Program Title: English Major/Minor (BA, BS, BSE)    Review Date: 1996-2002

I. Academic Assessment

A. Highlights/Initiatives

1. Overview the current curriculum, including options available within the program (e.g., discussion of the different emphases).

The Languages and Literatures Department currently offers a Major and Minor with four possible emphases: English Literature, English Writing, English Education, and English Writing Education. A minor is also offered in Teaching English as a Second Language K-12 as well as Teaching English as a Second Language for Adults.

2. Highlight any new academic assessment initiatives you anticipate for the upcoming review period.

Although the area of assessment needs to be discussed and acted upon by the entire department, I anticipate adding to our current assessment procedures. The department currently utilizes several types of assessment (see I.B. below) but lost an important component of its assessment package with the demise, several years ago, of the Senior Seminar, a course that used portfolios to assess program and student performance. I hope that we will return to this portfolio system. The benefit is that it is a fair and accurate measurement of what we teach; the drawback is that it is tremendously labor intensive.

(Attach the program’s APR(s) as Appendix A.)

(Since APRs are no longer in use, I have attached the departmental Check Sheets, which provide the same information)

B. Educational Objectives and Assessment Techniques

1. State the subject matter, cognitive development, and skill objectives for the program, indicating what students will know and be able to do upon completion of the program.

Students with a degree in English should have competence in the following areas (the sequence of these areas is not meant to suggest their relative merit):

1. Understanding the structure of the English language.
2. Understanding of the various literary periods, and the interplay between culture and literature.
3. Interpretation of specific pieces of literature, from a wide range of genres and historical periods.
4. Appreciation and Understanding of cultural diversity and the ethical, aesthetic and humanistic values expressed in literature.
5. Critical thinking.
6. Ability to conduct independent research.
7. Proficiency in writing.

The level of skill in these seven areas will vary depending on the student’s chosen emphasis. There will be higher expectations for English Literature Majors to excel in the literary categories, just as there will be higher expectations for the Writing Emphasis Majors to excel in writing. However, a certain level of expertise is expected of all majors in all seven categories.

There are also often-unexpressed, intangible goals that are extraordinarily difficult to assess, but which are at the very heart of any humanistic education. All of the above seven areas of
competence are informed by the broader desire to educate students to be intelligent, responsible citizens, who have an appreciation for beauty and truth.

2. **Describe the data collection techniques used to determine if the program has been successful in achieving the desired outcome for each objective above.**

In spring 2001, 333 English Majors and Minors from all of the degree programs completed an assessment survey. The survey covered a range of issues: quality of instruction, content of courses, course offerings, advising, responsiveness of faculty, student knowledge of literature, writing skills, grammar knowledge, critical thinking, and faculty contribution to cultural climate. The outcomes in all of these areas were very positive (see attached bar graphs, Appendix G).

There was also an alumni survey conducted in 1997, which was largely qualitative. The results of this survey were also very positive and were useful in providing guidance and ideas for the curriculum revisions that followed (for the format of this survey, see Appendix G).

Although the results of the alumni and the 2001 assessments were gratifying, the limitations of this kind of assessment instrument are apparent. Both assessments show a plethora of student satisfaction, but the results are entirely based on self-assessment. It provides only a gestalt of student competency in the seven areas listed above (I.B.1).

A more objective assessment instrument was used to compare the writing skills of freshmen English 101 students and junior/senior World of Ideas students (see attached Memo on Results from the Spring 2002 Writing Assessment). Using a portfolio system of evaluation, the evaluating team (Mike Longrie, Mark Lencho, and Emily Hipchen) found a definite improvement in writing skills from the freshman to junior and senior levels. This survey, however, is only tangentially an assessment of the English programs, since any number of other courses or other factors could have led to the improvement in writing. In terms of the seven expressed assessment areas, the study is also limited, only being relevant to areas 4-7.

As stated in I.A.2., one reason for the current deficiencies in our assessment plan is the cancellation of the Senior Seminar course, which was to be the capstone course for the major. With the absence of this course, some other assessment device (preferably, in my view, a portfolio system) should be implemented. It should be added that the writing emphasis has maintained its capstone course, Advanced Writers’ Studio, and continues to use portfolio assessment in that course.

3. **Explain how individual courses are related to the student outcomes that are part of the program’s assessment plan.**

In a general sense, most of the courses offered for the major would have some relevance to all of the areas of assessment. Some, though, are more pointedly relevant. For example, English 281 (Introduction to Language) is most germane to assessment area 1. Similarly, the survey, period, and individual author courses would be most germane to area 2, 3, and 4. The ability to conduct research (area 6) is part of all upper-division courses, but research methodology is specifically taught in English 271 (Critical Writing in the Field of English).

All of the courses offered in the major teach writing and critical thinking (5 and 7) in varying proportions.

1. **List any dual-level courses and indicate how course content, pedagogical processes, assignments, etc. create different educational experiences for graduate and undergraduate students.**
Although the department no longer offers a graduate degree of its own, there are 35 courses that are dual-level undergraduate/graduate course (see Appendix B for a list of these courses). The graduate enrollment is small, but offers elective opportunities for students in other graduate degree programs.

Because the number of graduate students is slight, the different expectations for the graduate students are left to the individual instructor, often with consultation with the student. Typically graduate students would be expected to devise a more ambitious research project, one that might also include a presentation to the class.

C. **Assessment Data**

1. **Summarize the assessment data gathered during the review period.** If it is helpful to include data from previous years for comparison purposes, then please do so. (Use tables where necessary.)

   See I. B. as well as the appended material on assessment (Appendix G).

D. **Program Improvement Resulting from Assessment Efforts**

1. **Highlight some of the important changes to the curriculum, the assessment objectives, and/or the data collection techniques/processes that have occurred during the review period.** Make sure to link the changes to the data collected during the review period.

   In 1999 the department underwent extensive curriculum changes that were partially driven by student and alumni responses (and partially driven by the faculties’ own analysis of the curriculum).

   Some of the most salient changes have been the introduction of a Senior Seminar (which, as stated above, is now defunct); the introduction of a critical writing course, which is required at the outset of the major; the introduction of an individual authors course; an increased emphasis on global and multicultural literature (this has become one of the required categories in the Major); an increase in American and World Literature and a diminution of the English offerings; an increase in the number of literature courses that writing students are required to take in order to make writing a more distinct emphasis; and the inclusion of more traditional grammar in the Composition for Teachers course.

   Of these changes the ones most purely driven by student assessment were the increased emphasis on American and World literature, the increased emphasis on global/multicultural literature, the increased writing course requirement for writing emphasis students, and the increase in traditional grammar.

2. **Indicate how the program has responded to recommendations relevant to assessment from the most recent Audit and Review Evaluation Report.**

   Some of the assessment goals in the previous Audit and Review have been discarded, such as the objective literary test that caused too many pedagogical and logistical problems. Likewise the call for refinement of portfolio assessment has been derailed because of the demise of the Senior Seminar. Although the department has not conducted exit interviews, as suggested in one of the goals, the 2001 survey captured some of the same information in a different form.

   (Attach Audit and Review Evaluation Report from last review as Appendix C.)
E. Information Shared with Constituencies

1. Discuss how the assessment information has been shared with important constituencies, including students, staff, advisory boards, etc. In particular, indicate systematic efforts—e.g., regularly scheduled orientation meetings, departmental newsletters, etc. Assessment reports are given at department meetings. They were also discussed by many faculty in the numerous curricular meetings that led to the revamping of the department’s curriculum. Assessment has been discussed in at least one of the department’s annual August retreats.

II. Strategic Purposes and Performance

A. Centrality

1. Describe the centrality of the program to the mission and strategic plan of the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater.

Mission
The English curriculum is traditionally part of the liberal arts curriculum, which appears as Item C of “The Core Mission of the University Cluster Institutions”:

With the approved differentiation stated in their select missions, each university in the Cluster shall: “Offer a core of liberal studies that supports university degrees in the arts, letters, and sciences, as well as specialized professional/technical degrees at the associate level.”

Strategic Plan
There are a number of items in the strategic university plan that pertains to the English program. The following four seem especially important.

Priority 1, Goal 1.2: High levels of support early in the student’s academic career that enhance success and increases retention.
The bulk of the course load for all English faculty consists of freshmen courses, either remedial (090), or Freshman English (English 101, or English 102). These courses teach skills that are critical for the academic survival of the students. Beyond that, the freshmen courses also provide a sense of community for new, uprooted students. These are courses where the teacher knows your name.

Priority 1, Goal 1.4: Graduates who are broadly-educated, life-long learners.
Although the department teaches practical skills, such as writing and reading, its first priority is a liberal education, an education based on curiosity and a love of learning as well as critical thinking.

Priority 2, Goal 2.1: Academic programs that are intellectually challenging, current and dynamic.
Most English courses are discussion-based and are intentionally challenging, both in the readings and in the writing assignments.

Priority 4: UW-Whitewater will foster a sense of community, a respect for diversity, and an appreciation of global perspectives.
Most of the freshmen English courses contain culturally diverse readings, and the course offerings for majors have become increasingly global. (Note the curricular changes mentioned in I.D.1.) The World of Ideas, a junior/senior core course
2. **Explain the relationship of the program to other programs at the University.**

Since every academic discipline depends on critical thinking and good writing, the English program is related in a fundamental way to all of the other programs in the University. In fact, I cannot imagine a program that is more integral to the university by virtue of its basic academic training of students.

Besides the freshmen courses, there are two advanced writing classes, Advanced Composition (370) and Technical Writing (372) that are required by a variety of different majors.

B. **Goals and Objectives**

1. Describe the current (non-assessment) goals and objectives of the program, plus any stated mission for the program itself.

**Departmental Goals**

**PRIORITY I: PROGRAMS AND CURRICULUM**

1. Discuss and augment our current method of assessment, with particular attention to the possibility of using portfolio assessment.

2. Revise the check-sheets and course rotation.

3. Check into the possibility of offering a writing certificate in technical writing.

4. Discuss possible curricular modifications of English 101 and English 102.

5. Discuss the function/content of the Critical Writing class.

6. Expand the internship program.

7. Continue to upgrade the writing labs.

8. Encourage more student exchanges.

**PRIORITY II: QUALITY OF TEACHING**

1. Continue yearly retreats that focus on pedagogical issues.

2. Encourage undergraduate research.

3. Continue to develop the Superior Writing Awards program.

4. Continue to support travel for professional activity.

5. Encourage the search for more outside funding.
6. Continue in-house training about technology.

7. Find ways to free faculty, especially tenure-track faculty, for research.

8. Continue examination of merit/retention/post-tenure review procedures.

9. Maintaining workable class-size limits in all courses, but especially the freshman English courses.

**PRIORITY III: LEARNING COMMUNITY**

1. Work for more collaboration between English and Foreign Languages.

2. Create more of a learning community within the English Major.

3. Continuing support of informal departmental research forums.

4. Continue to foster a departmental spirit of congeniality and democratic decision-making.

2. **Summarize the progress in fulfilling any stated goals and objectives for the program beyond the assessment program. Explain failure to fulfill specific goals and objectives.**

   See the third and next-to-last pages of the previous Audit and Review (Appendix C) for a list of stated departmental goals.

   Under Priority I (Programs and Curriculum), the department successfully met a number of ambitious goals, including the implementation of an English as Second Language Program, a World of Ideas range of courses, and a revision of the curriculum. We have also been successful at creating a foreign language lab and at upgrading the writing labs. Areas that still need work are the handbook for majors and a more rigorous assessment program. The department continues its efforts to expand the internship program, which is now up and running, as well as the exchange programs.

   Under Priority II (Quality Teaching), we have been successful in all of the items except item c1. Most of the faculty are still locked into the 4/4 teaching load. The one way around this has been to take a reduced load, an option several teachers take per semester. This, in effect, is teachers subsidizing their own research. This option is unacceptable. New ways of creating release time for research still need to be realized.

   Under Priority III (Learning Community), the department has been successful in all of the areas, with the possible exception of f2., integration between English and Foreign Languages. Since the original union of these two departments was imposed, it is not too surprising that the two departments have maintained their separate entities. The need for more collaboration and cooperation, though, is apparent, and is the main topic of the next Languages and Literatures retreat.

3. **Describe how the program contributes to meeting specific state and societal needs.**

   As stated above (I.B.1.) all of the seven areas of assessment are informed by the wider, less-readily-assessable goal of creating informed and responsible citizens. As thinkers from Plato to Alexis de Tocqueville have pointed out, democracies live and die according to the capacity for the general population to think and reason. In the most fundamental sense, this is why English programs (and, more generally, a Liberal education) exist.
Explain any changes in goals and objectives that have occurred since the previous audit and review, indicating how the program has responded to the recommendations listed in the previous audit and review report. Refer to the Appendix C as necessary.

See Appendix C for a complete list of the goals in the previous Audit and Review.

Under “Programs and Curriculum” the department has been highly successful in all but the assessment goal and the handbook for Majors. Since the last review period, the department now has a vibrant ESL program, an array of World of Ideas courses, a revamped curriculum, an expanded internship program, and a new foreign language lab (as well as upgraded labs in Heide 302 and McGraw) that will be available fall 2002.

Under “Quality of Teaching” we have been successful in all but C.1: Explore methods of scheduling for release time or blocks of time available for research activities. Of the remaining items that have been achieved, two should be highlighted. The department continues to have full-day August retreats, in which some time is always devoted to teaching. The department’s Superior Writing awards have become more prominent, with more types of awards (for example, there are now foreign language awards) as well as more lucrative awards.

Under “Learning Community” the department continues to make improvements. Because of the many English faculty who now teach World of Ideas, the Departments of Languages and Literatures and the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies have begun to work more closely together, from summer seminars for the World of Ideas (there have been four of these) to collaboration on hiring committees. The final item—seeking commonalities between foreign languages and English—continues to be a somewhat illusive goal. It will be one of the primary focuses of the 2002 summer retreat.

C. Trend Data

1. Respond to the following trend data for the program:

   a. Number of students enrolled each fall for each of the past five years. (Data provided from the University’s fact book.)
      The enrollment for majors have remained fairly constant over the years listed in the Fact Book, with a high of 214 (1996-97), a low of 192 (1997-98), and the most current (2000-01) being 205.

   b. Number of degrees granted each year for the past five years. (Data provided from the University’s fact book.)
      Over the years listed in the Fact Book 1997-2001 the degrees granted have been as follows, from earliest (1997) to most recent (2001): 47, 51, 35, 34, 38.

   c. Average number of total credits completed by those earning degrees for each year for each of the past five years if the program is an undergraduate major. (Data provided from the University’s fact book.) Undergraduate majors with a consistent pattern of students graduating with more than 120 credits should provide an explanation of the program elements that require credit accumulation in excess of that number.
      The credits to degree numbers have been as follows: 138 (1997), 136 (1998), 142 (1999), 142 (2000), and 160 (2001). The recent spike in these numbers is hard to fathom since there are no curricular requirements that would offer an explanation. Most of the spike comes from the education majors, who in 2001 took 171 credits for graduation in English Ed and 205 in English Writing Ed. I assume these numbers are
high because of late changes by students to the education program. Whatever the cause, these numbers are unacceptable and need further exploration.

d. Student placement information. (Data to be provided by the department/program.)
Only anecdotal information is available from the last (1997) extensive alumni survey, which suggests that graduates are finding employment in a variety of related fields.
(Attach trend data from the University’s Fact Book as Appendix D.)

D. Demand for Graduates

1. Identify career opportunities available for graduates of the program. Placement statistics to be considered may include:

   a. Acceptance into graduate programs and employment;
      Only anecdotal data are available; however, the 1997 qualitative alumni survey showed widespread employment in a variety of related fields. Placement in graduate school has been more sporadic, and again the record is anecdotal. We have placed several students in Wisconsin schools (Madison, Milwaukee, Marquette) and several out-of-state schools: Kentucky, New York at Stony Brook, Indiana, and Goucher.

   b. Employment projections by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and/or state agencies; and/or
      One of the main reasons for the development of the ESL program was the need for more ESL teachers. The over three million dollars in grants from the U.S. Department of Education earmarked for the UW-Whitewater program indicates the long-term need in this area.

   c. Other indicators of employment trends.
      Even in a tight job market, there is usually a demand for students who can write and think analytical and creatively. UW-Whitewater English majors have generally done well finding jobs because they are well trained in these skills.

E. Accreditation

1. Identify the role of program accreditation for employment of graduates or program continuation.
   The program is accredited by North Central Accreditation.

2. If accreditation is not required for graduates’ employment or program continuation, but provides a competitive edge for the program, provide a brief explanation of the advantages of holding this accreditation.
   Does not apply.
(Attach the most recent accreditation report as Appendix E if relevant.)

F. Location Advantage

1. Explain any advantage the program has due to the location of the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater and its access to opportunities and resources in the region.
   Because of Whitewater’s location, we draw from several metropolitan areas, notably Madison and Milwaukee. One benefit our department derives from this location is the variety of internships available in this area. From a cultural perspective, we do not take advantage of this central location nearly enough. We should, for example, pick up a number of high-profile lecturers who are speaking at or are from Madison, Milwaukee, and Chicago.
G. Comparative Advantage

1. Identify any unique features that set the program apart from other competing programs and/or elements that contribute to the program having a competitive edge. Factors to discuss may include:

   a. The program’s content or special emphases;
   The program is primarily provides service courses for the university. Virtually all Freshmen take two semesters of English. All juniors and seniors take the core course, World of Ideas, which is staffed over 50% by English.

   Beyond these service requirements, the department offers quality programs in literature, writing, and education. An indication of this quality was the UW-System’s Regent’s award for best department that was awarded to the Department of languages and Literatures in 1999.

   b. Its focus on a specific population;
   The majority of our students are freshmen and juniors/seniors because of reasons given in point a.

   c. The expertise of the faculty and staff in specific areas;
   For a summary of faculty expertise, see Appendix F.

   d. The availability of practicum or internship experiences; and/or
   An internship program is available for English and Writing Emphasis students.

   e. The lack of duplication of the program at other institutions in the University of Wisconsin System.
   The service aspects of our department are no doubt duplicated in a general sense throughout the System. If we are unique, it is in the quality of our programs.

   One area of the program, though, that is relatively unique is the Writing Emphasis Program. We are one of the few campuses in the Wisconsin System to offer this program, which now enjoys strong enrollments (71 students in 2001-01) and a faculty that is blessed with a number of published authors.

I. Community Impact

1. Discuss the impact that the program has on the community and/or region. Factors to discuss may include:

   a. The involvement of students and/or faculty in the region;
   Several programs directly affect the southern region of Wisconsin.
   1. The $1.2 million grant followed by a second and third million-dollar grants from the U.S. Department of Education will affect ESL programs in southern Wisconsin for years to come. (For more on this, see III.D.1.)
   2. The annual High School Writing Festival attracts 500-700 students per year from southern Wisconsin and Northern Illinois.

   b. The utilization of the program by consumers (i.e., performances and/or services); and/or
   The departmental internship program run by Alison Townsend has sent out a number of interns each semester to work for various companies in the area. (Last year there
were 4 interns each for fall and spring semester; other years the numbers have been slightly higher.

c. Support by regional constituencies.

G. Strategic Planning

1. Discuss potential revisions to the curriculum (e.g., the development of new academic emphases, new courses, etc.) that you foresee over the next review period in view of projected trends in employment and the development of new technologies, etc. We recently revised the curriculum. There may be fine-tuning in the next few years, but no major changes are expected. One possible exception to this would be if the newly emerging environmental emphasis gains momentum and could use an environmental literary critic in the program.

III. Resource Availability and Development

A. Faculty and Staff Characteristics

1. Discuss the characteristics of the faculty and staff responsible for the program. Factors to be discussed include levels of professional preparation; appropriateness of expertise to the needs of the program; unit cohesiveness in enhancing program quality; and success in meeting affirmative action goals.

   Nearly all faculty members have terminal degrees. The department is roughly 50% male and 50% female. There are few minorities: one African-American and two Asians. This could be improved. At the same time it should be noted that the department has lost several minorities to schools with better salaries and lighter course-load.

   The department prides itself in working collegially and democratically.

2. Indicate the courses in the curriculum for which each faculty and staff member is responsible.

   The majority of each faculty’s course-load is expended in teaching Freshman English. Typically faculty will teach 2, 3, or even 4 Freshman English sections per semester. The remaining upper-level English courses, which are taught on a rotating basis, are generally assigned from the following lists of faculty. Although there are many courses listed below, it should be emphasized that the vast majority of the faculty teach on average three freshmen courses per semester, with only about one upper-division course. A number of the courses listed below are on long rotations, up to two years.

   O90, 101, 102 Available for all faculty
   161, 162 English for International Students
      Huss-Lederman, Lackey, Brellenthin, Diamond
   200, 201 Chicano Literature
      De Onis
   206, 216 British Literature Survey I and II
      Levy-Navarro, Keely, Kim, Hogan B., Carlberg
   226, 236 American Literature Survey I and II
      Savage, Longrie, Lueck, Guo, Miller
   251 Classical Myth and Legend
      Hogan B., Levy-Navarro
   252 Bible as Literature
      Collins
   263 Contemporary Novel
Pinkerton, Miller
264 Women in Literature
   Musher, Hogan, B., Townsend, Thornton
265 Multicultural Literature
   Moore, Kim, Thomson, Townsend
271 Critical Writing
   Longrie, Smith
274 Creative Writing
   Musher, Shoemaker, Clinton, Annucci, Moran, Miller E, Davidson-Zielske
281 Introduction to Language Study
   Erdmann, Lencho
300 Special Topics
   Available yearly by selection of individual proposals
310 Literature for Adolescents
   Durham, Annucci, Pinkerton
315 Development of the English Novel
   Hogan B.
321 Ancient Western Literature
   Hogan B
322 Modern Western Literature
   Longrie
323 Asian Literatures
   Guo
324 Postcolonial Literatures
   Miller J.
341 American Renaissance
   Savage, Lueck
342 American Realism and Naturalism
   Longrie
345 African-American Literature
   Moore, Miller J.
346 Survey of Modern Drama
   Diamond
347 British Modernism
   Pinkerton
348 American Modernism
   Longrie
353 Modern Poetry
   Clinton
360 Postwar British Literature
   Miller J.
363 Postmodern American Literature
   Miller J.
368 American Minority Women Writers
   Moore
369 Multicultural Drama
   Diamond
370 Advanced Composition
   Miller E, Thomson
372 Technical Writing
   Carlberg
373 Poetry Writing
   Clinton, Musher, Ritterbusch
375 Fiction Writing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Instructor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Screenwriting</td>
<td>Davidson-Zielske</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Playwriting</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>Prose Stylistics</td>
<td>Schuetz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>Rhetoric for Writers</td>
<td>Erdmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>History of the Language</td>
<td>Erdmann, Lencho, Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>Modern Grammatical Theory</td>
<td>Lencho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>Topics in Linguistics</td>
<td>Lencho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Medieval British Literature</td>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Sixteenth Century Literature</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>and 405 Shakespeare</td>
<td>Smith, Kim, Hogan J. Keelty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>17th Century Literature</td>
<td>Levy-Navarro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>18th Century Literature</td>
<td>Kim, Keelty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Age of Romanticism</td>
<td>Hogan J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>Victorian and Edwardian Literature</td>
<td>Pinkerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>Major Authors</td>
<td>Available yearly by selection of individual proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>19th Century Women Writers</td>
<td>Hogan B., Musher, Thornton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>Twentieth Century Women Writers</td>
<td>Hogan B., Musher, Thornton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>Current Theories of Composition for Teachers</td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>The Current Writing Scene</td>
<td>Townsend, Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>Desktop Publishing</td>
<td>Hogan J., Carlberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>Creative Nonfiction</td>
<td>Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>Language and Literacy</td>
<td>Huss-lederman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>Advanced Writers’ Studio</td>
<td>Townsend, Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Writing Workshop</td>
<td>Townsend, Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>Internship in Writing</td>
<td>Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>Special Studies</td>
<td>Available yearly by selection of individual proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>Exchange Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decided on an individual basis

498 Independent Studies
Decided on an individual basis

3. **Identify anticipated staffing changes or areas of need, and the projected impact of these changes and needs on the program**

   The department has requested four tenure-track searches for the next year as replacements for retired faculty or for faculty who are now employed elsewhere: one generalist, one developmental writing expert, one fiction writer, and one specialist in multicultural literature.

   (Attach a table of faculty and staff as Appendix F.)

B. **Teaching and Learning Enhancement**

1. **Summarize faculty and staff activities in the areas of teaching and learning enhancement since the previous audit and review. Factors to discuss may include:**

   In 1999 the UW Regents Award for the Outstanding Teaching Department in the entire UW System went to the Department of Languages and Literatures. This award was a tribute to the major focus of the department: teaching. (See Appendix H)

Another indicator of the departments high level of teaching is the individual teaching honors that have been garnered over the last decade: six faculty have received the Dave Saunders Award for Excellence in Teaching in the Humanities; eight faculty have been UW System Teaching Fellows; several faculty have received academic staff teaching awards; Mary Emery received the first Everett Long Award for faculty contributing to General Education; one of our recently retired faculty, Jim Leaver, won the university Roseman teaching award in 2000.

   a. **Participation in on-campus and off-campus teaching enhancement activities;**

      The department faculty are at the forefront of on- and off-campus teaching enhancement activities. Several faculty (Jim Miller, Peter Blakemore, and, this year, Mike Longrie) have been campus Teacher Scholars. Mike Longrie also served as Mentor to a new faculty member for the 2001-2002 academic year.

      The department discusses teaching issues during their annual August retreat and also has periodic brown-bag sessions on teaching (“Tricks of our Trade”) throughout the year. Susan Huss-Lederman and Mark Lencho have been very active with the LEARN Center. Several faculty have taken advantage of summer two-week workshops on technology. There have also been four summer seminars for World of Ideas faculty that have been widely attended by World of Ideas instructors from Languages and Literatures.

      As for off-campus teaching, eight faculty have been Teaching Fellows. A number of faculty have also attended Faculty College, both at UW-Marinette and the Richland Center campus. One of the Teaching Fellows, George Savage, continues to help with the Fellows program, having led discussions during the Madison Summer Seminar on four different occasions.

   b. **Involvement in academic advising and efforts to maintain or improve advising performance;**

      Our department has selected a cadre of skilled advisors who see each major twice per year. Many of these advisors have attended summer advising workshops organized by Deb Heiber’s office or departmental advising workshops. Several faculty, Mike
Longrie, Bill Keelty, and Ed Erdmann, also have helped with undeclared advising. Starting this year, the department will have a Master Advisor, Mike Longrie, who will help with advising for the College but will also be an advising resource person for the department.

c. **Work with undergraduate students on research projects;**
   There are, semester to semester, a number of independent research projects that are done through independent studies courses. During this review period, Susan Huss-Lederman mentored a student project for NCUR in Idaho (1998); George Savage mentored a student for NCUR at the University of Kentucky (2001); Marjerie Rhine and Elena Levy-Navarro mentored students for last year’s NCUR at UW-Whitewater. (George Savage’s student, Erin Grueter, also published her NCUR paper in the peer-reviewed Whitewater publication of selected NCUR papers.) Mary Pinkerton, George Savage, Geneva Moore, and Regis Lecoanet read and vetted the manuscripts for the English proposals for the NCUR at Whitewater. Mary Pinkerton was a facilitator for one of the sessions.

d. **Initiatives in student-learning based outcomes;**

e. **New course development; and/or**
   Because of the recent curriculum change, there have been a number of new course since the last review period: American Literature II (236), Critical Writing (271), Asian Literatures (323), American Realism and Modernism (342), Major Authors (460), and Creative Nonfiction (479). To make room for these new courses, a number of courses, mainly in English literature, were removed from the curriculum.

f. **Involvement with interdisciplinary course development and/or delivery.**
   Many faculty would be interested in interdisciplinary and team-taught courses, but as of now one person must teach an overload in order for this to happen. Despite this obstacle, a special studies course was offered by Elena Levy-Navarro and George Savage in Utopias and Dystopias (spring 2001). Many faculty (14-15 sections per semester) teach World of Ideas, a course that is interdisciplinary.

There have also been experiments with linked courses in English 101, linking classes in English, History, and Psychology.

Several faculty in English also teach in Women’s Studies. One faculty member, Joan Schwarz, teaches a Business and Law class for the College of Business.

**C. Research and Other Scholarly/Creative Activities**

1. **Summarize the research and other scholarly/creative activities of the faculty and staff since the previous audit and review.** Delineate participation in professional meetings, exhibits, performances, presentations and publications as means of presenting original basic and applied research initiatives.
   A sense of the faculty research interests can be gathered by referring to Appendix F. Most faculty engage in some form of research. Some, especially the tenure-track and newly tenured faculty, are prolific scholars and creative writers.
   *(Include in the table of faculty and staff in Appendix F.)*

**D. External Funding**

1. **Summarize the efforts and successes of the program to generate funding through grants, contracts and/or gifts.** Indicate sources, requested dollar amounts, and current status of such requests.
(Include in the table of faculty and staff in Appendix F.)

The most prestigious (see Page One of the *New York Times*, August 5, 2002) and sizable grant that has been awarded during this audit and review period has been to Susan Huss-Lederman, who was a grant project coordinator involved in securing and administrating a 1.2 million dollar grant from the U.S. Department of Education. This grant helps to fund project SWEETT (Southern Wisconsin Excellence in Teaching through Teacher training), which endeavors to train future ESL teachers in this region. In a follow-up proposal (SWEETT II), the Department of Education awarded an additional 1 million dollars. There is yet a third, million-dollar grant from the Department of Education (SWEETT SOL), which Dr. Huss Ledermann helped to write in concert with colleagues from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction.

Dr. Huss-Lederman has also received a UW System’s grant for $15,877 to develop linking courses and a $6,250 Mellon grant to build participatory approaches to workplace ESL.

Lynn Shoemaker received a $20,000 NEA Fellowship in 1999.

Mary Emery and Alison Townsend ran a very successful visiting writer’s pilot program, with the help of seed money from the College of Letters and Sciences. During the 2001-2002 four nationally-recognized writers came to UW-Whitewater to read and discuss their work: Tim Seibles, Patricia Smith, and Frances Driscoll. Building on this successful program, Emery and Townsend applied for and recently received a $20,000 from the UW-System’s Undergraduate Teaching and Learning grant. This money will be used to attract multicultural writers of national stature.

Andrea Mushar was awarded $5,000 by Dane County Cultural Affairs to fund “Poetry Buzz,” which was heard on WORT.

A major private library collection was left to the department by Dr. Giles of Madison. The department, in turn, donated most of the 3,000-volume collection to the university library.

E. Professional and Public Service

1. **Summarize the professional and public service activities of the faculty and staff since the previous audit and review. Discuss such activities as:**

   a. **Service involvement in professional organizations at state, regional, national, or international levels;**
   
   Mary Pinkerton has been Co-Chair of the Women’s Caucus for the Midwestern Modern Language Association
   
   Becky Hogan has served as Delegate for the Life Writing Division to the Delegate Assembly of the Modern Language Association. Recently she was selected to be on the Executive Committee of the Life Writing Division of MLA.
   
   Bet Lueck is co-founder and first president of the Society for American travel Writing.

   b. **Editing or reviewing for professional publications within the discipline;**
   
   The department continues to be the home of *A/B*, which is the journal of record in the field of autobiographical studies. Joe and Becky Hogan continue to do the bulk of the editorial work, with help from Emily Hipchen, who is on leave for next year, as well as student interns.
   
   **Non-compensated consulting or intervention activities related to the discipline; and**
c. Roles and memberships in university, college and departmental committees.
Because of the size of the department (50 faculty), service within the department is highly regarded as well as very necessary. Despite this departmental burden of service, a number of faculty have distinguished themselves in college and university service. Ed Erdmann, for example, has done yeoman service as President of the Faculty Senate and as Faculty Representative at System. Other members of the department can be seen at virtually all levels of the college and university bureaucracy.

(Include in the table of faculty and staff in Appendix F.)

F. Resources for Students in the Program

1. Discuss the number of students in the program in relation to the resources available to the program. Factors which may be analyzed include:

   a. The number of students per faculty member; and
   
   SCH/FTE for fall 2001 was 262.57

   b. The amount budgeted to student help, capital, supplies/services, etc.
   
   $2,686  student help
   
   $1,636  capital
   
   $39,641 services/supplies

G. Facilities, Equipment, and Library Holdings
The department appreciates the new level-3 classrooms and looks forward to the addition of several more. The departmental lounge is also undergoing a much-needed facelift.

More generally, the facilities in Heide are not adequate. The climate control in the classrooms has been a literal health hazard, which faculty and students have been complaining about for at least two decades. Office space is likewise inadequate. The single occupancy offices are small, but many of the academic staff must double-up in these offices. This is especially difficult since so many of the faculty attempt to have frequent conferences with their students.

There are two possible solutions for these problems. First, a new system of ventilation/air-conditioning. Second, give the department a larger share of the fourth floor of Heide. If our department would be paired with its natural disciplinary counterpart, the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies (our departments share responsibility for teaching World of Ideas), there would be considerably more room, as well as more opportunities for professional collaboration.

Beyond these problems that need immediate attention, there are several long-term projects that should be considered: the department could use more leve-3 classrooms, a seminar room, and upgraded auditoriums in 100 and 101. These items may seem expensive but they would obviate the need for a new building.

The library holdings have been made stronger due to the department’s recent inheritance of 3,000 volumes from the Giles estate, most of which was re-donated to the library. More generally, we do a good job buying new scholarly books year by year, but do little to cover the major gaps in the holdings.
1. Discuss the adequacy of the facilities, equipment and library holdings available for the purposes of supporting a high quality program. Identify any deficiencies and describe plans to remedy them.

The Department of Languages and Literatures has recently (2001) been bequeathed a sizable private library from the estate of Dr. Giles. The department donated the vast majority of this valuable 6,000-volume collection. This will be used by the library to add to its current collection, especially in modern poetry, an aspect of the collection that is especially strong. The collection will also be used to replace volumes that have been lost or are in disrepair.

As for deficiencies, the current method of improving the collections relies to heavily on ordering recently published books. At some point, our department needs to take an inventory of the library holdings and determine the gaps.
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