

ENGLISH B. A. PROGRAM REVIEW PANEL REPORT

July 26, 2006

PROGRAM REVIEW PANEL

Chair and Program Coordinator:

Christine Persak

Department of Languages and Literature Faculty:

Douglas Haneline

Matt Nikkari

Jody Ollenquist

Tracy Webb

Individual with special interest in the Program:

Danielle Ryskamp

Faculty member outside of the College of Arts and Sciences:

Paul Kammerdiner

Department Head:

Reinhold Hill

CONTENTS

SECTION 1: PROGRAM OVERVIEW

A. Program Goals.....	1-1
B. Program Visibility	1-4
C. Program Relevance	1-5
D. Program Value	1-9

SECTION 2: PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM

A. Graduate Follow-up Survey.....	2-1
B. Employer Follow-up Survey	2-2
C. Graduate Exit Survey.....	2-2
D. Student Program Evaluation	2-3
E. Faculty Perceptions	2-3
F. Advisory Committee Perceptions	2-4

SECTION 3: PROGRAM PROFILE

A. Profile of Students	3-1
B. Enrollment	3-6
C. Program Capacity	3-6
D. Retention and Graduation	3-7
E. Access	3-7
F. Curriculum	3-9
G. Quality of Instruction	3-11
H. Composition and Quality of Faculty	3-13
I. Service to Non-Majors	3-17
J. Degree Program Cost and Productivity Data	3-20
K. Assessment and Evaluation	3-21
L. Administration Effectiveness	3-22

SECTION 4: FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

A. Instructional Environment	4-1
B. Computer Access and Availability	4-1
C. Other Instructional Technology	4-1
D. Library Resources	4-2

SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS

A. Relationship to FSU Mission	5-1
B. Program Visibility and Distinctiveness	5-1
C. Program Value	5-1
D. Enrollment	5-2
E. Characteristics, Quality, and Employability of Students	5-2
F. Quality of Curriculum and Instruction	5-2
G. Composition and Quality of the Faculty	5-3
H. Advisory Board	5-3
I. Resources	5-3

SECTION 6: APPENDICES

Faculty Qualifications (Accomplishments)	A
Graduate Survey/Exit Interview and Responses	B
Student Survey and Responses	C
Faculty Survey and Responses	D
Advisory Survey and Responses	E
Checksheet and Syllabi	F
Brochure/Recruitment	G
Institutional Research and Testing Data	H
Job Titles	I

ENGLISH B. A.
PROGRAM REVIEW PANEL REPORT

2006

SECTION 1: PROGRAM OVERVIEW

A. Program Goals..... 1-1
B. Program Visibility 1-4
C. Program Relevance 1-5
D. Program Value 1-9

SECTION 1: PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Overview of the Program

According to its current mission statement, Ferris State University is to be a “national leader in providing opportunities for innovative teaching and learning in career-oriented, technological, and professional education.” The English B. A. program prepares students for a wide array of career opportunities and provides a solid foundation for continuing study in English and various fields such as law, publishing, public relations, and public administration.

On a practical level, graduates of the program exhibit strengths in the ability to communicate, particularly in writing. They show a concern for clarity and grammatical accuracy in their writing and have gained experience in editing and revising as well as conducting research and documenting the use of sources. Thus the program’s emphasis on strong communication and analytical skills allows students to become flexible and prepared for the workplace.

Moreover, graduates in English exhibit creativity, the willingness to consider multiple interpretations of texts, and have engaged in critical thinking in order to evaluate competing interpretations. Through their wide reading, they have been introduced to other times and cultures, and they are aware that interpretations should consider changes in language over time and differences in cultural values. Also, their reading has broadened their understanding of human motivation and behavior.

The program is young—we are in our fourth year, but we have grown to an enrollment of thirty students. We have already graduated fifteen students at the present time. Currently, graduates of our program are enrolled in master’s and professional programs in law, library science, and English. Two of our graduates are doing their graduate studies in Michigan; one other will be attending Ohio State next fall.

A. PROGRAM GOALS

A. 1. Current learning outcomes of the program for its graduates

The Ferris English B. A. program is fairly typical of programs in English. The following goals have been established as learning outcomes:

- **Writing**
Students will demonstrate the ability to write expository essays that have focused theses, have adequate organization and development (drawing on both primary and secondary sources), use standard edited English, use proper methods for acknowledging and documenting sources, and honor the principle of academic honesty.

- **Literary Analysis**
Students will demonstrate the ability to identify and analyze/discuss literary elements (such as plot, characterization, setting, theme, metaphor,

personification, etc.) and literary forms (such as poetry, drama, short stories, novels, essays, etc.).

- **Cultural/Historical Contexts**
Students will demonstrate the ability to make connections between a literary work and its historical and cultural context (including periods such as Victorian, modern, etc. as well as movements such as romanticism, naturalism, etc.).
- **Critical Theory**
Students will demonstrate an understanding of critical approaches (formalist, feminist, Marxist, etc.) by applying critical theory to literary works.
- **Oral Presentation**
Students will be able to make clear and organized presentations of one paper/project in their senior portfolios, discussing the topic, the argument/thesis of the written paper, the evidence used to support it, and the research process.

A. 2. Manner in which the goals were established

Soon after the program was established, Dr. Roxanne Cullen, acting head of the Department, asked the program coordinator and members of an English B. A. *ad hoc* committee to determine learning outcomes and a means of assessment. The group researched and reviewed program outcomes established by English departments at other universities as well as a field test in literature from the Educational Testing Service. The committee also reviewed a survey taken by its own English literature faculty delineating learning outcomes for literature courses at different levels—100 through 400.

In 2003, the B. A. *ad hoc* Committee constructed the outcomes listed in A. 1 and decided to use, on a trial basis, a portfolio method of assessment. The committee decided to use the portfolio method and assess its effectiveness in not only requiring graduates to produce a portfolio of quality writing but also to present a paper and respond to questions from faculty. To date, thirteen graduates have submitted portfolios and made presentations (beginning Dec. 2004). While we will continue using this method of assessment, we feel further adjustments are likely to be made as to the content of the portfolio and requirements for presentations.

In addition to the formal portfolio review, the Committee decided to conduct senior exit interviews and graduate surveys. In the Fall semester of 2005, two seniors were interviewed; this winter, four seniors were interviewed. The interviews were conducted by Dr. Reinhold Hill, Interim Head of the department.

A. 3. How the goals prepare students for careers and meeting employer needs

The English B. A. prepares students for graduate study as well as career opportunities in fields such as law, government, education, advertising, public relations, and publishing.

In their courses, students develop a sensitivity to language and the nuances of words, enabling them to work in these fields. Students also sharpen their writing skills, learning to organize material and to adapt their writing to a particular readership. According to JobWeb's "Career Development and Job-Search Advice for New College Graduates," verbal and written communication skills ranked top in a list of twenty desirable qualities in new hires.

Furthermore, in studying literature, students develop an awareness of historical change and cultural difference which is especially needed in fields where policies and products are created in response to public needs.

A. 4. Changes in goals since the last program review

This is our first program review, so no changes to the goals have been made.

A. 5. Relevance of the program goals to the University's mission, and the departmental, college, and divisional strategic plans

In 2000, the College of Arts and Sciences proposed an array of more traditional liberal arts majors/programs to allow the University to more effectively recruit students state-wide, compete with neighboring institutions for talented students, enhance FSU's academic reputation, and better serve the geographic area by offering a wider range of degree options. The English B. A. was one of the programs proposed and established.

Even though the program does not have a single career outcome, it does contribute to the university's mission to provide an opportunity to students for career-oriented education. Some graduates will choose to continue their education to pursue careers as professors of English; others will (and have already) chosen to work toward graduate degrees in library science, law, and other fields. All current students express a desire to use their creativity and strong writing skills in their future careers; some students have expressed interest in particular fields where they would like to work such as non-profit organizations, advertising, the music industry, and digital game design.

The Department of Languages and Literature already offers strong programs in English Education and Technical and Professional Communication. The English B. A. program exists to channel students' abilities into careers other than teaching English in secondary schools or writing/editing in technical careers.

According to the Ferris Career Guide, 2005-2006, The College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) "is responsible for all of the course work, majors, minors, cultural programs, and enrichment activities which Ferris offers in the arts and sciences disciplines." The Department of Languages and Literature provides engagement activities for its majors, including the Literature in Person Reading Series, the *Prism* writing contest, the Shakespeare Birthday Celebration, The Dead Poets Society, The English Club, and Sigma Tau Delta, the national English honor society. Students in the English B. A. program benefit from our emphasis on engagement.

The University, Division, and College strategic plans are built on President Eisler's three pillars: creating a learning-centered university, becoming an engaged campus, and working together. The English B. A. invokes all of the University's pillars. We are clearly a learner-centered program: our classes are small, providing for ample interaction and discussion; we incorporate technology into our classrooms widely; and our students write extensively, challenging them to grapple with the material they are presented—analyzing and interpreting it.

Our engagement activities are outlined above. We provide a variety of co-curricular activities for our students, ranging from readings by professional authors to student-

centered clubs and activities. We also reach out to the larger campus community with our engagement efforts.

The English B. A. requires a minor as part of its program, which involves collaboration between departments and majors. A majority of courses in the English B. A. program also apply to the program in English Education, and there is strong collaboration between the School of Education and the Department of Languages and Literature in program development.

B. PROGRAM VISIBILITY AND DISTINCTIVENESS

B. 1. Distinctive features of the program

The English B. A. program is relatively new. It is built upon a strong foundation of liberal education with an emphasis on advanced literacy. Students in the English B. A. program read literature from a broad range of literary periods and from diverse perspectives.

Due to the steady growth of enrollment in the program, its visibility has steadily increased. Because of its practical, interdisciplinary nature, the English B. A. program can take advantage of all other Ferris programs and course offerings.

The most distinctive feature of our program is our emphasis on written communication. Most of the courses students are required to take as part of their curriculum carry writing-intensive designators. Students consistently write multiple drafts of several papers in each of the courses in the major. They wrestle with complex problems in language and literature through writing. The preponderance of writing intensive courses in our major is distinctive and provides the cornerstone for success for students completing our major.

Faculty in the program bring us much visibility locally, regionally, nationally and internationally. As descriptions of faculty work attest, program faculty are active in all facets of the discipline, which brings the program much attention in the state. (*See Appendix A*).

B. 2. The program's ability to attract quality students

Data provided by Institutional Research for Fall of 2002 show students who enrolled in the program had an average ACT score of 22. Data from 2001 to 2005 indicates that ACT scores ranged from 20 to 32. The current ACT minimum for admission to the College of Arts and Sciences is 18; the current ACT composite score for Fall 2006 incoming FSU freshmen is 20.9.

B. 3 Institutions that are the main competitors for prospective students in this program

The main competing institutions are Central Michigan University, Grand Valley State University, and Western Michigan University. Because these programs have existed much longer than the Ferris English B. A. program, we are now functioning as a competitor to them. Ferris students wishing to major in English who formerly left Ferris to attend these institutions are now remaining here, and our program also attracts students who previously would not have attended Ferris.

B. 3. a) Comparisons of the programs

The programs listed above are very similar to the FSU program in terms of their curricula and other requirements. One notable difference is that the range of available upper-level elective courses is more extensive at these other institutions. On the other hand, the FSU program is the only one among the group that designates all (or indeed any) of its core upper-level literature courses as writing intensive, which is of significant benefit to students planning to work in a variety of communications fields or to pursue graduate study. Our program also features courses taught exclusively by full-time tenure-track faculty with terminal degrees, in contrast to Western Michigan University, which employs graduate students to teach a number of its 200- and 300-level classes.

B. 3. b) Conclusions drawn from the comparisons that would help to improve the program at Ferris

Our program would be able to provide students with better preparation, particularly for graduate education, by offering a more extensive selection of advanced electives focusing on specific literary periods, individual authors, and special topics. Our curriculum currently includes several such elective seminars at the 400-level, and it will become more feasible to offer additional courses as the number of English B. A. students increases.

C. PROGRAM RELEVANCE

C. 1 Program relevance—labor market demand analysis

Unlike many degree programs at Ferris, the English B. A. program is not a vocational major that trains a student for one particular field. In general, an English degree “serves as a broad base for a range of careers, many of them quite lucrative.”¹ (*See Appendix I*). As stated in Section 1: A (Program Goals) of this document, learning outcomes for the English B. A. program include exemplary writing, oral communication, and critical thinking skills. These skills provide an excellent foundation for success in “a variety of fields, including writing, editing, publishing, teaching, public relations, technical writing, paralegal and legal, marketing, consulting, business, government, museums, libraries, . . . and more.”²

As many of the careers listed above require an advanced degree, the English B. A. program, furthermore, provides an excellent skill set for students with aspirations for a graduate-level education. In the case of the legal profession, for example, the *Occupational Outlook Handbook* makes it clear that “prospective lawyers should develop proficiency in writing and speaking, reading, researching, analyzing, and thinking logically—skills needed to succeed both in law school and in the profession.”³ Again, the development of these skills forms the core of learning outcomes for the English B. A. program.

¹ “An English Degree Can Translate Into Opportunity,” *The Washington Post*, June 19, 2005, <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe>> (accessed May 4, 2006).

² Shelley O’Hara, *What Can You Do with a Major in English?* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2005), 67-68.

³ Bureau of Labor Statistics, “Lawyers,” in *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2006-07 ed., <<http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos053.htm>> (accessed May 5, 2006).

In fact, communication skills (written and verbal) rank as the most desired quality employers are looking for in college graduate candidates according to JobWeb, a career development Web site operated by the National Association of Colleges and Employers.⁴ Research conducted by the National Commission on Writing also indicates that the strong emphasis that the English B. A. program places on analytical writing skills translates well into the writing needs of American business and government sectors, specifically. In a report released in September 2004, the Commission summarizes the results of a survey of human resource directors for 120 major American corporations. Among the findings:

- Writing is a “threshold skill” for both employment and promotion, particularly for salaried employees.
- Two-thirds of salaried employees in large American companies have some writing responsibility.
- Half of all companies take writing into account when making promotion decisions.
- More than 40% of responding firms offer or require training for salaried employees with writing deficiencies . . . remedying deficiencies in writing may cost American firms as much as \$3.1 billion annually.⁵

A follow-up report, detailing a survey of human resources offices of state governments, was released by the Commission in July 2005. Not only were the general results virtually identical to the survey of businesses but, in fact, “writing is considered an even more important job requirement for the states’ nearly 2.7 million employees than it is for private-sector employees.” Other findings include:

- More than two-thirds of professional state employees have some responsibility for writing as do 60% of clerical employees.
- More than 75% of respondents report taking writing into account in hiring and promoting state employees.
- More than two-thirds of responding officials say they routinely offer writing training for professional employees with deficient skills . . . the Commission estimates that providing writing training for those employees who do not meet state standards costs state agencies about \$221 million annually.⁶

It is also important to note that according to the 2006-2007 edition of the *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (OOH), many of the possible career paths for English majors enjoy healthy prospects for the coming decade. The OOH reports, for example, that employment opportunities will be quite good for salaried writers and editors in the publishing industry and that, owing to the projected rate of retirements, elementary and secondary teachers as well as librarians will enjoy good to excellent job opportunities.⁷

⁴ JobWeb, “What Employers Want,”

<http://www.jobweb.com/Resumes_Interviews/resume_guide/comp.htm> (accessed May 4, 2006).

⁵ National Commission on Writing, “Writing: A Ticket to Work . . . Or a Ticket Out: A Survey of Business Leaders,” CollegeBoard, <http://www.writingcommission.org/prod_downloads/writingcom/writing-ticket-to-work.pdf> (accessed May 4, 2006), 5-6.

⁶ National Commission on Writing, “Writing: A Powerful Message From State Government,” CollegeBoard, <http://www.writingcommission.org/prod_downloads/writingcom/powerful-message-from-state.pdf> (accessed May 4, 2006), 4-5, 7.

⁷ Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2006-07 ed., <<http://www.bls.gov/oco/home.htm>> (accessed May 5, 2006).

Overall, the learning outcomes of the English B. A. program correspond well with the demands of the current technology-driven economy. A graduate of English B. A. program will be well prepared for a number of available prospects, whether in the workplace or in graduate school.

C. 2. The program’s response to emerging issues in the discipline, changes in the labor force, changes in employer needs, changes in student needs, and other forces of change

In the last two decades, English programs have emphasized the importance of literary/critical theory; when our program was first developed, a new course—LITR 416—was designed to introduce our students to this subject. This rigorous course prepares our juniors and seniors not only for upper-level literature classes but also for graduate study in English, should they pursue it.

The field of English has been especially sensitive to multicultural education as any recent anthology of literature will attest. English majors are required to take three of four survey of literature courses; these courses introduce them to writings by Native Americans, African-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, post-colonial “third world” writers, gays and lesbians—voices formerly at the margins of society. Those in the program must also take a “genre” course, three of which have a “world” focus. Moreover, English majors may choose from a number of elective literature courses which currently satisfy general education credit in the “global consciousness” category. Through their reading, our students encounter diverse viewpoints and consider how these differ from their own.

Many of our students work part-time or are trying to complete their degrees as soon as they can. The department regularly offers a number of online courses in an attempt to accommodate the needs and schedules of our students. This summer, we are offering a total of five scheduled courses, one fully online. In addition, some professors have volunteered their time to do independent studies in order to help students meet graduation requirements: five are being conducted this summer.

Program faculty actively integrate relevant media into their classes. Most of our classrooms have computers and lcd projectors, which faculty use widely to access sites of interest on the Internet, to show short video clips, or to provide media-enhanced lectures. We are currently in the process of developing many of the courses in the English B. A. program for online delivery, which is certain to increase the use of media in our courses taught on campus as well.

Although our program is young and the number of our graduates small, we have already anticipated helping our current students plan for their futures. Last fall, we held a “Grad School Night” seminar to familiarize students with the career of teaching at the college level. The demands and opportunities of the field were presented along with practical information about the Graduate Record Exam and the process of job-hunting through listings posted by the Modern Language Association as well as the [Chronicle of Higher Education](#).

As our graduates go out into the world, we hope they will offer advice and testimonials to our current students by participating in future seminars discussing career prospects and graduate school. All four members of our Advisory Board have expressed a willingness to attend these yearly seminars and give individual presentations to our students.

C. 3. Why students come to FSU for the English B. A. program

C. 3. a) Student expectations and sentiment

Generally, students enter the program because they love to read and believe that reading and writing are their strengths. A number of them transfer from English education or other majors/fields (even technical ones) feeling that the English program will better meet both their personal needs and professional goals—though not all are sure what their professional goals may be as they enter the program.

Current students are positive about the program; over 75% of those who responded to our survey say they would still choose to attend Ferris, and 87% say they probably or definitely would choose to major in English if they started again. As previously stated, most of these students say they were attracted to the major because of their personal interest in the subject matter—they enjoy literature. More than half indicate that they feel a degree in English would be good preparation for graduate study or career preparation. Over 90% of students surveyed consider their literature/English courses to be of high quality and the faculty to be highly qualified. (*See Appendix C*).

However, current students express some disappointment with the location of some courses (such as the Automotive Center), and AV equipment that did not always function. One commented on the difficulty of accessing database resources while off-campus and felt some databases were confusing. One student was disappointed not to be in one of the newly renovated classrooms in Starr.

Exit interviews with our recent seniors indicate that they also are pleased with their decisions to become English majors. Most of our students do not enter Ferris as English students but transfer to the program because of their love of literature or their interest in writing. (*See Appendix B*).

Graduating students indicate that the program improves communication skills, particularly written communication skills, provides multiple perspectives on literature, and improves reading and research skills. Some students also indicate that the program has made them more open and accepting of others different from themselves.

The students who are graduating attribute much of their success in the program to solid advising and careful attention from program faculty. Students see the advantages of class sizes that allow close interaction with faculty and with their peers.

Many of the concerns raised by students in their exit interviews are addressed elsewhere in this report: students would like to see more upper-division, seminar-style courses, and they resent having courses cancelled for low enrollment, but the overall feeling from current exit interviews is that students are pleased with their choice of the English major. (*See Appendix B*).

All of the graduates who responded to our survey indicated that they would choose the same major again if given the chance. Their comments reflect their positive view of the program and indicate that its greatest strengths are faculty who are knowledgeable, available for help, interested in their students, and eager to foster an appreciation of literature. Graduates also commented in particular on how their studies enhanced their awareness of the relationship between literature and its cultural context.

Graduates did have recommendations, however. Cancelled courses due to low enrollment were a problem more than once for one student. Two other graduates commented that a seminar to help them find and apply to graduate school would have been helpful. Finally, one student felt that more should be done to encourage English majors to meet informally outside of class to talk about writing and literature. (*See Appendix B*).

C. 3. b) Method of measuring student sentiment

As indicated in the responses above, perceptions of current students and graduates of the program were measured by surveys designed with the assistance of Institutional Resources. Perceptions of the seniors were collected through exit interviews conducted by the acting head of the department.

D. PROGRAM VALUE

D. 1. The benefit of the program, facilities, and personnel to the university

The Department of Languages and Literature provides engagement and co-curricular activities for much of the campus, including faculty and financial support for the Literature in Person Reading Series, the *Prism* writing contest, the Shakespeare Birthday Celebration, The Dead Poets Society, The English Club, and the Sigma Tau Delta national English honors society.

Faculty in the program are active in service to the university. For example, faculty edit newsletters, such as *Diversity Counts!* and *Insider*, as well as provide lectures in conjunction with FSU Arts and Lectures programs. (*See Appendix A*).

Program faculty are active in the Academic Senate, in program review, and in interim administrative assignments throughout the university. Program faculty are often solicited for participation on university committees because of their writing and editing skills. (*See Appendix A*).

Contemporary training in English language and literature also emphasizes pedagogy, and program faculty are actively involved with the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning providing training and learning communities on a variety of topics.

D. 2. The benefit of the program facilities, and personnel to the students enrolled in the program

Faculty who teach in the program are excited about this new program and the quality of students who enter it. Thus faculty sponsor and attend events, work with students on projects and independent studies, and take interest in the future plans of their students.

- Events

In addition to the engagement activities mentioned above, the department sponsors a Graduate School Night during which program faculty and advisory board members speak with students in the program about applying to graduate school; a fall gathering for new and continuing students in English and English Education; an English department awards luncheon in the spring; and intensive work in areas of interest to students through independent studies with faculty members.

- Scholarships

The Helen Popovich scholarship is a competitive scholarship for students interested in teaching professions, and John and Roxanne Cullen have established a scholarship for students in the program.

- Independent study courses for students in the program

A number of faculty in the program have worked with students on topics of mutual interest or when scheduling problems would have kept students from meeting their timeline for graduating. (*See Appendix A*).

D. 3. Faculty assessment of program value to employers.

The value of our program is demonstrated through our students' success in admission to graduate programs and in securing gainful employment. As the job market outlook demonstrates above, the skills of English majors are in high demand. English majors must often begin work in entry-level positions in order to gain experience in their specific areas. However, English majors often progress very quickly in their chosen fields because of their skills in analysis, writing, and research. Our pool of graduates is still too small to make generalizations about program value beyond those outlined above.

D. 4. Program benefit to entities external to the University

Many of the program's faculty members actively serve professional associations. Faculty also provide instructional services for regional organizations such as the writing workshops for elementary teachers and students. (*See Appendix A for a detailed list*).

D. 5. Services for extra-university general public groups that faculty, staff or students have provided.

Many of the cultural activities in and around Big Rapids have been organized by and feature members of our faculty who teach in the English B. A. program: The community benefits from the literary expertise and creative abilities of our faculty. (*See Appendix A*).

SECTION 2: PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM

A. Graduate Follow-up Survey.....	2-1
B. Employer Follow-up Survey.....	2-2
C. Graduate Exit Survey.....	2-2
D. Student Program Evaluation	2-3
E. Faculty Perceptions	2-3
F. Advisory Board Perceptions	2-4

SECTION 2: PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM

A. GRADUATE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

The graduate perceptions instrument (*see Appendix B*) was developed in consultation with Institutional Research and Testing, and was sent both via e-mail as an Internet-hosted survey and as a letter to eight graduates. The survey sample was small: surveys were sent to eight graduates, and five replied. Because of this, we also incorporated (for the statements below) some responses from the two fall 2005 senior exit interviews.

A. 1. Graduates' perceptions of the program as career preparation

None of the graduates is currently employed in an English-related field. However, some graduates are working, and all graduates who are not currently in graduate school plan to attend graduate school in the future. While those employed said they did not use the skills they acquired in their major in their current jobs, 60% said that the program helped them develop problem-solving and critical-thinking skills as well as writing skills. When asked what other skills they learned as English majors that would be helpful to them in their career goals, they mentioned text analysis, composition and research, and elements of style. (*See Appendix B*).

A. 2. Graduates' perceptions of faculty and the program

All students agreed that the program helped them develop a knowledge of and an appreciation for literature. Sixty percent also felt their coursework helped them explore a wide variety of cultural perspectives and human dynamics. Eighty percent felt the courses provided a bias-free learning environment.

All students also agreed that the English B. A. program's faculty were knowledgeable in their subject areas. One student remarked that professors brought together cultural contexts—art, music, and history—providing the background necessary to understand various literary works. All respondents also agreed that faculty were available outside of class. In addition, all said that they would choose English as a major again if they were beginning their undergraduate careers.

Comments were overwhelmingly positive, citing the cultural and social benefits of a knowledge of literature. Students mentioned the enjoyment they received from their courses and emphasized their satisfaction in having chosen the English major. (*See Appendix C, comments entered after questions 21 and 22*).

A. 3. Graduates' recommendations for improving the program

Recommendations by the graduates for the program focused primarily on course offerings and scheduling as well as on preparation for graduate school. One student was disappointed that he or she was unable to take certain classes because either the classes had been cancelled due to low enrollment or the student had a schedule conflict. Another wished to see more courses focusing on individual authors.

One student suggested a one-credit-hour course be made available to help students applying to graduate school. Another suggested a senior seminar in which students would be able to work “one-on-one with a faculty member on an in-depth research paper.”

Finally, a few students commented on the benefits of close ties to faculty and other students due to the size of the program; one respondent wanted students to be encouraged to develop and join informal groups for talking about literature.

B. EMPLOYER FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

Because our sample of graduated students is small, we have not conducted employer follow-up surveys. Such surveys will not be instructive for our program because our students are not prepared for any single career track. As our graduate survey indicates, we have students enrolled in graduate programs in English and law. We have a student employed full-time as an employment services specialist. Another student works part-time as a sales clerk, and a third student is working in fast food service. During exit surveys in fall of the current academic year, one student indicated that he had a position in construction management, and another student had been accepted into a program in library science. Even in these first few years of our program, it is easy to see that students will pursue a variety of career paths and graduate training that will be difficult to track on the basis of employer surveys.

C. GRADUATING STUDENT EXIT SURVEY

The Department of Languages and Literature began conducting exit surveys of its students during Academic Year 2005-2006. The survey is conducted in an open-question interview format with the department head. Graduating students are asked about their plans upon graduation, how the English major has contributed toward those plans, whether or not students entered Ferris as English majors, what majors they may have transferred from, why they decided to major in English, future career goals, and what skills were gained through the major. Graduating students are then asked to reflect upon how the program has helped develop problem-solving and critical thinking skills, writing skills, knowledge of and appreciation for literature, explore a variety of cultures, perspectives, and human dynamics. Finally, feedback is solicited on course selection, faculty experience and expertise, advising, co-curricular activities, and recommendations for the program.

The six exit interviews conducted during the current academic year have been overwhelmingly positive. A summary of student responses is included in Appendix B. All graduating students felt that the program helped developed their skills in the areas emphasized by the program. They indicated that the program emphasized critical thinking and problem solving, writing, reading, and research skills. The most consistent recommendations for the program focused on course offerings – students would like more intensive study of movements and authors – which we will begin to offer on a regular basis in our 400-level period and author surveys. Some students were also concerned about the closure of under-enrolled courses. The department has addressed this concern by regularizing course offerings by semester and providing a schedule of course offerings to students well in advance.

The graduating student exit survey provides the department head with the opportunity to meet with graduating students and thereby assess program effectiveness from the

graduating students' perspectives. The perspectives of graduating students are informative to the program as it goes through curricular and programmatic review because they give us the opportunity to see whether or not the changes we propose are consistent with student needs and perspectives. We have begun to address all of the concerns raised by students and will strive to continue to anticipate and resolve student concerns as they arise.

D. STUDENT PROGRAM EVALUATION

The English B. A. Program Review Panel developed an instrument to survey the perceptions of the students currently in the program. During March 2006 these twenty-eight (28) students were contacted via e-mail and asked to fill out a survey at a website used by Ferris' Institutional Research and Testing (IR&T) Office. Of the twenty-eight (28) students surveyed, sixteen (16), or 57%, responded.

The survey indicates a high degree of student satisfaction with advising, faculty, university and program choice, quality of courses, library and database resources, textbooks, perception of fellow students, and program quality. Students were more measured in their appreciation of program facilities, and they correctly noted that the program's small size limited the frequency and variety of certain course offerings.

E. FACULTY PERCEPTIONS

The faculty perceptions instrument was developed in consultation with Institutional Research and Testing, set up as an Internet-hosted survey, and distributed via a link in e-mail to the 34 members of the English seniority group within the Languages and Literature department. Eleven of those faculty members, or 32% of the group surveyed, provided responses. (*See Appendix D*).

E. 1. Faculty perceptions of the program

The survey results indicate a consistently favorable general view of the program and its elements. All respondents agree, either moderately or strongly, that the English B. A. program is consistent with the mission of FSU, that the program's curriculum is appropriate to achieving its goals, and that program faculty engage in appropriate professional development activity. Most respondents (between 81 and 91%) moderately or strongly believe that the clarity of the program mission, program review procedures, student advising, classroom instruction, and number of tenure-track faculty are currently effective.

One program area in which faculty responses indicate a need for improvement is the role of the program advisory board; only 46% of respondents agree that the board has provided effective guidance. This perception almost certainly arises from the fact that the advisory board was formed during the 2005-2006 academic year and hasn't had the opportunity thus far to provide much guidance, nor have faculty members become fully acquainted yet with board members and their activities. The survey responses indicate that we need to work actively to increase this awareness among program faculty.

E. 2. Faculty perceptions of administrative support and resources

Perceptions of the level of administrative and financial support the program receives are somewhat less favorable than perceptions of the program. Only 45-55% of respondents express agreement about the broad issues of FSU administration supportiveness and the sufficiency of the current budget. However, when asked to evaluate specific resources provided by the administration, faculty members had more favorable perceptions: approximately 73% of respondents agree that the university provides sufficient faculty professional development opportunities, clerical and support staff, and instructional facilities. The most problematic area, according to faculty perceptions, is library and research resources, which only 36% of respondents agree are meeting program needs effectively.

E. 3. Faculty perceptions of students

Faculty have relatively favorable perceptions of program students, with 73% of respondents agreeing that students conduct themselves appropriately and compare favorably with other FSU students. Faculty members indicate a stronger degree of confidence in graduating seniors' readiness for graduate study (91% agreement) than in their preparation for employment (64%). These results are predictable, considering that the program prepares students for a broad array of potential employment options rather than one specific career path and that most program students indicate a strong interest in pursuing graduate education at some point.

In addition to the numerical responses, faculty provided several suggestions for improving the program, of which these were the most frequently mentioned:

- We need to recruit and retain stronger, more qualified students.
- We need to improve library holdings and increase professional development opportunities for faculty.
- We need to build a more professional and supportive learning community for students outside the classroom, perhaps including events such as faculty-student symposia.

F. ADVISORY BOARD PERCEPTIONS

The advisory board perceptions instrument was developed in consultation with Institutional Research and Testing, set up as an Internet-hosted survey, and distributed via an e-mail link to the four members of the current advisory board. (The board consists of two graduates of the program, Monica Frees and Danielle Ryskamp, both of whom are currently pursuing graduate study; and two former English majors, Craig Westman, FSU Associate Dean of Enrollment Services, Director of Admissions and Records and Paul Kammerdiner, Assistant Professor, FLITE Reference and Instructional Services. Everyone on the board responded to the survey (*See Appendix E*).

F. 1. Advisory board perceptions of the program's curriculum

Three of the respondents perceived the program favorably, saying that it provided a strong foundation in literature and in writing as well as a foundation for further graduate study. One respondent, however, decidedly disagreed that the program did such.

Two comments were offered regarding improvements that could be made in the program. One focused on encouragement and opportunities for students to publish before completing their undergraduate education. The other comment was a recommendation that faculty in the program provide more information about applying to graduate school as well as preparing students to present papers at conferences.

F. 2. Advisory board perceptions of the program's graduates

There was a range of opinion as to whether or not the program provided a good foundation for multiple career opportunities, with two strongly or somewhat agreeing, one neither agreeing nor disagreeing, and one strongly disagreeing. Opinions were also divided as to whether the graduates of the program were sufficiently prepared to compete with graduates from other English programs. While two respondents somewhat agreed, two others either somewhat or strongly disagreed.

F. 3. Advisory board perceptions of the faculty

When questioned as to whether or not the faculty in the program had adequate credentials and experience, three respondents strongly agreed while one strongly disagreed. However, there was no specific comment from the respondent who felt faculty were not qualified or experienced enough. Concerning whether or not faculty had adequate institutional support for professional development, one respondent strongly agreed that it was adequate, while two disagreed and one strongly disagreed that faculty received adequate support.

F. 4. Advisory board perceptions of resources—faculty, library and instructional resources

Concerning whether or not the program had an adequate number of faculty, a range of opinions existed—from strongly agree to strongly disagree. No comment was offered to identify the particular deficit or to make a recommendation. More of the respondents agreed when it came to the adequacy of library resources: three disagreed somewhat while only one strongly agreed. However, no specific recommendations were made in comments. Finally, to the matters of whether or not the program has adequate instructional resources and receives financial support from the university, another range of opinion existed: responses were fairly evenly divided for agree and disagree with the second matter eliciting slightly more disagreement.

From these responses and remarks, we can conclude that, first of all, the members of the board need to discuss openly the information and suggestions found in the survey. Since no specific recommendations were made about improving the quality of the faculty or support for the program, inquiry must be made to elicit from the board member(s) who noted inadequacies what exactly needs to improve.

Another conclusion to be drawn is that the program must increase students' awareness of and preparation for graduate study and career decisions. This preparedness could include the production and presentation of a work of literary analysis that is publishable or that could serve as a writing sample.

SECTION 3: PROGRAM PROFILE

A. Profile of Students	3-1
B. Enrollment	3-6
C. Program Capacity	3-6
D. Retention and Graduation	3-7
E. Access	3-7
F. Curriculum	3-9
G. Quality of Instruction	3-11
H. Composition and Quality of Faculty	3-13
I. Service to Non-Majors	3-17
J. Degree Program Cost and Productivity Data	3-20
K. Assessment and Evaluation	3-21
L. Administration Effectiveness	3-22

SECTION 3: PROGRAM PROFILE

A. PROFILE OF STUDENTS

A. 1. Student demographic profile

Our student profiles are contained in the following tables. In each of the tables, ENG B is the original program prefix which was used only in 2002. ENG C is the prefix for the composition concentration, and ENG L is the prefix for the literature concentration. In cases where the total number of enrolled students differs from the demographic information, the difference comes from the numbers supplied by Institutional Research. Data from students is self-reported, which accounts for discrepancies.

STUDENT PROFILE (Demographic)													
TERM	ENROLLED	SEX			ETHNICITY						AGE		
		Male	Female	Blank	Black	Hispanic	Indian/ Alaskan	Asian/ Pac. Islander	White	Int'l.	(Average)		
												Eng B	26.5
2002 F	17	7	10	0	0	0	0	1	12	0		Eng C	21.3
												Eng L	22.8
2003 F	27	10	17	0	1	0	0	1	17	1		Eng C	22
												Eng L	23
2004 F	29	11	18	0	1	0	0	1	22	0		Eng C	21.4
												Eng L	23.5

All of the students in English B. A. program are enrolled on campus. We do, on occasion, have students in the English B. A. program who enroll in fully online courses because of scheduling conflicts, etc., but most of our fully online and partial Internet sections are scheduled for students in the English Education program.

STUDENT PROFILE (Enrollment/Residence)					
TERM	ENROLLED	Full-time	Part-time	RESIDENCE	
				In-state	Out-of-state
2002 F	17	11	1	17	0
2003 F	27	26	1	27	0
2004 F	29	26	3	29	0

The department tries to balance course offerings throughout the day and according to faculty and student needs and preferences. Such balance, however, is not always achievable. Nonetheless, because of our off-campus English Education programs, many of our literature courses are currently in development to be fully online Internet courses, which will allow students more flexibility and should resolve any remaining conflicts.

A. 2. Quality of students

Data from Institutional Research indicates that the program, overall, attracts qualified students.

STUDENT PROFILE (Academic History)							
TERM	TRACK	ACT			FSU GPA (Cumulative)		
		Min.	Avg.	Max.	Min.	Avg.	Max.
2002 F	Eng B	22	22	22	2.387	3.193	4
	Eng C	22	23.3	24	1.913	3.067	3.785
	Eng L	20	24.1	30	0.835	2.746	3.59
2003 F	Eng C	17	23.5	29	2.025	2.709	3.373
	Eng L	17	23.9	31	1.413	3.201	4
2004 F	Eng C	19	24	30	2.421	2.941	3.838
	Eng L	18	24.3	30	2.472	3.32	3.909

College of Arts and Sciences statistics from the 2006 Winter semester show the GPAs of the 4 students in the composition track of the program ranged from 3.16 to 3.88; in the same semester, GPAs of the students in the literature program ranged from 2.62 to 3.94.

The GPA of one student fell below the 2.0 minimum for two semesters, and he has been dismissed from the university. Many of the students in the program maintain a high GPA. Thirteen of the 16 survey respondents reported making the Dean's List; some have made the list more than once, and one student consistently makes the Dean's List each semester. (See Appendix C).

The average GPA of our graduates for 2004-2005 was 3.78 for students in the composition track and 3.49 for students in the literature track. To date, we have graduated 15 students. The average GPA for these students is 3.46.

The ACT Composite score for incoming freshmen to the College of Arts and Sciences for Fall 2006 is 20.9. As shown in the table above, ACT scores for the students enrolled in the English program average between 22 and 24.3.

These data indicate that, overall, the program attracts students who are not only qualified for the academic demands of college but also motivated to work and to learn.

A. 2. Scholarly or creative activities and awards

Many of our students have achieved academic distinction. This year, six students with the requisite GPAs became charter members of the Sigma Tau Delta International English Honor Society. Once our chapter is established, students in our program will be eligible for scholarships and opportunities to publish creative and analytical essays in the Society's two publications.

One of our students, Anne Hogenson, was selected for *Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities* in 2006. This same student also presented a paper on Wordsworth's and Thoreau's use of natural imagery at the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters in March 2006. This paper was the outcome of a year-long independent study with Professor Paul Blake.

Students in the program have also demonstrated and been rewarded for their scholarly and creative efforts through the *Prism* writing contest. In the past three years, eleven of our students have accrued twelve awards for essays, five awards for fiction, and eleven awards for poetry in this annual competition. Students gain confidence in their abilities when their work is singled out for merit by the faculty who judge the contest; moreover, students feel a sense of achievement in receiving the award in the presence of faculty, peers, and family members and in seeing their work published in the annual *Prism*.

Those students who write fiction and poetry have also given public readings of their work. Recently, at a "Celebration of Writers and Writing" sponsored by the Mecosta Osceola Council for Humanities and Arts, Anne Hogenson and Elzbeth McLain gave public readings of their poetry and short fiction.

An annual activity for both English B. A. and English Education students has been the Shakespeare's Birthday Celebration, where participants present poems and scenes from plays to the public. This event continues to attract more and more participants each year and is eagerly anticipated by most students in the two programs.

As all this indicates, students entering the program are qualified and maintain good grades once at Ferris. Our program is enhanced by attracting and retaining bright, creative students who promote class discussions, contribute their writing to the community, and inspire their classmates to achieve academically and artistically.

A. 3. Employability of students

Based on data from graduate survey responses, currently none of our graduates is employed full-time within the field though three are employed full-time (two in Michigan, one in

Florida). One graduate who is attending Central Michigan University's master's program in children's literature was substitute teaching part-time but is now employed at Ferris.

The English degree does not prepare students for one specific career path, and roughly a third of our graduates go on to graduate study. Currently, four students who completed the program are in graduate school (three in Michigan, one in Ohio), a few have chosen to work before pursuing graduate study, and one is pursuing certification for teaching in secondary schools. As of now, we have no data which predict what percentage goes on to graduate school or further education.

Overall, graduates felt that the program had enhanced their employability. When they were asked what specific skills they had acquired from their courses that would be helpful to them in pursuing their career goals, they mentioned the ability to read texts closely and critically, the ability to communicate, and the need to be open and accepting of others.

Most agreed that their skills in written communication were improved through the program; survey respondents mentioned having learned to focus their writing, develop a style or voice suited to the intended audience, and acquire the conventions of academic prose (including proper documentation methods). (*See Appendix B*).

However, two graduates commented on the amount of career or graduate school preparation they had received, indicating that more needs to be provided. One suggested that the program offer a senior thesis seminar in which an in-depth research paper would be produced, saying, "A substantial published or publishable work would have gone a long way on my resume." Another suggested that the program establish a one-credit seminar advising seniors how to choose and apply to graduate school. These comments indicate that students in the program have much clearer ideas about career goals as they near graduation (unlike those who enter the program) and are in need of guidance as to how to pursue these goals.

When current students were surveyed about why they chose to major in English, 7 (43.8%) indicated they chose the program as preparation for graduate or professional school while 6 (37.5%) indicated it was preparation for a career. While some of the students surveyed had specific ideas about going on to graduate school and the professions they would pursue (lawyer, librarian, professor), others were undecided or were simply planning to find some type of career in which they could use their writing skills. (*Appendix C: Career Plans/Educational Plans after Graduation*). The significant number of students who are not sure what careers they wish to pursue suggests that further advising and/or seminars discussing possible career paths are needed.

In the last three years, a "Grad School Night" was offered to interested students to familiarize them with the teaching profession, introduce them to the Graduate Record Exam, and allow them to voice any questions they might have about pursuing graduate study. The few students who attended responded positively to the event and the information they received. However, the overall attendance of current students as well as the comments from graduates indicate that more needs to be done in terms of helping students think about future career paths and plan for their professional futures.

Since members of the newly formed advisory board are in a position to offer our students testimonials about career planning as well as attending graduate school, their knowledge

should be tapped and made available to current students in an informal gathering or seminar.

B. ENROLLMENT

B. 1. Anticipated fall enrollment for the program

The anticipated enrollment for the B. A. English program Fall 2006 is 36 students, which exceeds the number of students who have graduated from the program since 2001. (The English Composition concentration is no longer accepting applications for Fall 2006.)

B. 2. Increase or decrease in enrollment and student credit hour production (SCH) since last program review

This is the English B. A. program's first review.

B. 3. Number of students to apply to the program annually since last program review

This is the English B. A. program's first review.

B. 4. Applicant number, number and percentage of accepted

As of Fall 2005, out of 35 applicants, 16 have been accepted to the English B. A. program with one cancelled application. Twelve additional applications are pending and incomplete, and three students have been rejected, giving the English B. A. program a rate of 50% admissions from applicants at the present time.

B. 5. Enrollment number and percentage of enrolled from accepted

In Fall of 2005, 35 students applied for the English B. A. program and 19 enrolled, making the percentage of enrollment among accepted students approximately 54%.

B. 6. Current enrollment goals, strategy, and efforts to maintain, increase, or decrease the number of students in the program.

The department is currently working to increase the number of students in the program. Our primary method of increase is through recruiting new students. We have two initiatives geared toward student recruiting. First, we have designed and printed a brochure for students interested in any of the programs offered in the department (English B. A., English Education B. S., Technical and Professional Communication B. S.). The department head is currently in the process of contacting community colleges in western Michigan to distribute the brochure. (*See Appendix G*).

The department also plans to sponsor a state-wide writing contest in the fall of 2006 that will draw attention to the presence of an English program at Ferris State University.

C. PROGRAM CAPACITY

C. 1. Appropriate program enrollment capacity, given available resources, regulations, and limitations

Program capacity is not limited by accreditation requirements, or state and federal regulations. We have sufficient experienced and qualified faculty to teach two or more sections of upper-division literature surveys and genre courses. Most of our upper-division courses share enrollments with English Education. The primary obstacle to growing the program is the paucity of qualified local instructors who would need to be hired to teach lower-division writing classes if the program ran at an ideal capacity of 100 students in the English B. A. program with another 90 to 100 students in the English Education B. S. program. Funding for supplemental faculty to teach lower-division writing courses could also become an issue if we ran at a full capacity of 100 students.

The department currently manages eighteen classrooms, thirteen of which are technology-enhanced classrooms. Classroom resources are sufficient to meet programmatic needs. However, all of the classrooms available to Languages and Literature would ideally be technology-enhanced classrooms because the integration of media into English language and literature courses has become commonplace, putting a strain on our available classrooms with appropriate technology. We also have three computer labs available for instructional use.

Because we are still a fairly young program at Ferris State University, we are only beginning to attract the attention of graduating high school students. Until recently, most of the students in our program have come through program changes or transfers, but we are generating more interest among high school students in the state, and the program will continue to attract students through internal program change as well as external transfer.

D. RETENTION AND GRADUATION

D. 1. The annual attrition rate (number and percent of students) in the program

The program is too new to have meaningful attrition numbers. Most of our students in the English B. A. program have transferred from other programs at Ferris State University or from elsewhere, so attrition rate numbers from Institutional Research and Testing do not provide an accurate representation of program success. Realistically, we lose no more than three students in any given year, which is less than 10% of our students.

D. 2. The program's current goals, strategy and efforts to retain students

We have begun to focus on creating a community for our students that provides both intellectual and social interaction. In the current academic year, we hosted our first welcome social for new students, which we hope to make an annual event.

D. 3. Trends in number of degrees awarded in the program

The program has seen a steady increase in the number of degrees awarded annually. As the program continues to grow, the number of degrees awarded will continue to increase. We would like to award at least ten degrees per year in the near future.

D. 4. Number of students enrolled in the program and graduating within prescribed time

Most English B. A. students have completed the program in the prescribed time. Some of our students are enrolled in multiple minors or in second majors that increase their time for graduation, but we expect that most of our students who persist in the program will complete the program within four years.

D.5. Average length of time to complete the program

Most Ferris students enroll in fourteen hours per semester. Prior to this year, all B. A. students had to complete at least 126 credit hours for graduation, which meant that most students took at least nine semesters to complete their programs. With the reduction of the minimum number of credit hours to 120, we hope that most students will complete the program in four years if they attend at least one summer term.

E. ACCESS

E. 1. Program's actions to make itself accessible to students

While the B. A. degree is only offered at the main campus, a number of off-site course offerings are available at campuses around the state, including Traverse City, Flint, Ludington, and Grand Rapids. At each of these locations, the program has adequate staff and qualified instructors. In addition to full-time traditional students, non-traditional students are attracted by the number of offerings and the flexible scheduling of off-site courses.

The program accepts course work from many other institutions and students may enter the program at any point in the academic year. In addition to a wide variety of courses offered on the main campus during the academic year, including summer semester, the program offers a generous selection of mixed delivery and fully online courses.

INTERNET AND PARTIAL INTERNET DELIVERED COURSES (Three-Year History)		
SEMESTER	FULL INTERNET COURSES	PARTIAL INTERNET COURSES
03W	ENGL-321-EIA ENGL-321-EIB ENGL-321-MIA LITR-380-NIA LITR-580-NIA	LITR-352-NTA
04W	ENGL-321-EIA ENGL-321-EIB ENGL-321-EIC	ENGL-321-MAA ENGL-321-015 LITR-250-001 LITR-311-001

04S	ENGL-301-AIA ENGL-301-NIA ENGL-321-EIA ENGL-321-EIB ENGL-321-MIA ENGL-321-MIB	
04F	ENGL-321-EIA ENGL-321-MIA LITR-352-EIA	ENGL-301-EFA ENGL-321-EFA LITR-311-001
05W	ENGL-321-EIB ENGL-321-EIC	ENGL-321-EFB ENGL-321-EFC ENGL-321-WNA LITR-352-NTA
05S	ENGL-301-AIA ENGL301-MIA ENGL-301-NIA ENGL-321-EIA ENGL-321-MIA ENGL-321-NIA ENGL-321-NIB ENGL-321-NIC	LITR-231-001
05F	ENGL-321-EIA ENGL-321-EIB ENGL-321-EIC ENGL-321-MIA	ENGL-321-NLA

E. 2. Effects of these actions on the program

The program is still new, but certain effects can be deduced at this time. For example, Ferris students who previously decided to attend other Michigan institutions to earn an English B. A. now remain here, and the program increasingly attracts students who previously would not have attended Ferris. The variety in course delivery contributes to the program's visibility as well as its desirability to students.

Academic advising and scheduling have adapted to the increased number of students in the program (from 8 graduates originally to 15 now). Dr. Christine Persak, the program coordinator and originally the sole advisor, now advises juniors and seniors, conducts final audits for graduation, and handles other program-related issues. Dr. Genevieve West and Dr. Matt Nikkari advise freshmen and sophomores.

ASC instructional facilities have been improved, with an increasing number of multimedia (i.e., "smart") classrooms containing computers, projections equipment, and Internet access. Such improvements also facilitate access to FLITE holdings and databases, which continue to expand.

This summer, more courses are being offered at both on and off-campus sites as well as online. More than seventy students enrolled in literature course offerings this summer.

The department has responded to student needs in course scheduling in several ways. First, the department head, in consultation with program directors, has constructed a schedule of courses by semester in order to facilitate curriculum planning. We have added courses

when necessary, particularly during summer term, to aid students in their desire for timely program completion.

E. 3. How these actions advance or hinder program goals and priorities

More courses available mean that students in the program fulfill requirements in a timely fashion. However, despite increased online and off-campus course offerings, some students have expressed dissatisfaction with the number of course options available for a semester, citing the small number of students in the program as the likely cause. Furthermore, students also expressed dissatisfaction when courses that are originally offered do not “make” due to low enrollment. One student, in particular, has had to be notified of course cancellations and the need to revise his schedule on more than one occasion.

Students also become frustrated when enrollment for online courses is capped low and sections fill quickly.

Thus, while the program attempts to offer a range of courses to students, low enrollment (usually—but not always—due to the total number of students in the program) prevents this from happening. It is evident that increasing enrollment must become a priority to ensure that advanced courses (400-level) as well as historical survey and critical theory courses can be offered to students wishing to graduate in a timely fashion.

F. CURRICULUM

F. 1. Program requirements: Description and assessments

The program curriculum includes five components (*refer to Appendix F, check sheets and sample syllabi*):

- Component 1: Three core courses required of all students:

LITR 250, Practical Criticism, an "entry-level" class providing students with an introduction to the fundamental methods of literary study.

LITR 323, Shakespeare, providing a solid grounding in the works of the single most important and culturally influential author in literary history.

LITR 416, Literary Theory, generally taken late in the undergraduate career, providing in-depth coverage of major theoretical approaches to literature and cultural studies.

- Component 2: One genre course

Students select one of four courses, each focusing on one major literary type (poetry, fiction, drama, novel) and including literature from around the world.

- Component 3: One course in English language study

Again, students may select from several classes, each focusing on a major English-language topic: linguistics, rhetoric and style, history of the language, or literacy.

- Component 4: Three upper-level core literature surveys

Each course provides a thorough chronological overview of the major works and authors, literary trends/history and themes, and cultural backgrounds of English or American literature. Students may choose three of four courses: LITR 311 and 312, American Literature 1 (to 1865) and 2 (1865 to present); LITR 351 and 352, English Literature 1 (to 1800) and 2 (1800 to present).

- Component 5: Three additional elective literature courses, including two at the 200 level or above and one at the 400 level

The electives allow students to pursue their individual interests in literature and language studies and, at the 400 level, require them to engage in extended study of one major author, topic, or literary movement.

These program courses effectively provide students with well-rounded expertise in the methods and theories of language and literature study as well as thorough knowledge about a wide variety of literary forms, works, themes, and authors.

F. 1. a) Directed electives and directed General Education courses

The program includes no directed electives or directed General Education courses.

F. 1. b) Hidden prerequisites

There are no hidden prerequisites.

F. 2. Significant revisions to the program since the last review

While this is our first program review, significant changes to the program have already been made.

In 2004, the B. A. *ad hoc* committee proposed abandoning the composition track of the program. Its original intention was to prepare for graduate study those students who wished to pursue teaching composition. However, the few students who opted for this track had misconceptions about its goal. Most believed it was intended to teach them to become better writers, not to become teachers of writing.

Students who were already enrolled in/expressed interest in the composition track were either allowed to finish their programs or were advised to pursue a Technical and Professional Writing minor which, in fact, is geared toward the practice of writing and not the teaching of it. The difference between this minor and the composition track was basically three credit hours—the minor requiring 18 hours of specialized coursework and the composition track requiring 15 hours.

As a result of this change, the title of the major was simplified to English B. A.

A second change occurred in 2003 when we added a requirement for a literature elective at the 400-level. The rationale for this change was to better prepare students for the rigors of graduate study.

The Department has offered courses at this level although low enrollment has, to date, sometimes meant that courses were not allowed to “make.” Next year, however, there will be juniors and seniors who are required to have a 400-level course.

Finally, the University revised the Bachelor of Arts degree, reducing the total number of hours required (from 126 to 120) as well as specific general education requirements. However, the requirements for our program/major remain the same.

F. 3. Curricular or program changes currently in the review process

There are no changes currently underway.

F. 4. Plans to revise the current program within the next three to five years

There are no plans to revise the program.

G. QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

G. 1. Student and alumni perceptions of the quality of instruction

The 16 current students who responded to the survey all agree that their instructors are qualified and helpful, though one student commented that, in his or her opinion, most, not all, are qualified. Comments from the respondents concerning the instructors are all favorable: instructors are perceived as “knowledgeable, personal, and accessible,” “willing to help,” and “invaluable to my academic career.” Regarding the quality of the courses, 93.8 % indicate that the literature and English classes they are taking are of high quality.

Criticisms of the overall quality of the program seem to center on the problem of limited course offerings, scheduling, and class cancellations (about 24%). (*See Appendix C*).

In the exit interview, students were asked about their perceptions of faculty members’ knowledge in the field. All respondents indicated that they were favorably impressed by faculty. Specifically, respondents felt that faculty were passionate about their subjects; brought together information, cultural context—art, music, and history; and provided background necessary to complete understanding. Respondents also found faculty to be accessible; students could count on faculty to answer questions or to know where to find the answers, and students felt they were given multiple opportunities to interact with faculty through class and in personal communication. (*See Appendix B*).

G. 2. Advisory committee and employer perceptions of the quality of instruction

Currently, there are four people serving on the advisory board, two of whom are graduates of the program. When surveyed about the quality of the program’s faculty members—whether or not faculty had adequate credentials and experience—three felt strongly that faculty members were qualified while one felt strongly that faculty were not. However, no specific comment was offered by this board member as to who was lacking what or what kind of improvement needed to be made.

G. 3. Departmental and individual efforts to improve the learning environment; add and use appropriate technology

Instructors in the program commonly use a host of appropriate technology (e-mail, websites, WebCT discussion boards, MSWord, electronic journal assignments and discussion groups, blogs, as well as in-class computers to play relevant music or show visuals) in order to facilitate learning and enhance the learning environment.

G. 4. Type of professional development faculty have participated in, in efforts to enhance the learning environment

Faculty participate in a wide variety of professional development activities to enhance student learning. Faculty in Languages and Literature are active in the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning, both as participants and as facilitators; faculty attend and contribute through presentations at professional conferences, several of which focus on pedagogy, including the widely attended Conference on College Composition and Communication; faculty also conduct as well as attend faculty development sessions during “Kick Off” week in the beginning of the school year. Several faculty are active in local and regional assessment activities, which also strengthens the programmatic emphasis on learning. (*See Appendix A*).

G. 5. Efforts made to increase the interaction of students with faculty and peers

Last fall, the department hosted a “get together” for new students in the English and English Education programs. In 2004 and 2006, a “Grad School Night” was offered to English majors. A number of faculty have worked with students on independent studies (Blake, Hill, McCullough, Persak, Reynolds, West).

G. 6. Extent to which current research and practice regarding inclusive pedagogy and curriculum infuse teaching and learning in this program

The field of composition studies has a long tradition of inclusive, active, engaged pedagogy. Most of the faculty in our program have extensive training and experience in composition, the pedagogy of which also infuses our literature classrooms. Several of our faculty are well grounded in contemporary literary theory and bring those perspectives into their classrooms as well.

G. 7. Effects of these actions (described in G. 5. and G. 6. on the quality of teaching and learning in the program

Despite being a relatively young program, the English B. A. program has an active history of assessment and revision. Faculty training and expertise in pedagogy and assessment have led to the development of a culture of continuous improvement focused on student learning and outcomes. The department strives to remain current with contemporary trends in undergraduate education and to integrate those trends into the program. Faculty, students, alumni, and advisory board perceptions indicate that faculty preparation and quality are excellent and are strengths of the program.

H. COMPOSITION AND QUALITY OF FACULTY

H.1. Faculty in the program

H. 1. a) Rank and qualifications

Professor

Sandra Balkema, Ph. D.
Paul Blake, Ph.D.
John Caserta, M.Litt.
John Cullen, Ph. D.
Roxanne Cullen, Ph. D.
Douglas Haneline, Ph.D.
John Jablonski, Ph. D.
Andrew Kantar, Ph. D.
Phillip, Middleton, Ph. D.
David Russell, Ph. D.
Phillip Sterling, Ph. D.
Elizabeth Stolarek, Ph. D.
Robert von der Osten, Ph. D.

Associate Professor

Paul Devlin, M. A.
Reinhold Hill, Ph. D.
Mary Kilgallen, M. A.
Ruth Mirtz, Ph. D.
Matthew Nikkari, Ph. D. (promoted 2006)
Jody Ollenquist, Ph. D. (promoted 2006)
Tracy Webb, Ph. D.
Genevieve West, Ph. D.

Assistant Professor

Christine Persak, Ph. D.
Gordon Reynolds, Ph. D.
Rex West, Ph. D.

H. 1. b.) Promotions and merits since last program review

This is our first program review.

H. 1. c) Summary of professional activities of program faculty since inception

See Appendix A.

H. 2. Faculty workload

H.2. a) Standard loads and overloads

The standard, annualized load is 24 credit hours per year (Fall and Spring).
Generally, faculty teach four three-credit-hour courses.

The overloads indicated below are the result of our general education commitments:

06W - 8 faculty accepted overload assignment
05F - 15 faculty accepted overload assignment
05W - 8 faculty accepted overload assignment
04F - 13 faculty accepted overload assignment
04W - 10 faculty accepted overload assignment
03F - 14 faculty accepted overload assignment
03W - 8 faculty accepted overload assignment
02F - 20 faculty accepted overload assignment

H. 2. b) Activities for which faculty receive release time

Program Coordinators:

Technical and Professional Communication
English B. A.
English Education

Interim positions: Department Head

CAS Associate Dean
COEHS Assistant Dean

TORCH Advisor
Writing Center Director
Composition Coordinator
Honors Advisor
Crossroads Writing Project Director
Online Course Development
FCTL Projects
Academic Senate
Academic Program Review
Grant Development
Assessment
Ferris Faculty Association

H. 3. Recruitment

H. 3. a) Process for new faculty

We follow the university Affirmative Action process in our recruitment of new faculty. Generally, open positions are advertised in both the Chronicle of Higher Education and in the Modern Language Association Job List in both traditional print media and on the Internet. The university also currently posts open positions on Higher Ed Jobs. The department head also sends position vacancy announcements to relevant discussion groups and to regional Ph.D.-granting institutions.

Applicants participate in both phone and on-campus interviews, with reference checks occurring before the on-campus interview. On-campus interviews include sessions with the search committee, open forums, and a teaching demonstration.

H. 3. b) Qualifications (academic and experiential) typically required for new faculty

New faculty are required to hold the Ph.D. in a discipline relevant to the program. Candidates who have completed all requirements for the degree but have not yet defended the dissertation may be considered if the search committee and the candidate's dissertation committee feel certain that the dissertation will be defended early in the first semester of employment. New faculty must demonstrate teaching competence. New faculty in the English program typically have had experience teaching at the college or university level prior to employment at Ferris.

H. 3. c) Program's diversity goals for both gender and race/ethnicity in the faculty

The program strives to recruit a diverse faculty with representation of minority groups and gender equality.

H. 3. d) Assessment of the efforts being made to attain goals in (c)

The department structures search committees to be representative of the faculty and seeks to attract applicants from a broad array of sources. The department has used hiring policy exceptions to retain faculty as part of its diversity efforts.

H. 4. Orientation process for new faculty—description and assessment

New faculty are encouraged to participate in the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning pre-semester orientation, kick-off week activities, and first-year activities. Additionally, new faculty are assigned faculty mentors to whom they may turn for advice and who meet with the new faculty regularly throughout the first year to provide informal information on tenure and promotion, service work, and teaching. The department head also meets with faculty regularly to discuss tenure and promotion processes and to serve as a resource for new faculty.

H. 5. Reward structure for faculty

H. 5. a) Description of reward structure and eligibility criteria

The Department of Languages and Literature provides professional development funds through a committee application process. Those presenting papers at meetings or conferences receive higher awards than those simply attending meetings and conferences. Faculty generally receive funding for one meeting per year. The department head also has a small discretionary fund account that is used to fund professional development activities that fall outside the purview of the committee. The College of Arts and Sciences evaluates professional development funding on a case-by-case basis. The English B. A. program does not have professional development funding separate from the department.

H. 5. b) Impact of existing salary structure on the program's ability to recruit and retain quality faculty

The current salary structure has been adequate to recruit new faculty, but recent figures from the Modern Language Association and the Chronicle of Higher Education indicate that future hires will command significantly higher salaries

than our most recent hires. The resulting salary compression and/or salary inequity may create problems for faculty retention in the future.

H. 5. c) Adequacy of the current reward structure to support faculty productivity in teaching, research, and service

Funding for professional travel has remained fairly consistent for several years. As program faculty become ever more involved in national and international organizations, current levels of support for professional travel will be inadequate to meet the professional goals and aspirations of the faculty.

While several faculty members have been quite productive in terms of research and scholarship, the heavy teaching responsibilities in the department prevent many from pursuing their research agendas. Department-level reassigned time and/or mini-sabbatical leaves of up to half-time release for completing manuscripts for submission, etc. may become necessary.

H. 5. d) Enhancing diversity and inclusion is a component of the reward structure

We do not provide specific grants for enhancing diversity and inclusion in our current funding program. Nonetheless, the College of Arts and Sciences and the Vice President for Academic Affairs have recently fully funded attendance at diversity and equity conferences.

H. 6. Graduate instruction

The English B. A. program is an undergraduate program.

H. 7. Non-Tenure-Track and Adjunct Faculty

H. 7. a) Full-time non-tenure-track and adjunct faculty who taught courses in the program.

Non-tenure-track faculty do not regularly teach courses in the program.

I. SERVICE TO NON-MAJORS

I. 1. General Education courses

H. I. a) General Education service courses provided by the program faculty for other departments at FSU

GENERAL EDUCATION SERVICE COURSES			
PREFIX	TITLE	CREDITS	GE DESIGNATORS
ENGL 150	English 1	3	Comm. Comp.
ENGL 211	Industrial and Career Writing	3	Comm. Comp.
ENGL 222	Intro. to Creative Writing	3	C

ENGL 250	English 2	3	Comm. Comp.
ENGL 311	Advanced Technical Writing	3	Adv. Writing
ENGL 321	Advanced Composition	3	Adv. Writing
ENGL 323	Proposal Writing	3	Adv. Writing
ENGL 325	Advanced Business Writing	3	Adv. Writing
LITR 150	Introduction to Literature	3	C
LITR 170	Women in Contemporary Culture	3	R, C
LITR 180	Topics in American Lit. and Culture	3	C
LITR 202	Black Literature	3	R, C
LITR 203	Introduction to African Literature	3	G, R, C
LITR 204	Native American Literature	3	R, C
LITR 231	Poetry	3	W, C
LITR 233	Science Fiction	3	C
LITR 241	Intro. to World Short Fiction	3	G, C
LITR 242	American Popular Literature	3	C
LITR 243	Literature and Film	3	C
LITR 251	World Drama	3	C
LITR 261	World Novels	3	C
LITR 286	Justice in Literature	3	W, C
LITR 300-305	Global Literature	1	G, W, C
LITR 311	American Literature 1	3	W, C
LITR 312	American Literature 2	3	W, C
LITR 323	Shakespeare	3	W, C
LITR 326	Children's Literature	3	W, C
LITR 327	Adolescent Literature	3	W, C
LITR 328	Golden Age of Children's Lit.	3	W, C
LITR 330	Contemporary Literature	3	W, C
LITR 343	Crime and Violence in Literature	3	W, C
LITR 351	English Literature 1	3	W, C
LITR 352	English Literature 2	3	W, C
LITR 370	20 th Century Women Writers	3	R, C
LITR 380	World Folk Literature	3	G, W, C
LITR 401	Major Literary Movements	3	C
LITR 402	Major Authors	3	C

Most of our literature courses serve the English Education B. S. program as well as the English B. A. program. Literature 380: World Folk Literature is required for Elementary Education B. S. students and students in Digital Animation and Game Design. English 301 is required in both the Elementary Education and English Education programs.

The department and program generate a significant number of credit hours in general education courses. Departmental student credit hour production is illustrated below. Decreases in credit hour production are addressed in subsection I.1.c below.

DEPARTMENTAL STUDENT CREDIT HOUR PRODUCTION				
PREFIX	YEAR	FALL	WINTER	TOTAL
ENGL	2001-02	10,165	7896	18,061
ENGL	2002-03	9510	7938	17,448
ENGL	2003-04	10,103	7821	17,924
ENGL	2004-05	9398	7189	16,587
LITR	2001-02	1452	1719	3171
LITR	2002-03	1689	1893	3582
LITR	2003-04	1368	1686	3054
LITR	2004-05	1194	1430	2624

I. 1. b) Non-General Education service courses or courses required for other programs

English 074 is a college preparatory writing course offered by the Department of Languages and Literature. As the university has admitted better prepared students, we have seen significant decreases in the number of sections of English 074 offered by the department. As a result, we have fewer non-tenure line faculty teaching in the department.

I. 1. c) The impact of the provision of General Education and non-General Education courses on the program

The provision of General Education courses is beneficial to the English program because of the significance of the courses to the university. Many of the General Education courses benefit English majors directly and are part of their programs of study.

There are two major factors contributing to the credit hour production decrease between AY 2003-2004 and AY 2004-2005: 1) students are better prepared for college-level work, and 2) changes in other programs have impacted literature course offerings.

1.

STUDENTS WITH CLEP OR AP CREDIT FOR ENGLISH		
YEAR	COURSE	COUNT
2003	ENGL 150	179
	LITR 150	34
2004	ENGL 150	199
	LITR 150	34
2005	ENGL 150	180
	LITR 150	45

The preceding chart indicates that we saw an increase of 20 students with CLEP or AP credit between AY 2003 and AY 2004.

2.

AGGREGATE D, F, AND W NUMBERS FOR ENGLISH 150			
YEAR	COURSE	OFFICIAL GRADE	COUNT
2003	ENGL 150	D	62
		F	207
		W	146
2004	ENGL 150	D	44
		F	165
		W	124

AGGREGATE D, F, AND W NUMBERS FOR ENGLISH 250			
YEAR	COURSE	OFFICIAL GRADE	COUNT
2003	ENGL 250	D	45
		F	120
		W	203
2004	ENGL 250	D	40
		F	125
		W	203

The chart above indicates that there has been a significant decrease in the number of students earning Ds or Fs in English 150, and the withdrawal rate has decreased as well, pointing again to better preparation of our students and fewer credit hours being generated because of underperformance.

As students have been better prepared for college-level work, we have seen a steady decline in student enrollment in English 074. In AY 2005, we saw a decrease of 264 credit hours in English 074. There has been a steady decrease in 074 enrollment since AY 2001.

We have also seen a slight decrease in enrollment in English Education. Some of the enrollment decrease can be tied to the start of the History Education program, and some is in line with stronger advising of students.

As Ferris State University continues to admit better prepared students, we will see significant declines in English 074 and English 150. At the same time, our enrollments in English 250 will at least remain consistent, if not increase, while most of our upper-division writing courses have seen significant increases.

We are also recruiting more students into the English B. A., which will bring back enrollments in 300-level literature courses. Nonetheless, we are also focused on productivity for our faculty, which will impact the number of upper-division literature courses we are prepared to offer.

I. 1. d) The program’s plans to increase, decrease, or keep constant its level of service courses

Our service course offerings will remain consistent. While some courses have not been offered for some time and may be removed from the course catalog, the number of General Education course sections offered by the department will remain constant to satisfy university needs and demand.

J. DEGREE PROGRAM COST AND PRODUCTIVITY DATA

J. 1. Degree Program Cost

According to the most recent available data from Institutional Research, the average degree program cost for the English B. A. is \$19,522 (*See Appendix H*).

J. 2. Productivity Data

Faculty in the Department of Languages and Literature are quite productive. The table below illustrates student credit hour production per full-time equivalent faculty from 2001 to 2005.

CREDIT HOUR PRODUCTION PER FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT FACULTY (2001-2005)		
PREFIX	YEAR	SCH/FTEF
ENGL	2001-02	499.24
ENGL	2002-03	473.06
ENGL	2003-04	498.40
ENGL	2004-05	467.15
LITR	2001-02	488.87

LITR	2002-03	424.65
LITR	2003-04	449.20
LITR	2004-05	352.47

K. ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

Graduating seniors are required to present a portfolio of three to five pieces of their work (assignments) near the end of their final semester as well as make an oral presentation to members of the B. A. *ad hoc* committee and department faculty.

Assessment of the portfolio contents and the presentation is conducted by the committee using the following variables: demonstration of writing ability; ability to conduct literary analysis; understanding of the impact of cultural/historical contexts on works of literature as well as a knowledge of periods and movements; knowledge of critical (literary or rhetorical) theory and the ability to apply theory to interpretation; ability to make a clear and organized oral presentation of one of their own papers.

Members of the English B. A. *ad hoc* committee evaluate the portfolios/presentations at the end of each semester. To date, portfolios for thirteen students have been collected, and nine have been evaluated. (At the time our first two graduates completed the program, the committee had not yet decided on a method of evaluation, so none was conducted.) One of the graduating students did not attend the oral presentation. The total of the nine portfolios received a total of 34 separate evaluations by committee members. Assessment data in percentages is as follows:

- Evidence of
 - 100% Writing skills
 - 97% Ability to conduct literary analysis
 - 97% Understanding of cultural/historical contexts and periods
 - 82%* Knowledge of critical theory
- Oral presentation
 - 32% Judged excellent
 - 44% Acceptable
 - 12% Student or evaluator not present
- Some evaluators noted that rhetorical theory was in evidence as opposed to literary theory; this accounts for the remaining 18%.

L. ADMINISTRATION EFFECTIVENESS

L. 1. Adequacy of administrative and clerical support for the program

The departmental administrative and clerical support for the program have been excellent. Former head Dr. Roxanne Cullen and current head Dr. Reinhold Hill have enthusiastically worked with faculty to develop the program curriculum and requirements. Hill has provided effective staffing and scheduling; he regularly informs faculty of professional development opportunities and provides financial support for these activities as well as extracurricular activities for students, such as the annual Shakespeare's birthday celebration and pizza parties that enhance faculty-student interaction and increase student interest in the program. He has actively supported the renovation of classrooms with up-to-date educational technology.

Former department head Roxanne Cullen served as initial program coordinator at the program's inception and was assisted by Dr. Christine Persak, who initially served as sole student advisor. Persak became program coordinator in 2004 and has carried out all graduation audits as well as maintaining supportive relationships with alumni and assembling the B. A. advisory board. Working closely with Hill and faculty, Persak has effectively developed program curriculum and our portfolio-and-presentation outcomes assessment system. She continues to advise junior and senior students; faculty members Dr. Matthew Nikkari and Dr. M. Genevieve West have acted as advisors to freshman and sophomore students since 2004.

Departmental clerical staff Gayle Driggers and Debra Vance have ably assisted Hill, Persak, and individual faculty members. They admirably manage and process all essential paperwork and institutional forms related to travel, professional development, scheduling, overloads, etc. for a department of approximate 50 full-time and adjunct faculty members offering multiple majors and minors.

At the college level, former Dean Sue Hammersmith, current Dean Matt Klein and Interim Associate Dean Kevin Miller have actively supported the English B. A. Hammersmith was a strong advocate for the program during its development, and Klein has been helpful in responding to scheduling and funding needs. Klein and Miller have also supported faculty members' use of and training in web-based educational technologies. At the university level, Academic Affairs Associate Vice President for Operations and Assessment Roxanne Cullen has been instrumental in providing funding and support for the ongoing renovations of program classrooms and equipment.

L. 3. Efficiency of program and/or department administration

The program has been run in a very efficient manner. Because the Languages and Literature department and its large faculty shoulder a variety of responsibilities—offering general education writing and cultural enrichment courses, the technical communications and English education majors as well as the English B. A., and ten separate academic minors—administrative efficiency has long been a critical part of our successful operation.

L. 3. Efficiency/effectiveness of course schedule and its preparation

The department has an established, efficient faculty rotation system for program courses. Hill and Driggers work together effectively to staff courses and provide teaching schedules in a timely manner.

L. 4. Ability of students to take the courses they need in a timely manner

Hill has effectively monitored the scheduling of courses to insure that students can make efficient progress through the program. He has established a clear fall-winter rotation of core literature courses and has worked closely with Persak to coordinate course offerings with student advising to insure that students complete the program requirements efficiently. In addition, the department generally offers several on-ground or web-based literature courses, both core requirements and electives, in the summer term to provide another scheduling option for students.

Although the department has been able to schedule core requirements and electives during the regular academic year and summer term, there have been problems with the university cancelling under-enrolled sections, which has led to some students being unable to take necessary courses in a timely manner. While we recognize that economic feasibility must enter into decisions about course offerings, we also recognize a responsibility to provide students with the courses our program requires. As the student population of the program grows, the enrollment in core courses and electives, particularly at the 400 level, will grow as well, but in the interim, additional support for and flexibility about running small sections would help students to complete the program with fewer obstacles.

SECTION 4: FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

A. Instructional Environment 4-1
B. Computer Access and Availability 4-1
C. Other Instructional Technology 4-1
D. Library Resources 4-2

SECTION 4: FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

A. INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

The department currently manages eighteen classrooms, thirteen of which are technology-enhanced. Classroom resources are sufficient to meet program needs. However, students respond favorably to the recently remodeled classrooms and clearly prefer an environment with some color as well as larger desks. They also appreciate presence of the technology in the classroom. Ideally, all of the classrooms available to Languages and Literature would be technology-enhanced because the integration of media into English language and literature courses has become commonplace, putting a strain on our available classrooms with appropriate technology.

In the English B. A. Faculty Perceptions Survey, 18% of faculty who responded moderately disagreed that facilities and equipment are sufficient to meet program needs, 9.1% were neutral, 45.5% moderately agreed, and 27.3% strongly agreed. To a large extent, the faculty perceptions are in line with the current position of the department that we can manage with the facilities that we have, but that we are constrained by the number of classrooms we occupy, and that we would benefit from having all of our classrooms technology-enhanced.

We are currently in the process of creating one additional technology-enhanced classroom in the Alumni building. We have purchased the equipment and are collecting bids for the cabinet to hold the equipment. An additional room in the Alumni building is scheduled for remodeling and enhancement as part of the university plan.

B. COMPUTER ACCESS AND AVAILABILITY

The English B. A. program has three computer labs available for instructional use. Our computer labs are in the most need of attention. Our machines have become quite dated, and the configuration of the laboratories makes holding class discussions difficult.

Ruth Mirtz has been appointed chair of a work group to examine the computer labs and make recommendations beginning in the fall of 2006 for integration into future planning documents.

C. OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY

University computing resources limit the kinds of literature courses we can deliver online. We would like to see the university provide streaming media servers to host a class in literature and film as well as to enhance courses in linguistics and world folk literature. Indeed, many online courses could be enhanced through the use of streaming media.

Several of our courses are in development for online delivery, including ENGL 380 and 382, LITR 243, LITR 311 and 312, and LITR 352. Many program courses have been taught using a mixed-delivery format, but the fully online course development currently in progress will facilitate course delivery at our off-campus sites as well as provide more flexibility for our students on campus.

D. LIBRARY RESOURCES

D. 1. Book resources

Since the inception of the English B. A., the library has made an effort to expand, appropriately, its print and electronic collection. Owing to the continued importance of book materials to the Humanities in general and literature studies specifically, the book allocation for Languages and Literature is the largest for any single department or program on campus. Though this allocation is spent to support not only the English B. A. program but also the English Education B. S., the Technical and Professional Communication B. S., and the English- and foreign-language related minors, emphasis is placed upon acquiring books in the areas of literary criticism and language studies. The average book appropriation for Languages and Literature has been a little over \$16,000 per year since FY 2002.

The English B. A. faculty has taken an active role in collection development. Since January 2002, fourteen faculty members have requested nearly 400 titles in such areas as folklore, African American literature, children's literature, information literacy, and Shakespeare studies. The library has attempted to honor all such requests, failing only when books are out-of-print or otherwise unavailable for purchase.

Though holes in the collection still exist, nearly 19% (over 39,000 volumes) of the library's book collection resides in the Library of Congress classification subclass "P": Languages and Literature. There are also an additional 300+ volumes in the LC subclass "GR": Folklore. Since July 2001 there have been over 10,000 checkouts of books in the "P" LC subclass. Another healthy indicator of collection use is that nearly 40% of the books in the "GR" subclass have circulated in the past five years..

D. 2. Electronic resources

Over the past three years, the library has added four Web-based database products to support the English B. A. program. American Periodicals Series, JSTOR, and Project MUSE are full-text, multidisciplinary databases focusing on providing access to core journals. All contain significant Languages and Literature components. Literature Resource Center is a full-text product combining the Gale Literature Series and literary journal articles. The MLA International Bibliography, the main indexing source for literary journals, is an added component of Literature Resource Center. For FY 06, the library allocated about \$26,000 for continued access to these online products (Note that this amount also includes money spent for individual journal subscriptions relevant to the Department of Languages and Literature).

D. 3. Instructional services provided by library faculty

The current library liaison to Languages and Literature, Paul Kammerdiner, has provided extensive instructional services for the various classes offered by the department. For classes specifically offered in the English B. A. program, for example, Kammerdiner has given a literature research session for LITR 250, an early program prerequisite, for the past two years. He has also offered tailored sessions for a variety of other classes within the program and has created several handouts and Web pages to support research assignments in various classes. Former Distance Education Librarian Carrie Forbes also traveled to Traverse City to present library research sessions for 300-level LITR classes.

D. 4. FLITE budget adequacy

The annual FLITE budget has been generally adequate for programmatic needs. The library has ordered most of the books that faculty have requested. The growth of electronic resources has assisted both program faculty and students in their research. There are additional electronic resources, such as a subscription to ABELL, the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature, and the Online Oxford English Dictionary, that would be helpful to both faculty and students in the program, but their cost may be prohibitive at present.

SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS

A. Relationship to FSU Mission	5-1
B. Program Visibility and Distinctiveness	5-1
C. Program Value	5-1
D. Enrollment	5-2
E. Characteristics, Quality, and Employability of Students	5-2
F. Quality of Curriculum and Instruction	5-2
G. Composition and Quality of the Faculty	5-3
H. Advisory Board	5-3
I. Resources	5-3

SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. RELATIONSHIP TO FSU MISSION

Historically, the mission of Ferris State University has been to prepare students for careers. The English B. A. does not prepare students for a specific career path; it does prepare them for careers in communication, especially fields with an emphasis upon written communication.

The focus of the program is aligned with the President's three pillars: the program is student-centered, provides engagement activities, and fosters cooperation among faculty and between colleges.

B. PROGRAM VISIBILITY AND DISTINCTIVENESS

The English B. A. program is a traditional program focused on introducing students to a broad array of literatures in English from a variety of periods. However, many of our competing institutions offer a wider array of upper-division elective courses. At present, students are required to take one 400-level course, and as the program grows, we will offer more advanced electives for our students. The most distinctive aspect of our program is the number of upper-division writing-intensive courses our students take. Our focus on developing writing skills in all of our core literature courses is unique among our competing institutions.

One thing mentioned in the student and graduate survey was the benefit of having students in the program interact with each other outside the classroom. Students indicate they value knowing the other students in the program and forming friendships with them. While we sponsored an informal gathering for freshmen last year, we plan to offer one or two informal gatherings each year where all students in the program can meet and mingle to foster a sense of community among the English majors.

C. PROGRAM VALUE

The Department of Languages and Literature provides engagement and co-curricular activities for much of the campus. Faculty in the program are active in service to the community, department, and university. Program faculty are also active in the Academic Senate, in academic program review, and in interim administrative assignments throughout the university. Finally, program faculty provide instruction and training to regional K-12 students and teachers on writing and literature. We will continue to provide this level of service to our communities.

D. ENROLLMENT

The English B. A. program has quickly grown since its inception to more than thirty students. The program strives to attract highly qualified students from throughout the state. We have developed recruiting brochures and are working in conjunction with campus recruiting staff to increase enrollment.

The English B. A. *ad hoc* committee continues to discuss methods to attract qualified students to our program.

E. CHARACTERISTICS, QUALITY AND EMPLOYABILITY OF STUDENTS

As previously stated, the English major prepares students for an array of career possibilities rather than one specific profession. Some of the program's graduates will go on to academic careers while others will use their degrees as a foundation for further study or training in various communication-related fields.

To date, we have offered informal seminars about graduate training, focusing primarily on academic careers. However, comments from both graduates and advisory board members indicate that more needs to be done to help students make informed career choices and to better prepare them for graduate study.

We are discussing creating a one-credit capstone course focused on portfolio presentation, as well as careers and graduate study. Additionally, we plan to offer opportunities for students to meet people from a variety of fields who have applied their undergraduate English degrees in those fields, and former students who are currently in graduate school.

Finally, as part of advising, we will strive to make students aware of classes in technical and professional writing or journalism which can help them prepare for specific career choices and enhance their marketability after graduation.

F. QUALITY OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Overall, both students and faculty approve of the current quality of instruction, according to the respective surveys. However, as has been noted above, other programs with which we compete offer a greater array of upper-level elective courses to their English majors. While we have recently stipulated a 400-level literature course as a required elective, we have been unable to offer this course due to low enrollment numbers. As the new requirement takes effect, we are sure such a course will “make.”

Graduates, faculty, and advisory board members have some sound recommendations. They include offering more advanced electives focusing on specific literary periods, authors, and topics to help students better prepare for graduate education; and offering symposia where faculty and students present and discuss papers so students are made aware of the requirements of scholarly writing and the quality expected in publishable papers.

Members of the English B. A. *ad hoc* committee have also suggested that we alter the requirements for the portfolio contents and make evaluation criteria for the senior portfolio presentation more rigorous.

LITR 250, a course created for the major, has been a “work in progress” during the last three years. Faculty in the program have credited this course for the improved quality of writing done in the 300-level literature courses; however, we are discussing whether or not LITR 250 could be further enhanced by introducing students to critical approaches in more detail so that they can use such approaches in their 300-level courses and be better acquainted with critical theories prior to LITR 416.

G. COMPOSITION AND QUALITY OF THE FACULTY

Our program is taught by highly qualified faculty who actively engage in research and attend professional conferences. They work closely with students and are available outside of class. Indeed, current students and graduates were very positive about the faculty and the knowledge they provide to their students.

As our program grows and as retirements occur, we may need to hire new faculty trained in both literature and composition.

H. ADVISORY BOARD

Our advisory board was only recently created. As a result of our discussions with the advisory board this year and the advisory board survey, we plan to further discuss the perceived weaknesses in the program and work toward strengthening them.

One of our continuing goals is to recruit more members for the board from outside FSU. We also need to increase our department's awareness of the advisory board and its recommendations.

I. RESOURCES

Our faculty survey indicated that library resources could be increased, though no specific recommendations were made. We plan to survey faculty who teach in the program to find out what precise needs they may have in terms of library resources.

Additional funding may be needed for faculty sabbaticals, reassigned time, and international travel, as well as student engagement activities and classroom improvements.