general, the department seems to be moving away from prerequisites, though with a new software scheduling system and a plan to schedule courses out one year in advance we may institute prereqs for 4000-level classes.
	Year 2 Action Taken:	
	Year 3 Action Taken:	
	Year 4 Action taken:	
	Year 5 Action taken:	

Action Plan for Ongoing Assessment Based on Current Self Study Findings

Action Plan for Evidence of Learning Related Findings

Problem Identified	Action to Be Taken
Issue 1: Identify thresholds of evidence of student learning, gather data/artifacts, report the results of that assessment, explain how those findings are interpreted, and describe the course of action to be taken based upon the interpretation.	Current 5 Year Program Review: 2014-15
	Year 1 Action to Be Taken: Have all Program Directors identify thresholds of evidence of student learning and gather data/artifacts.
	Year 2 Action to Be Taken: Report the results of that assessment, explain how those findings are interpreted, and describe the course of action to be taken based upon the interpretation.
	Year 3 Action to Be Taken: Repeat as described in Year 1 and 2.
	Year 4 Action to Be Taken: Repeat as described in Year 1 and 2.
Issue 2: Program Directors, under guidance of the Department Chair need to be accountable for executing the steps described in Issue 1.	Current 5 Year Program Review: 2014-15
	Year 1 Action to Be Taken: Communicate above expectations to Program Directors, discuss, and begin process.
	Year 2 Action to Be Taken: Chair needs to follow up with Program Directors to ensure milestones are being met and to refine process as needed.
	Year 3 Action to Be Taken: Repeat as described in Year 2.
	Year 4 Action to Be Taken: Repeat as described in Year 2.

Summary Information (as needed)

Action Plan for Staff, Administration, or Budgetary Findings

Problem Identified	Action to Be Taken
Issue 1: Need to schedule classes more than one semester in advance.	Current 5 Year Program Review: 2014-15
	Year 1 Action to Be Taken: Chair will, in consultation with Program Directors, determine class rotation schedule for fall, spring and summer. Chair will, in consultation with Administrative Assistant, begin using course scheduling software to streamline scheduling process.
	Year 2 Action to Be Taken: Refine process described in Year 1.
	Year 3 Action to Be Taken: Consider scheduling out 6 semesters in advance.
	Year 4 Action to Be Taken: Work toward Year 3 action goal.
Issue 2: Need to consider more release time for Composition Director. May need release time for newly established NULC committee chair. Same for Department Chair.	Current 5 Year Program Review: 2014-15
	Year 1 Action to Be Taken: Department Chair will consult with Dean's Office.
	Year 2 Action to Be Taken: Department Chair will consult with Dean's Office.
	Year 3 Action to Be Taken: Implement if possible.
	Year 4 Action to Be Taken: Implement if possible.
Problem Identified	Action to Be Taken
Issue 3: Professional Development: Departmental Travel Budget is less than \$11,000 for 30+ full-time faculty.	Current 5 Year Program Review: 2014-15
	Year 1 Action to Be Taken: Chair is working to see whether restructuring overload, evening, adjunct and online class assignments can save Instructional Wage monies that could be reallocated to travel and professional development opportunities.
	Year 2 Action to Be Taken: Reallocate cost savings, if possible.
	Year 3 Action to Be Taken:
	Year 4 Action to Be Taken: Work toward Year 3 action goal.
Issue 4: Department was over budget in previous academic years.	Current 5 Year Program Review: 2014-15
	Year 1 Action to Be Taken: Department Chair will work more closely with Dean's Office budget staff to identify areas for improvement.
	Year 2, 3, 4 Action to Be Taken: Ongoing.

Summary of Artifact Collection Procedure

Artifact	Learning Outcome Measured	When/How Collected?	Where Stored?
Composition (ENGL 1010 and 2010); Papers	Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)	Random Sample	Canvas
General Education CA Designation (ENGL 2250, 2260, 2270); Terminology	Gen Ed CA Learning Outcomes	Pre- and Post-Test	Chi Tester
General Education DV Designation (English 2200); Book Reports, Papers, Essays	Gen Ed DV Learning Outcomes	Various Points	Canvas
Creative Writing Portfolio	Various CW Learning Outcomes	Prior to Graduation	Need to Decide
Developmental English; Third Essay	DE Rubric in Appendix 4	End of Semester	Sandbox course in Canvas
Developmental English; Grammar Concepts Test	Grammar	Pre-and Post-Test	Need to Decide, but electronically in any case
English Teaching; Materials and Classroom Observations	English Teaching Learning Outcomes as Specified in Curriculum Map and English Education Block Course Outcomes in Appendix 5, Evaluation for Integrative Curriculum Unit in Appendix 6, and Student Teacher Observation and Evaluation Form in Appendix 7	Various points during semester	WSU Department of Education and Utah State Department of Education
General Education HU Designation; Unspecified Assignments	Gen Ed HU Learning Outcomes	End of Semester	Need to Decide, but electronically in any case

Linguistics; Unspecified artifacts	Linguistics Outcomes when determined	Not Sure	Need to Decide, but electronically in any case
Literary and Textual Studies; Papers	LTS Learning Outcomes as Specified in Curriculum Map	End of Semester	Need to Decide, but electronically in any case
Literary and Textual Studies; Gen Ed Test	Literary Terms	End of Semester	Chi Tester
Professional & Technical Writing; Portfolio	Writing, content management, editing	End of Semester	Electronic format (URLs)

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Student and Faculty Statistical Summary Data provided by Institutional Effectiveness.

English - Undergraduate	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Student Credit Hours Total ¹	42,944	38,218	36,546	35,946	34,745
Student FTE Total ²	1431.47	1273.93	1218.20	1198.20	1158.17
Student Majors ³	474	471	451	389	371
3020 - English/Creative Writing	128	135	137	134	138
3022 - English	177	184	159	126	110
3023 - English Teaching	147	134	120	100	94
3024 - Prof/Tech Writing	22	18	33	27	28
3067 - Tech Writing Certificate	0	0	2	2	1
Program Graduates ⁴	80	87	80	83	72
3020 - English/Creative Writing	15	14	17	21	17
3022 - English	43	40	31	36	32
3023 - English Teaching	21	19	18	12	12
3024 - Prof/Tech Writing	1	10	4	6	6
3067 - Tech Writing Certificate	0	0	10	8	5
Student Demographic Profile ⁵					
Female	317	315	298	253	252
Male	156	156	153	136	119
Faculty FTE Total ⁶	57.21	63.87	64.76	63.62	n/a
Adjunct FTE	28.08	32.08	32.93	32	n/a
Contract FTE	29.13	31.79	31.83	31.62	n/a
Student/Faculty Ratio ⁷	25.02	19.95	18.81	18.83	n/a
Dual majors; ENGL not 1st	12	8	15	13	9

Appendix B: Contract/Adjunct Faculty Profile

(To preserve privacy we are not listing ethnicity).

Name	Gender	Highest Degree	Years of Teaching	Areas of Expertise
A Luper	F	MA	9	Composition
Adam Webster	M	MA	1	Composition
Allison Copier	F	MA	4	Composition
Angela Choberka	F	MA	5+	Composition
Angela Kelson-Packer	F	MA	2	Composition
Ashley Szanter	F	MA	2	Composition
Becky Marchant	F	MA	10	Composition, Development English, TW
Benjamin Johnson	M	BA	1	Composition, Secondary Education
Brad Roghaar	M	MA	32	Composition, Poetry, Literature
Brad Wojciechowski	M	MA	8	Composition
Brigitte Smith	F	MA	15	Composition
Brittney Hicken	F	MED	1	Composition
Brooke Kelly	F	MA	12	Composition, Development English, TW
Bryson Newhart	M	MFA	7	Composition, Creative Writing
Buck Kolz	M	MA	4	Composition, Developmental English, ESL
Byron Borup	M	MA	31	Composition
Carl Porter	M	MA	23	Composition, Literature
Carolyn Olsen	F	MA	3	Composition
Chelsea Adams	F	BA	1	Composition
Cheyney Wheelwright	F	BA	7	Composition
Chris Carter	M	MA	1	Composition
Christy Techmeyer	F	MA	4	Composition
Claire Hughes	F	MA	9	Composition & Learning Theory, Development
Crystal Nelson	F	MA	14	Composition, Literature
Darron Coray	M	MA	8	Composition
David Rummel	M	MA	2	Composition
Debbie Hansen	F	MA	1	Composition
Debi Sheridan (Sirideain)	F	MA	16	Composition, Developmental English, Literature
Deborah Davis	F	MA	8	Composition
Donald Carper	M	MA	15	Composition
Eleanor Olson	F	MA	15	Composition, Teacher Education
Elizabeth Gillis	F	BA	1	Composition

Name	Gender	Highest Degree	Years of Teaching	Areas of Expertise
Elizabeth Jones	F	BA	1	Composition
Elizabeth Robison	F	BA	1	Composition
Emily Whitby	F	MA	6	Composition
Eric Howerton	M	PhD	10	Composition, Literature, Creative Writing
Gail Yngve	F	MA	22	Composition, Literature, Creative Writing
Hillary Finder	F	MA	8	Composition
Holly Hirst	F	MA	9	Composition
Jan Hamer	F	MA	12	Composition, Literature, Creative Writing
Jessica Richards	F	MA	1	Composition
Jim James	M	MA	21	Composition
Joan Triplett	F	MA	21	Composition
John Beal	M	MA	18	Composition
Jolynn Drott	F	MA	??	Composition
Jonathan Evans	M	MA	3	Composition
Jose Otero	M	MA	2.5	Composition, Literature
Kamri Goff	F	MA	9	Composition
Kaydee Summers	F	MA	13	Composition
Kimberly Strickland	F	MA	3	Composition
Kristin Friederichs Champi	F	MA	5	Composition
Kyra Hudson	F	MA	25	Composition, Literature
Laura Long	F	MA	4	Composition
Laura Stott	F	MFA	11	Composition, Literature, Creative Writing
Lauren Nall	F	MA	2	Composition
Lesli Unrein	F	MA	2	Composition
Les Wade	M	MA	25	Composition
Linda Tobias	F	MA	4	Composition
Logan Mickel	M	MA	2	Composition
Lynda Guiver	F	MA	1	Composition
Maria Georgiou	F	BA	1	Composition
Marilee Mason	F	MA	8	Composition
Marilyn Diamond	F	MA	9	Composition
Matthew Winters	M	MA	3	Composition
Melody Navarro	F	MA	1	Composition
Merci Rossmango	F	MA	1	Composition
Michael Handy	M	MA	??	Composition
Michael Hatch	M	MA	1	Composition
Michael Wojciechowski	M	MA	4	Composition

Name	Gender	Highest Degree	Years of Teaching	Areas of Expertise
Mike Wason	M	MA	1	Composition
Moana Patterson	F	MA	??	Composition
Natalie Leavitt	F	MA	6	Composition
Nathalie Aghoro	F	MA	5	Literature
Nathanael Myers	M	MA	15	Composition
Nicole Butler	F	MA	3	Composition
Nicole Thompson	F	BA	1	Composition
Patricia Thorpe	F	MA	8	Composition
Prasanna Reddy	F	MA	39	Composition
Rachel Bryson	F	MA	1	Composition
Robert Macdonald	M	MA	4	Composition
Rodney Marchant	M	MA	11	Composition
Ryan Evans	M	MA	3	Composition
Sara Layton	F	MA	4	Composition
Sarah Vause	F	MA	10	Composition, Literature
Scott Forman	M	MFA	14	Composition
Shaun Conner	M	MA	3	Composition
Stacie Egan	F	MA	14	Composition
Stacie Nye	F	MA	2	Composition
Steven Ludlow	M	MA	5	Composition
Steven Shurtleff	M	MA	6	Composition
Sunni Wilkinson	F	MFA	10	Composition
Susan Houtz	F	MA	23	Composition
Sylvia Newman	F	MA	21	Composition, Literature
Todd Schwartz	M	MA	4	Composition
Toni Asay	F	MA	11	Composition, Developmental English
Tonia Wilson	F	MA	1	Composition
Tyler Barnum	M	MA	3	Composition
Tyler Chadwick	M	MA	1	Composition
Walter Prothero	M	MA	38	Composition, Literature, Creative Writing
Wanda Heaton	F	MA	2	Composition
William Pollett	M	MA	13	Composition, Literature, Creative Writing

Appendix C: Staff Profile

(To preserve privacy we are not listing ethnicity).

Name	Gender	Job Title	Years of Employment	Areas of Expertise
Genevieve Bates	F	Administrative Specialist III	30	Business, Marketing, Education, Data Management
Robin Scott	F	Administrative Secretary II	11	Computer, typing, registration, student records
Kimberly Webb	F	Administrative Specialist III	35	Scheduling, Customer Service, Office Management
Elizabeth Ruttenbur	F	Work Study	2	Media, Research, Writing, Clerical Work

Summary Information (as needed)

Appendix D: Financial Analysis Summary

Department of English

English Undergrad					
Funding	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15
Appropriated Fund	2,579,033	2,556,331	2,835,750	2,717,154	2,644,200
Other:					
Special Legislative Appropriation					
Grants or Contracts	30,641	41,735	11,951	13,251	29,764
Special Fees/Differential Tuition	9,386	4,691	24,828	18,628	5,826
Total	2,619,060	2,602,757	2,872,529	2,749,033	2,679,790

Note: Data provided by Provost's Office

Appendix E: External Community Involvement Names and Organizations

Name	Organization
National Undergraduate Literature Conference	Connects with various community entities in Ogden Area.
Ogden School Foundation	Supports Ogden public schools.
<i>Metaphor & Weber: The Contemporary West</i>	Journals that reach a wide audience at WSU, locally, statewide, nationally and internationally.
Weber School District	Teacher Education Program places student teachers and provides the Weber Writes Program.
Community Education and Concurrent Enrollment	Community education classes and English 1010 taught in public high schools.

Appendix F: Site Visit Team

Name	Affiliation
Dr. Nancy Ciccione	University of Denver
Dr. Richard Harp	University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Dr. Tom Mathews	Weber State University
Dr. Doris Geide-Stevenson	Weber State University

Appendix G: Evidence of Learning Courses within the Major or General Education

-- In sum, the department needs to do a better job of providing Evidence of Learning. We have significantly improved our collection and storage of artifacts, but need to specifically identify:

1. Thresholds of evidence of student learning,
2. Report the results of that assessment,
3. Explain how those findings are interpreted, and
4. Describe the course of action to be taken based upon the interpretation.

--Most of the Department's programs are doing a solid job of assessment; naturally there is room for improvement. Literary and Textual Studies will need to quickly bring its assessment efforts up to speed. The LTS Director position is only in its second year, (other programs have had program directors in place for many years) and having this position should allow us to tackle some of the remaining issues in this area of the Department's portfolio of programs.

--The last assessment report was submitted 11/15/2013. The current report provided here represents a significant improvement over the assessment efforts reported in 2013, when there was no assessment plan report from Creative Writing, Developmental English, Linguistics, Literary and Textual Studies, Professional and Technical Writing, or Teacher Education.