University of Nevada, Reno
Department of English
Self-Study
Fall 2015

University of Nevada, Reno
Department of English Self-Study
Fall 2015

Table of Contents

D) Virtual Resources

VII   Working toward the Future: A Summary

Appendices

A. Department of English Bylaws
B. Department of English Committees, 2015-16
C. Guidelines for Review of Probationary Faculty
D. Major and Minor Specialization Forms
E. Four-Year Graduation Timetables
F. Graduate Advisement Procedures
G. Graduate Placement Workshops
H. Graduate Assessment Plans

I. Department Mission, Recent History, and Administrative Structure

A. Mission

The University of Nevada, Reno, the land grant and flagship research institution of the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), was established in 1874. The Department of English, one of the oldest at the university, has long had multiple roles in meeting the university's mission and began offering the Ph.D. in the 1960s. Our degree programs are the second largest in the College of Liberal Arts at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Our undergraduate program offers the B.A.; our graduate program offers the M.A., M.F.A., and Ph.D. The M.A. and Ph.D. programs include multiple curricular tracks, a reflection both of the expansion and evolution of English as a discipline and our long history as a department that includes linguistics and prepares many students who will become secondary teachers. Our doctoral program has an excellent record of placing its graduates in tenure-track faculty positions across the United States.

English also takes a central role in each level of the University of Nevada, Reno's Core Curriculum. The Core Writing Program within the department is responsible for all first-year writing courses. The department contributes substantially to Core Humanities, a collaborative interdisciplinary sequence of courses that meets the general education requirements in the humanities. The courses we offer to meet diversity and capstone requirements in the Core draw students from many departments and colleges.

Our faculty's commitment to our research and teaching missions is evident in the fact that they have been recipients of the Nevada Carnegie/CASE Professor of the Year, the system's Regents' Teaching Award, the University's Outstanding Researcher Award and the F. Donald Tibbitts Distinguished Teacher Award. They have also received numerous awards at the college level. English faculty serve extensively at the university and several have taken leadership roles in both the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council.

B. Recent History

Over the last twenty-five years the Department of English has made a concerted effort to become the kind of department expected at a research institution, one with excellent teaching, an international research reputation, and a well-respected Ph.D. program. We have made significant progress toward this goal, which continues to be our chief priority. We have developed and expanded our undergraduate and graduate programs to reflect current developments in the discipline. We have continued our solid commitment to the general education of all undergraduates. We have worked to establish departmental practices that meet or exceed the guidelines set by the major professional organizations in English studies: the Modern Language Association, the Association of Departments of English, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the Council of Writing Program Administrators. In addition to gauging ourselves through comparison with peer institutions, we consult national benchmarks for program objectives and practices, including curriculum, class sizes, and instructional staffing.

The seven years since our last review have not been a particularly easy time, although the University's commitment to the English Department continued to be manifest throughout,

most fundamentally in the "vertical cuts" elsewhere in the university so that English could remain strong, or at least maintain its numbers. The number of English continuing faculty (tenure-track and continuing lecturers combined) has expanded slightly, from 32 in 2007 to 34 in 2015. Several of our present tenure-track faculty are recent additions: two joined the department in 2013, two in 2014, and four in 2015. We are undertaking three more tenure-track searches for positions beginning in 2016.

C. Administrative Structure

The College of Liberal Arts bylaws state that department chairs "shall be responsible to the dean for implementing college policies and procedures, and responsible to faculty for implementing policies and procedures mandated by department or unit bylaws" (III.13.A). In English, as specified in our bylaws, the chair shares that responsibility with four faculty members: the Associate Chair (a new position as of this year), and the three directors of our instructional programs: the Director of Undergraduate Studies, the Director of Graduate Studies, and the Director of the Core Writing Program. In addition, the department has permanent, standing, and ad hoc committees as necessary to carry out its responsibilities. (The department has no administrative responsibility for the University Writing Center.)

The department chair, associate chair, and three directors each serve terms of three years and may be re-elected. The faculty holds an election to determine its nominee. For department chair, the faculty recommends its nominee to the dean, who recommends to the provost, who recommends to the university president, who appoints. For associate chair and directors, the faculty recommends its nominee to the chair, who appoints. The current department leadership, with terms of service, includes:

> Eric Rasmussen, Chair (2008-)
> Ashley Marshall, Associate Chair (2015-2018)
> Ann Keniston, Director of Undergraduate Studies (2015-2018)
> Valerie Fridland, Director of Graduate Studies (2013-2017)
> Melissa Nicolas, Director of Core Writing (2015-2018).

The only major change to our administrative structure since the last review is the recent addition of the associate chair position.

The chair and directors meet together at least once per month during the academic year as well as individually as needed; together they form the department's Planning Committee (as of this year, along with the associate chair). The chair consults with the associate chair and the directors in preparing personnel and budget requests, planning course and teaching schedules, and proposing new policies. The committee works together to prepare planning documents and shared responsibility for preparing this self-study.

In the 1990s the department chair chaired every faculty search committee. Since 1999, faculty members other than the chair have headed search committees (with the exception of one search that could have resulted in a senior hire). The chair now elects the degree to which he or she will be involved in searches, and as of this year the chair and associate chair share responsibilities where there are multiple searches (this year we are running three searches; the chair is overseeing two of them, and the associate chair the third).

The administrative responsibilities of faculty who serve as department chair, associate chair, or director are recognized in their faculty role statements, which specify the weighting of their annual evaluation, in a partial reassignment from teaching, and in some instances by a stipend, which partly acknowledges the fact that though faculty have nine-month contracts, these positions all now have twelve-month responsibilities.

At present the department recognizes administrative work as follows:

Table I-A. Department of English Administration

	Role Statement Percentage for Administration	**Course Reassignment (per semester)**	**Stipend (per year)**
Chair	50%	1 course	$12,500 plus one month's salary
Associate Chair	25%	1 course	$4500
Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUS)	20%	1 course	$3000
Director of Graduate Studies (DGS)	25%	1 course	$4500
Director of Core Writing (DCW)	35%	1 course	$5200

Role statement percentages for directors are determined by the chair and approved by the dean; the percentage for the chair is determined centrally. Stipend levels require approval by central administration and reflect both university-established ranges and historical arrangements. Since our last program review, the chair's stipend has remained the same, but the month's salary was not added until 2011. At the time of our last program review, the DUS did not receive a stipend; the department sought and received approval for a stipend for that position the following year (2008). Variation in role statement percentages and stipend levels for these positions reflect the fact that the positions vary in responsibility. (It is essential to note, however, that the percentages represent the weighting of responsibilities for faculty annual evaluation, not the actual time these responsibilities consume.)

The English Personnel Committee evaluates the administrative work of the chair, associate chair, and directors, after inviting feedback from all members of the department faculty, as part of the process of annual faculty evaluation. The dean evaluates the work of the chair annually.

The department is an institutional member of ADE and provides full funding should the chair and directors wish to attend summer workshops appropriate to their administrative responsibilities. The chair regularly attends the ADE Summer Seminar, and graduate directors have done so occasionally. The Core Writing director has attended the WPA summer workshop. (For an analysis of classified staff and financial support for the department's administrative work, see section VI below.)

D. Analysis

The department's administrative structure and means of self-governance have evolved over the last decade in ways that are serving us well. As we look ahead, we have much reason for optimism: the department has established closer communication between chairs and directors and developed methods of planning and self-governance that work. (Planning methods are discussed in more detail in the sections on faculty and each of the instructional programs.) We have benefited considerably from some of the university-wide changes in the last several years. We have been able to hire excellent new faculty, our national research profile is growing, our students are doing well, and our interests are represented at the college and university levels. We have built a good foundation for our work in the next decade.

However, we also have reason for concern. The implementation of the associate chair position has been under discussion for several years, and it should be a considerable improvement in the department's administrative structure. Not only does this change make the job of department chair less untenable; it also represents a way of addressing / achieving one of the goals we stated in our last self-study: "Prepare faculty to assume administrative responsibilities—at appropriate points in their professional lives—in the coming decades." The associate chair is not exactly an apprenticeship, and we've carefully avoiding setting it up as a natural succession from associate chair to chair—but it should give more faculty members opportunities for administrative experience and service. As the roles of chair and directors have become more heavily administrative, fewer faculty have been prepared or inclined to assume them. The addition of the associate chair should improve that situation—but in light of continued growth and continued corporatization, it remains difficult to mesh deeply-held commitments to faculty governance with the realities of an increasingly bureaucratic institution. These concerns are not unique to our department, of course, but they are especially visible in a department of our complexity and size. The current chair is serving beyond his two terms in office because of the absence of candidates willing to take on the position. The department is very young in a number of respects, with several junior faculty—assistants and young associates—who will no doubt be able to assume the leadership mantle a few years down the road. But we remain concerned that the institution is moving in a direction that will make faculty leadership of academic departments more difficult to sustain.

II. Faculty

A. Composition of the Faculty and Instructional Staff

The Department of English includes several kinds of faculty and instructional positions. Our baseline state budget currently includes 34 continuing faculty positions: 28 tenure-track positions and 6 continuing lectureships.[1] It also includes 40 graduate assistantships.[2] Each year,

---

[1] The total of 34 includes the five faculty serving as chair, associate chair, and directors, one holding another part-time administrative appointment (director of the Gender, Race, and Identity Program), one whose appointment is currently half in English half in Judicial Studies, and one with an administrative appointment as Director of the Composition and Communication in the Disciplines Program. Two additional tenured members of the English Department currently hold full-time administrative

we request considerable supplemental instructional funding for 15 contingent lectureships, and numerous adjunct instructors. At present, we have one tenured faculty member in retirement phase-in, as well as a continuing lecture. All told, over one hundred individuals teach for the department each semester.

As required by university policy and both college and departmental bylaws, each faculty member has a formal statement of professional responsibilities or role statement. Our role statements specify the weighting of those responsibilities for annual evaluation, and each kind of faculty position has a customary weighting. The following chart includes all instructional positions—faculty, teaching assistants, and adjunct instructors. Definitions are in order, since terminology varies from one institution to another and some of our positions are unusual:

- **Continuing faculty** = Faculty hired in continuing positions, funded in our base budget. Includes both **tenure-track faculty** and **lecturers**, who are eligible for retention through a process parallel to the tenure process. All continuing faculty receive annual evaluations and are eligible for promotion, merit increases in salary, and sabbatical or professional development leave. All receive full benefits. Formally, the department is composed of its continuing faculty, all of whom may vote in departmental matters.
    - o **Tenure-track faculty** = Faculty hired in tenure-track positions, all of which are funded in our base budget. Tenure-track faculty typically teach two courses per semester and mentor graduate students. Their customary role statement is 40% teaching, 40% research, 20% service. By Graduate Council policy, they are the graduate faculty who chair and serve on graduate student committees.
    - o **Lecturers** = Faculty hired in continuing positions defined as lectureships, all of which are funded in our base budget. "Continuing lecturers" typically teach seven courses over two semesters (a 4/4 load with a one-course release per year for advising), and they have a specific service assignment in the department. Their customary role statement is 60% teaching, 20% professional development, 10% specific assignment, 10% service.
- **Contingent Lecturers ("term lecturers")** = Faculty hired in one-year lectureships, all of which are funded though supplemental instructional funding that is approved annually. Contingent lecturers receive annual evaluation and are eligible for merit. They receive benefits (including retirement matching funds). They are not eligible for promotion, sabbatical, or professional development leave. They hold full-time or .80 appointments: the former teach 4 courses per semester and mentor new instructors; the latter teach 3 courses per semester and mentor. The university would allow us to renew contingent contracts year after year. However, the department has determined that for the professional well-being of the individuals hired and the faculty balance within the department these appointments should be of fixed duration. We hire contingent lecturers in national searches that specify that these appointments are not renewed beyond a third year. Some hires are recent Ph.D.s or M.F.A.s, others ABD, others new M.A.s. Most contingent lecturers who have terminal degrees have landed tenure-track positions upon leaving our department.

---

appointments as Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Vice Provost of the University, respectively.

[2] Four additional assistantships are in the Core Humanities budget but formally assigned to English.

- **Teaching Assistants** = Graduate students who hold assistantships to support their studies. Two-thirds of our TAs serve as instructors of record in sections of Core Writing courses, teaching two courses one semester, one the other semester. One-third serve as discussion leaders in Core Humanities, with responsibility for two discussion sections per semester. M.A. students may hold a TA for two years, Ph.D. students for five. (However, by state regulation a student who completes both degrees at Nevada may hold a TA for a maximum of six years.) Assistantships provide a stipend (currently $17,000 per year), in-state status, a shrinking percentage of course fees (currently about 75%), and health insurance.
- **Letter of Appointment instructors ("LOA instructors")** = Individuals hired on an adjunct basis. Our current LOA pool includes graduate students who have exhausted their TA appointments, new graduate students to whom we are unable to offer TAs, community members, and Ph.D. candidates teaching an additional course to obtain experience in their specialty. LOA contracts are not formally considered faculty appointments. LOA instructors receive $2700 per three-credit course. If they teach three courses or more at NSHE institutions they are eligible for health benefits, but only after three months. They are eligible for an education grant-in-aid to cover partial waiver of course fees (currently about 75%), but only for the number of credits they're teaching, up to a cap of six credits per semester.

Table I-B. Composition of the Department of English instructional staff by faculty rank, employment status, terminal degrees held, gender, and ethnicity—Fall 2007

POSITION	NUMBER	STATUS	TERMINAL DEGREES	GENDER	ETHNICITY
CONTINUING FACULTY	34 total + 3				
tenure-track	28				
--professor Rank IV	7	tenured		3 F, 4 M	7 Caucasian
--associate professor Rank III	13	tenured		7 F, 6 M	13 Caucasian
--assistant professor Rank II	8 + 3	tenure-track		3 F, 5 M	8 Caucasian
lecturers	6 total				
--lecturer Rank 0(IV)	6	retained	2 (1 MFA, 1 PhD)	4 F, 2 M	6 Caucasian
--lecturer Rank 0(III)	0	retained	--	--	--
--lecturer Rank 0(II)	0	eligible for retention	--	--	--
CONTINGENT FACULTY					
--lecturer Rank 0(I)	15	contingent		9 F, 7 M	13 Caucasian 1 Native American

Faculty searches of the last decade have led to tenure-track hires from Penn State, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, University of Texas at Austin, Vanderbilt, NYU, University of Virginia, University of Wisconsin at Madison, University of New Hampshire, Syracuse, Illinois State, and Temple.

The continuing faculty is perfectly balanced between men and women—17 women, 17 men—and though there are more associate professors than full and assistant professors, seven of those associate professors have been promoted to that rank in the last few years.

Perhaps the most pressing diversity issue facing the department is the matter of faculty diversity. While the faculty of the university is 20% diverse, and the president's and provost's goal is to achieve 25% diversity, the English department currently has no faculty of color among the graduate faculty. The English department is beginning to address this issue by attending to the idea that ideally *all* hires could be diversity hires, not just positions focused on minority literatures, and by writing ads that name desired secondary areas that are likely to increase faculty diversity. If the department is successful with these hires, it will also likely need to consider what is involved in retaining faculty from underrepresented groups. In fall 2014, the department created a faculty diversity officer. That diversity officer has served in an advisory role to search committees when requested, and the University has now required the presence of a "diversity advocate" on all tenure-line searches at UNR, but it remains unclear what the way forward is for improving faculty diversity. For more on the diversity of our student population, see the enrollment section of the undergraduate report below, and in the graduate report, the section entitled "Number, Distribution, Quality, and Diversity of Students."

B. Continuing Faculty

The Department of English has 34 faculty positions, 28 tenure-track and 6 continuing lectureships, and is currently searching for three new tenure-track positions. Faculty are expected to teach well across a range of courses, including those in their specialties designed for English majors/minors and graduate students, those in the university's Core Curriculum, and those that primarily enroll students from other majors. The tenure-track faculty are expected to publish nationally in refereed venues of high quality, and continuing lecturers are expected to pursue a program of professional development that may include various kinds of achievement including publication. All are expected to serve professionally. As required by NSHE, each faculty member is evaluated annually in each area of professional responsibility each calendar year. Most of our current faculty have spent the majority of their professional lives at Nevada, and their investment in the university as well as in the profession is evident in their considerable commitment to university service.

1. New Faculty

Since our last review the department has conducted numerous national searches, and in the course of doing so we have regularly defined and revised our priorities. Before requesting permission to fill an existing faculty line or seek a new one, the continuing faculty meets to discuss hiring priorities, taking into account both our teaching and research missions. We make decisions, for instance, to reallocate positions from one field to another and to prioritize a replacement in one over a replacement in another. We have also obtained new positions in areas that complement existing expertise. These new faculty have had considerable effect on our undergraduate and graduate programs. They

have helped to update and diversify our literature curriculum, meet the demands of a rapidly growing undergraduate major in writing, revive a once moribund undergraduate major in language and linguistics, support the new graduate emphasis Public Engagement, and develop a growing constituency in creative writing that has allowed us to launch an M.F.A. program. They have done much to enhance our research profile as well. In a period when the institution's research expectations for both tenure and promotion have been increasing, our faculty have more than met those expectations with refereed publications of considerable quality.

English takes seriously the obligation to mentor as well as to evaluate new faculty. The university requires us to conduct thorough third-year reviews, and we do. In addition, the senior faculty reviews the progress toward tenure or retention of each probationary faculty member each spring. Through this process, we aim to provide feedback that is constructive as well as frank (see Appendix C, Guidelines for Review of Probationary Faculty).

2. Teaching

Continuing faculty teach all graduate seminars, nearly all upper-division courses in the major and minor, and over half of the foundation courses for majors and minors. They also regularly teach in the university's Core Curriculum: tenure-track faculty typically teach one lower-division Core course each year, continuing lecturers typically teach two. About half do this teaching in Core Writing, the university's first-year writing program (see section V below), half in Core Humanities, the interdisciplinary sophomore-level sequence designed to meet the humanities general education requirements. Core Humanities operates as a separate program in the College of Liberal Arts. Continuing faculty also regularly offer upper-division diversity and capstone courses in the Core. Faculty committees in the different fields are responsible for revisions to the curriculum at the undergraduate and graduate level. They also propose new courses in view of curricular need, disciplinary changes, faculty interest, and student demand.

Until recently, in a typical year, a tenure-track faculty member could expect to teach a lower-division Core course, a graduate seminar, and two courses for English majors/minors. Now, because of relatively low enrollments in the graduate program—a trend that seems to be reversing now—and because of a growing faculty, we can no longer assign every tenure-track faculty member a graduate seminar. The expectation now is that a tenure-track faculty member will teach a seminar every other year (though we do try to ensure that those working their way toward tenure get as much opportunity as possible to develop their teaching portfolios in that way). A continuing lecturer will teach two lower-division Core courses, three sophomore- or junior-level courses (some for majors, some for nonmajors), and one upper-division course for English majors/minors. These representative schedules vary depending on the faculty member's areas of expertise, departmental needs, and patterns of student enrollment. Faculty may apply for Instructional Enhancement Grants from the Office of the Provost to support teaching innovation; they may also attend university and NSHE workshops on teaching.

At the undergraduate level, we have sufficient faculty numbers and expertise to offer a full slate of upper-division courses in British and American literatures and an expanding slate of courses in rhetoric, writing, and linguistics. Our coverage is thin in

some periods of literary studies: for example, we have no one whose primary field is British Romanticism (though the eighteenth-century British literature person we hired in 2011 is qualified and willing to teach that course). At the graduate level, we have sufficient faculty numbers and expertise to offer our full programs. In a typical year, 6 English faculty have a part-time reassignment from teaching to administration, and 6 are away for a full year or semester due to sabbatical, faculty development leave, medical leave, teaching in programs of the University Study Abroad Consortium (USAC), or are teaching primarily in the Core Humanities Program as Distinguished Fellows. We often have 1-2 positions open for a year or two between retirements and new hires.

For more detailed discussion of how we meet our instructional mission, see the undergraduate report below, which provides statistical information. Of course, FTE numbers and section counts provide only a partial measure of teaching in our department. Teaching includes the time-intensive work of chairing and serving on the committees of M.A. and Ph.D. students in English and other departments; overseeing independent studies and internships; advising undergraduate majors and minors; and training and mentoring new teachers.

For more detailed discussion of our curriculum and curricular priorities, see sections III and IV below.

3. Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity

Our research programs are thriving. Over the last three years, English faculty placed books (now published or now in press) with several major publishers and university presses, including the following: Cambridge University Press, Johns Hopkins University Press, Oxford University Press, University of Georgia Press, Temple University Press, Utah State University Press, University of Delaware Press, Routledge, Palgrave Macmillan, and Broadview. They placed articles and review essays in major refereed journals including *Modern Philology*, *Philological Quarterly*, *Studies in Philology*, *Lingua*, *Modern Fiction Studies*, *Modernism/Modernity*, *Journal of Modern Literature*, *Rhetoric Review*, *College Composition and Communication*, *Rhetorica*, *Studies in Bibliography*, *The Library*, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, and *Modern Language Review*.

English faculty regularly present their new research at annual meetings of major professional organizations, including the MLA, NCTE and CCCC, LSA, MSA, SSNL, ASLE, RMMLA, and WLA. Our graduate students do so as well. In specializations such as rhetoric and composition and linguistics where collaborative research is customary, faculty regularly involve graduate students in research projects, present with them at conferences, and publish jointly.

English and the College of Liberal Arts actively support research and creative work that will help to enhance both the intellectual environment on campus and the department's research profile nationally and internationally. Between 1996 and 2012, English and the college provided the institutional home for the journal *ISLE: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, edited by faculty with graduate student assistance. The 2008 Rocky Mountain MLA Conference was held in Reno, as was the 2015 meeting of the Western Literature Association, the latter organized by the society co-president, a member of our department.

Our overall priority in research is to increase our national prominence as a Ph.D.-granting department at the state's flagship, research institution. Research, scholarship, and creative work are central to our understanding of the discipline, our teaching of graduate and undergraduate students, and our professional lives. They are also a central part of the faculty's responsibility to the university: research is 40% of a tenure-track faculty member's workload, and professional development (which may include research) is 20% of a continuing lecturer's workload. The university's expectations in research, scholarship, and creative activity have all increased considerably in the last decade. That academic careers require one to obtain external funding or use one's salary to support the research that is a requirement of one's employment is a familiar fact of academic life. English faculty members have developed strong research programs despite the modest funding that the institution provides to support faculty research. It has been a challenge to create increased support for research at an institution so pressed by rapid growth, but the department, college, and university have all been successful in doing so (as we discuss in section VI below). We will continue to make the most of this support. We also anticipate an increased emphasis on obtaining external funding to support research in the decade ahead.

In the seven years since our last program review, faculty in our department have obtained significant external grant funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Science Foundation. They have won awards for their creative work from the National Endowment for the Arts and the PEN/America Foundation, along with the Western Literature Association Frederick Manfred Award for Creative Writing, and the Nevada Governor's Award for Excellence in the Arts. One faculty member was a finalists for both the 2014 Phi Beta Kappa's Christian Gauss Award and the 2014 Edgar Allan Poe Award. They have secured research fellowships from the NEH, the American Council of Learned Societies, the Humanities Research centers at Rice and Stanford, and humanities and arts organizations in Nevada.

4. Service

English has a long tradition of extensive service to the university as well as in the profession. We're a large department—about twenty percent of the College of Liberal Arts—and we contribute significantly to faculty governance at the college and university levels. In most years, a faculty member from English serves in an elected or appointed role on each standing college committee, and English faculty are often elected to represent the humanities disciplines or the college as a whole in the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council; at present our department has two representatives on the Faculty Senate and one on the Executive Board of that body. Our faculty regularly serve on teaching-related panels in Core Writing and Core Humanities or as consultants for the Excellence in Teaching Program. They serve on the Honors Program board and volunteer to evaluate applications for Graduate Student Association awards. They're asked to speak at sororities and show up to tutor student athletes. As a faculty, we seek to be represented and have a voice in the affairs of the university, and we benefit from our involvement in university-wide matters.

In the profession, English faculty regularly serve in the leadership of scholarly organizations, including RMMLA, WLA, ASLE, and others. They serve as series editors, journal editors, book review editors, and contributing editors. They review manuscripts

for presses and applications to granting agencies. They write external reviews in tenure and promotion cases and serve as external consultants or reviewers of departments and programs.

C. Instructional Mission and Enrollment Growth

Determining how to handle rapid enrollment growth at the undergraduate level without failing to meet the department's full mission in teaching, research, and service has been one of the primary challenges of the last decade. While growth is an institution-wide phenomenon, it poses distinctive challenges for English because we provide the university's first-year writing curriculum and our own majors and minors are writing intensive. Strategies for addressing the challenges of enrollment growth have been a major concern of every university and college planning and review document in the last decade. Consistently, the university has taken the stand that to the degree possible, university-level courses should be taught by continuing faculty rather than contingent instructors. At the same time, it has recognized that the state's funding for higher education is not commensurate with its commitment to open university education to a higher percentage of Nevadans.

After analysis and discussion, the department established criteria for a mix of instructional positions that would be suitable to the department's mission as well as realistic in the context of Nevada's budgetary situation:

- Continuing faculty positions should be at least 2/3 tenure-track, at most 1/3 continuing lectureships
- The number of term lectureships should not exceed 1/2 the number of continuing faculty
- LOA instructors should teach at most 20% of first-year writing courses (the percentage of 200-400-level courses is smaller, depending on expertise, typically no more than 7.5% of sections).
- TA positions should increase in accord with graduate program size and recruitment goals.

Since developing these modest criteria, we have consistently sought to maintain and expand our faculty and instructional staff with replacement and new positions that are suitable to our mission and the standards of our discipline. We work from these criteria in preparing our annual requests for faculty positions (replacement and new) and for supplemental instructional funding (to hire contingent lecturers and LOA instructors). From an institutional standpoint, we have done well in an era when the gap between resources and needs has grown exponentially. From a disciplinary standpoint, however, our limited success must be seen in the context of our having lost ground overall.

D. Changes to the continuing lecturer positions

At the close of the spring semester in 2008, the administration and the English department chair increased the workload of three continuing lecturers (and one tenure-track faculty member). Two of three continuing lecturers filed an EEOC complaint and by the following year the administration increased the workload of all continuing lecturers in the department.

For nearly twenty years the workload had been 3/3 plus significant professional development and service components. The latter varied: some lecturers worked with the writing center director, others helped administer English 098, 101, or 102 programs and so on. This arrangement was part of a plan to professionalize the position of Continuing Lecturer in the department.

Once underway, the plan produced varied and significant results. Lecturers began attending conferences, and also presenting papers and chairing panels at a variety of conferences. At least five of the lecturers also published books over years; indeed two of the lecturers first targeted for increased workloads had six books between them and the third lecturer regularly published articles in journals. One year, hers was the only publication in a refereed article in the department. (One of the lecturers is the most recent co-president of the Western Literature Association, and organized the conference that met in Reno in October 2015—a conference for which he got no support from the college, though the English department and other programs contributed to the event.) In short, the period leading up to the workload increase saw regular substantial productivity among all the continuing lecturers.

Their service was substantial at every level of the university. They were committee members in the department, college, and university and they chaired many such committees, served in the faculty senate (a continuing lecturer chaired the senate one year), served on ad hoc committees at every level and chaired as well as served on search committees within the English department. These faculty were retained and promoted in parallel with tenure-track faculty, awarded raises, and asked then to serve on promotion committees for those not yet at rank IV among the continuing lecturers. In nearly every sense they were full participants in the department, following a career path that benefited the university, the departments and our students.

The current workload for continuing lecturers is 4/4 with a release for significant advising for five of these faculty. In fact, all official advising within the department has been done by a small group of continuing lecturers for at least the past ten years.

How has the shift in workload benefitted the department, the university, and its students? As the chair of the department noted in a recent committee meeting, evaluations show that lecturer teaching has been negatively impacted. In four-course semesters, these faculty have at times faced three- preparation semesters and even a four-preparation semester (probably not more than twice). To avoid that burden lecturers have often taught multiple sections of the same course or two year in and year out. Their productivity has declined steeply, a loss compounded by the refusal of the university to grant developmental leaves to these faculty despite backing by the department.

Continuing lecturers have been further marginalized. The college has badgered the department to staff basic composition courses with continuing lecturers. They cannot serve on search committees for tenure-track faculty, despite a long, proven record of excellent performance on such committees for over twenty years. Many of their tenured colleagues feel that this is a mistake and an injustice. While lecturers still serve indispensably in the department they are almost never on college or university committees now. Their experience in such matters of governance has been set aside. The gain to the university amounts to a few hundred dollars, the difference being the money saved by replacing a few LOAs with regular faculty (a savings eclipsed by the inevitable and persistent reliance by admin on those LOAs). In short, no one has benefitted from this change in workload, but many have felt its deleterious impact.

E. Diversity

Since the last self-study, the University's student diversity has increased, and in this time the English department has been actively pursuing the recruitment and retention of diverse student populations. Specific data and details about graduate student and undergraduate student diversity are discussed in the corresponding sections, but attracting diverse students works better with a more diverse faculty—and this is perhaps the most pressing diversity issue facing the department. While the faculty of the university is 20% diverse, and the administration's goal is to achieve 25% diversity, the English department currently has no faculty of color among the graduate faculty. The English department is beginning to address this issue by attending to the idea that ideally *all* hires could be diversity hires, not just positions focused on minority literatures, and by writing ads that name desired secondary areas that are likely to increase faculty diversity. If the department is successful with these hires, it will also likely need to consider what is involved in retaining faculty from underrepresented groups.

In Fall 2014, the department created a diversity officer position. The faculty member who has been in this role has focused initially on gathering data about the English Department's demographics compared to those of the university at large and on making connections to other units on campus that serve diverse populations as well as those which deal more generally with student retention and recruiting. Specific efforts at undergraduate and graduate-level student recruiting are discussed in the relevant sections. Going forward, the diversity officer will continue to work in collaboration with the DGS and DUS to focus on direct outreach to recruit diverse student populations and on programs to help retain these students. The issue of recruiting and retaining diverse faculty members remains more challenging, and while the diversity officer has served in an advisory role to search committees when requested, and the University has now required the presence of a "diversity advocate" on all tenure-line searches at UNR, it is less clear what the way forward is for improving faculty diversity.

Faculty diversity and student diversity are linked in a variety of ways. The diversity among English majors and minors has improved somewhat, reflecting the demographic changes in the university at large. These changes are discussed in the undergraduate section of the document. Additionally, we have a number of courses on the books at the undergraduate level that address diversity issues, including courses in sociolinguistics, women's literature, postcolonial and American minority literatures. These courses will continue to be featured aspects of the curriculum with the transition to the new Silver Core. The real challenge we face at the undergraduate level is having faculty with research expertise to teach the upper level classes. Now that the department has more diversity among our undergraduates, the next project is to be sure the department retains and supports these students.

The diversity among English department graduate students has stayed roughly the same since the previous self-study. This is an area in which the department would like to see growth, as the diversity among English department students does not mirror that of graduate students in the University. The department has started making specific efforts to recruit more diverse graduate students, but we also see this issue as closely linked to matters of faculty diversity. As with undergraduate students, we have many graduate students with interest in fields that might be considered diversity-related (minority literatures, world literatures and postcolonial theory, indigenous studies queer theory, feminist theory, disability studies, etc.), and we offer courses at

the 600 and 700 level in topics including postcolonial literature, sociolinguistics and African American literature, but we do not have many faculty with the research expertise necessary to support seminars in all of these fields. More problematically, it is difficult to make up graduate committees for these students. This year, we are searching for a faculty member in Global Anglophone literature. In the future, we would hope to search for faculty members in Chicano/a literature and Native American linguistics. These hires would help us to offer more robust support for our graduate students' research interests.

F. Analysis

The department's faculty has handled the teaching challenges and increasing research expectations of the last decade well, and we have made excellent, strategic hires who have helped not only to maintain but also to build and enhance our programs. Our faculty publishes refereed work of high quality with major academic presses and in premiere journals. We've come a long way toward what we expect of ourselves—and the institution expects of us—as a Ph.D.-granting department at a research institution. In many ways this is an exciting time in our history.

Obviously, we are concerned that what we have achieved not collapse under the weight of our under-funded teaching mission. Some of the developments of the last decade have been necessary, including the addition of fixed-term lectureships. What we have in place now is working reasonably well—albeit with precarious, inadequate funding, as discussed in section VI below. But it may well fracture under the modest but steady continued growth that Planning, Budget, & Analysis projects for the next five years. It will surely collapse if the dramatic growth sought by the university president becomes a reality.

In short, the mix of instructional positions in our department has long since passed the limit of what is sound. It violates the university's own planning priorities and many professional guidelines. It sets serious constraints on the department's ability to improve its quality and stature. The tenured portion of our faculty is small enough that more than a third (this year, 7 of 20) hold administrative appointments that limit their contribution to the department's teaching and research mission. The continuing faculty is a small enough portion that as the numbers of majors/minors increase we may have to choose whether to give priority to the undergraduate program or to the Core Curriculum. Continuity in instruction and the institutional commitment that allows room and time for curricular innovation are particularly limited in Core Writing (see section V below). The department's teaching and research missions would each benefit were we able to reduce the considerable portion of faculty time that must now be spent on the constant hiring, training, and mentoring of new contingent instructors of all types.

As we look ahead to the next decade, much of our future rests on NSHE's ability to obtain adequate state assistance for higher education and the university administration's ability to turn that assistance into the kinds of instructional positions appropriate to our comprehensive mission. What is most frustrating in this situation is that the policies and fiscal realities within which we must operate lie far outside our control. In our lifetimes, English will always include a mix of continuing and contingent instructional positions. We hope, as discussed in section VI below, that the funding for the latter can be stabilized.

Our planning regarding faculty has two focuses. First, we seek to hire the best possible faculty members, mentor those faculty members well, support them professionally, and keep

them at Nevada. Since the last program review only four continuing faculty have elected to leave the department, three of whom were individuals in their first or second year who sought a different kind of position or one in a location better suited to personal obligations. One point of concern is that English, reflecting national trends in professional employment, has a growing percentage of faculty whose personal lives involve commuting long distances. A decade ago about 6% of continuing faculty were in this situation; now about 18% are. Nevada, like most state-assisted universities, does not have a spousal hiring program but is committed to the needs of two-career couples.

Our support for continuing faculty has been good. We have been able to maintain the faculty workloads the department established early in the 1990s. These arrangements included tenure-track faculty assuming increased responsibilities in graduate mentoring and continuing lecturers playing an increased, central role in the undergraduate major/minor. They have allowed us to handle the growth of our undergraduate degree program while continuing our commitment to the Core, strengthening our graduate program, and significantly enhancing our stature in research.

Faculty annual evaluation, required by NSHE policy, is based on faculty role statements, handled by a faculty Personnel Committee, and may result in merit increases to base salary (more on this in section VI below). Improvements could be made—a few inconsistencies remain in continuing lecturers' specific service assignments, and some tenure-track faculty serve on a disproportionate number of graduate student committees. But by and large faculty workload is commensurate with the nature of faculty appointments and evaluation is an equitable process that takes role statements and both the quality and quantity of achievements into account.

Our last program review noted both the limitations and benefits of the department's continuing lectureships. In the 1990s, some of the benefits were stabilized when the department, with support at the college and university levels, created retention and promotion processes for continuing lecturers parallel to the tenure and promotion processes for tenure-track faculty. Several lecturers have now been promoted through that process to the senior rank, Rank 0(IV). Those processes have since been formally codified in the College of Liberal Arts bylaws (2005). Since our last self-study, every promotion case the department has sent forward has been approved, and every faculty member the department has supported for tenure has been tenured.

Second, we seek to achieve a mix of positions suitable to our teaching and research missions. This means increasing the number of continuing faculty and teaching assistants and the proportion of these positions in relation to the number of contingent positions (faculty and LOA). It also means gradually readjusting our criteria for the mix of instructional positions from being a line beyond which we should not go to an ideal toward which we will work. As we compare ourselves to peer institutions, it is evident that our mix is askew: our continuing faculty includes an unusually high percentage of lectureships, and the proportion of graduate students on teaching assistantships is unusually low. Over time, then, both numbers and proportions of tenure-track faculty and teaching assistants should increase. As continuing lectureships become vacant due to retirement over the next decade, the department should seek to convert some of these positions to entering tenure-track positions. Conversions often could create both an entering tenure-track position and a new TA position without requiring the allocation of any additional state funds. Each such conversion would add research strength, enhance graduate programs, increase the proportion of tenure-track positions, and provide instruction for 1-2 additional lower-division course sections per year. Exactly what proportion of positions to convert, and what mix will best

help the department to meet its comprehensive mission in 2020 or 2030, will depend on institutional circumstances in the decades ahead.

III. Undergraduate Program

A. Mission, Enrollment, and Structure

1. Mission

The undergraduate program's goals closely resemble those of similar liberal arts programs at land-grant universities: to educate its students as generalists, providing them with a broad range of courses and a diverse set of intellectual skills centering on studies in language, literature and culture. Undergraduate students in English at the University of Nevada, Reno declare one of four 36- or 39-credit major specializations or one of six 18- or 21-credit minor specializations (three of them are currently inactive and the undergraduate committee is in the process of eliminating them). All four majors currently require a set of three foundation courses:

- ENG 298: Writing About Literature
- ENG 281: Introduction to Language OR
  ENG 282: Introduction to Language and Literary Expression
- ENG 303: Introduction to Literary Theory and Criticism

Each major further requires nine or ten upper-division English courses with certain specialization-specific distribution requirements. All of our active minor specializations require ENG 298.

2. Enrollment

We have obtained data from a variety of sources, which are slightly divergent. The discrepancy among these numbers may be explained by the fact that of our 319 current majors, 38 are enrolled in 0 credits in Fall 2015. Of these students, 20 have 60 or more credits, 11 (all freshmen) have 15 or fewer, and 7 have between 31 and 57. The first group seems most likely to return to complete their degree requirements, the second the least likely, while it is difficult to calculate the odds for the third.

Total UG Majors

University Data: UG Majors (Fall Semester)

2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
292	301	311	318	330	288	275

Enrollment by Specialization (Compiled from CLA Data)

English Majors

	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall

	2008	2008	2009	2009	2010	2010	2011	2011
Writing Majors	173	193	167	174	163	181	198	NA
Literature Majors	98	115	72	99	88	98	109	NA
Lang & Ling Majors	30	30	27	27	26	32	47	NA
2ndary Teaching Majors	4	3	5	4	5	5	4	NA
Total Majors	289	341	271	304	282	316	358	NA

	Spring 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015
Writing Majors	NA	183	156	169	157	163	160	177
Literature Majors	NA	102	86	99	89	87	77	77
Lang & Ling Majors	NA	33	25	32	33	34	32	38
2ndry Teaching Majors	NA	15	12	14	16	19	19	27
Total Majors	NA	333	279	314	295	303	288	319

English Minors

	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Fall 2009	Spring 2010	Fall 2010	Spring 2011	Fall 2011
Writing Minors	55	57	61	67	66	55	61	58
Literature Minors	44	44	40	46	33	41	36	30
Lang & Ling Minors	14	9	8	7	10	10	8	3
2ndary Teaching Minors	7	5	2	2	1	1	0	NA
TESOL	7	7	10	3	3	3	4	NA
Total Minors	127	122	121	125	113	110	109	91

	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall

	2012	2012	2013	2013	2014	2014	2015	2015
Writing Minors	43	44	46	52	50	61	72	72
Literature Minors	26	19	19	20	22	18	19	16
Lang & Ling Minors	4	4	4	6	6	7	7	8
2ndry Teaching Minors	0	11	13	14	11	0	14	15
TESOL	8	0	0	0	0	15	0	0
Total Minors	81	78	82	92	89	101	112	111

College of Education, Secondary Education in English Majors

Secondary Ed Majors Taking English 411B

Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015
5	5	3	3	5	7

While the College of Education does not divide its enrollments by subspecialization, education students who are majoring in English Education are required to take our three foundation courses, as well as 24 upper-division English credits. Based on the number of education students in English 411B, which is required to be taken by all these students, we estimate that there are at least 25 or more students enrolled in this program, which functions as something of a "shadow" English major. (There are currently 76 students in the BA in Secondary Teaching in the College of Education program, which includes a focus on English education.)

Other UNR CLA Departments

Department	Spring 2015 # Majors	Enrollment Change Fall 2011-Spring 2015
English	288	+12%
History	122	+25%
Philosophy	57	+40%
Psychology BA	765	+33%

English Major Enrollments at Peer Institutions

Institution	2014 # Majors	Enrollment Change Fall 2011-Spring 2015

U of Oregon	395	-44%
UC Davis	588	-10%
AZ State	1264	+12%

While the data is not entirely consistent, it appears that our major has remained relatively stable over the past seven years, with one set of data (chart 2.a.i) indicating a slight overall drop and another (chart 2.a.ii) a slight overall increase. Such numbers seem quite good in the context of national drops in humanities and English majors that have been noted at schools from Harvard and Lehigh; the decline has been variously quantified. One source notes that humanities majors peaked in 1967 at 17% of all majors and now stand at 11% (http://www.dailycal.org/2014/03/07/employability-myth-humanities/); another describes a decline from 30% to less than 16% in the humanities and from 7.6% to 3.9% in English (https://theamericanscholar.org/the-decline-of-the-english-department/#.VgRR-MtVhBc). Our numbers also look quite strong in relation to the enrollments at several peer institutions). However, they look far less robust when understood in the context of the dramatic growth in UNR's undergraduate population overall. The number of majors in other departments, both small and large in the CLA, has risen in double-digit terms. Read in this context, our lack of sustained growth is troubling.

      In terms of the relative numbers in specializations within the major, the Literature major has declined slightly; language and linguistics has increased, while writing has remained mostly steady. Surprisingly, the secondary education major, which we were considering closing, has become very robust in the last few years and continues to grow. Many secondary education majors also major in Education, which provides them with a path to teacher certification. Such certification is also available to English majors in various post-baccalaureate programs here and elsewhere.

      The number of minors has for the most part echoed the majors, although the number of writing minors has increased, while literature has declined. The TESOL looks especially strong; it now has as many minors as literature. While the decline in literature numbers coincides with the introduction of the new required literature surveys, English 311 and 312, these courses are generally liked by students. The literature minor does involve more required courses and more total credits than the other minors; we are in the process of streamlining it so that it is more appealing to students and analogous to the other minors in terms of requirements.

      Not listed separately here are two other minors that have drawn few or no students in past years, the Literature and Environment minor and the Dramatic Literature minor. In fact, one of this minor's foundation requirements, THTR 210, is seldom or never offered by Theater and Dance. The undergraduate committee will soon consider removing these options, along with the moribund Secondary Education minor, from the program.

Diversity

Undergraduate	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015
American Indian / Alaska Native	4	6	4	6	5	5	3	2	1

Asian	13	14	12	8	8	10	4	9	12
Black Non-Hispanic	5	4	4	5	4	6	5	7	6
Hispanic	19	13	26	32	33	39	34	33	45
Pacific Islander / Hawai'an	N/A	N/A	2	0	0	1	2	2	1
Multi-Ethnic	N/A	N/A	10	15	19	21	9	14	15
White Non Hispanic	199	216	237	242	252	259	228	207	195
Unknown	40	35	4	1	3	3	1	1	4
Non-Resident Alien	3	4	2	2	2	1	2	0	0
TOTAL	283	292	301	311	326	345	288	275	277

The English Department has been somewhat behind the University in its number of students of color. However, we have seen an improvement in our numbers over the past several years. Whereas in Fall 2008, only 13% of our students were students of color, in Fall 2015 67 of 275 students were students of color (24%), and in Fall 2015 82 of the 277 majors are students of color (28%) in comparison to the University's 35% representation of students of color. Across the years, the main demographic group besides Caucasian has been Hispanic/Latino. Ideally, we would like to see the percentage of diverse students in the English major match that of the University. Our hope is that by more aggressively recruiting majors, including offering a range of courses focused on diversity issues, and making strategic hires, we will be able to keep pace with the University's increasing diversity.

Over the past few years, we have seen a consistent increase in the diversity of our English minors that indicates our minor is keeping pace with the University's increasing diversity. This fall's class of 86 minors includes 32 students of color (37%), exceeding the University's level of diversity, and in Fall 2011 and Fall 2012 we had 14 students of color (25%) of 55 and 14 students of color of 59 (24%), respectively. Working on recruiting efforts should help keep these numbers strong, as will making targeted recruiting efforts based on information about recruiting strategies gained from discussions with other campus diversity officers.

The department continues to offer courses that support departmental commitments to diversity, including the recently added course ENG 486A/686A: Studies in Postcolonial Literature and Theory. In the future, we would like to expand offerings in Latino(a) Literatures and Native American literatures and linguistics; however, doing so would require more hiring.

We feel that having a more diverse faculty body would help us to recruit under-represented student populations. As a group our current faculty remains over 95% Caucasian.

Retention

UNR Data (Institutional Analysis)

	2008-	2009-	2010-	2011-	2012-	2013-	2014-

	09	10	11	12	13	14	15
UG Fall-to-Fall Retention Rate, 2nd to 3rd Year	82%	79%	86%	82%	75%	79%	81%

The data we have been able to obtain from the University is not comprehensive enough to reveal the reasons that students leave the program, although our numbers have been stable over the last seven years. We are nonetheless undertaking several projects to improve retention. The literature committee has recently made changes to the minor that streamline it, remove obstructive requirements, and bring the number of total credits in line with the department's other minors. Working with the College, the DUS is attempting to identify students who leave the major each semester so we can send them a survey asking their reasons for leaving. Our ongoing assessment of the foundation courses is designed to ensure that these courses showcase the major and minor while teaching essential skills. We are also evaluating the inclusion of literature by members of underrepresented groups in our foundation courses.

It is worth noting that retention data we have obtained from other institutions seems comparable or worse, although the English major retention rates are measured at other institutions after the first, rather than the second, year of college: at University of Colorado, the rates are between 52 and 81%, whereas at Utah State, they are around 80%.

Graduation Data

			2011-2012				2012-2013
	Fall 2011	Spring 2012		Summer 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	
English BA total by semester	17	40		8	25	54	
English BA Total			57				87
				2013-2014			2014-2015
	Summer 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014		Fall 2014	Spring 2015	
English BA total by semester	5	18	41		13	42	
English BA Total				64			55

The number of UNR undergrads who graduated from July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014 is roughly 17% of the number of students enrolled in Fall 2014. The English graduation rate for 2013-2014 is about 22% of total majors, suggesting that our numbers are holding steady.

As the chart above reveals, the number of English graduates has fluctuated quite a bit over the last few years, but remains essentially unchanged from what it was in 2011-12. This data is consistent with our enrollment data, as described above.

Alumni Data. In our 2007 self-study, we noted that we had not systematically tracked the graduate and professional schools to which our graduates are admitted, or the careers they end up pursuing. We still have not done so and need to begin, perhaps with a simple exit-interview question about post-graduation plans. However, faculty report that their students have gone on to study in a wide range of fields -- Literature, Creative Writing, Law, Library Science, Psychology, Business -- at an impressive array of schools, including Indiana, Texas State, Mississippi State, Georgia State, Western Michigan, Seattle University, the University of San Francisco, UC Davis, Mills College, USC, Antioch, Emerson, Chapman, George Washington, the University of Virginia, Berkeley, Hunter, Columbia, University of Pennsylvania, Brandeis, and the University of Sussex in the UK. Of this year's 25 incoming graduate students at UNR, 11 were from our own program, due partly to the new MFA program, which enrolled 6. UNR writing students who have gone on to significant national publication include Claire Vaye Watkins, Willy Vlautin, Jamie Iredell, Gabriel Urza, and Heather Petty. Alanna Noyes, a recent Linguistic graduate, is currently teaching on a Fulbright in Mexico. Many of our graduates go into law, teaching at all levels (both in the United State and abroad), business and advertising writing, print and broadcast journalism, and publishing.

3. Undergraduate Program Organization

The Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUS). Supported by a course release each semester and a $3000 stipend (mostly covering Summer advising), the Director of Undergraduate Studies in English does informal advising, especially for students in complex situations, manages five undergraduate advisors; approves all curriculum exceptions, restrictions and prerequisite waivers; chairs the Undergraduate Committee, which meets monthly to oversee and assess the undergraduate curriculum, consider new course proposals, and conduct related business; advises and supervises undergraduate-related work on the various area committees; and is responsible for long-term planning for the Undergraduate Program, including recruiting, retention, student experience, and curricular oversight. In addition, the DUS maintains and evaluates the major and minor advisement forms and undergraduate web pages; deals with unusual or catastrophic student concerns; attends fall and spring semester new and transfer student orientations and college/university advisement meetings; represents English's undergraduate program to other advisors and administrators across campus; serves on our Planning Committee; communicates with majors and minors via our undergraduate email listserv; hosts a once-a-semester pizza party at which faculty describe their courses for the upcoming semester; plans a yearly series of workshops for undergrads on the English major, career paths, and graduate school applications; and fields a wide array of email inquiries regarding curricular, transfer, and general information. S/he also is responsible for keeping summer advisement hours, which have averaged an afternoon per week for much of the summer break, and for hosting the post-commencement reception each spring. For the first time in over twenty years, the current DUS is a tenured faculty member, with a full roster of graduate advising responsibilities, as well other service obligations (10% of role statement) in the department, college, university, community, and profession.

Academic Advisors. Advisement in the department continues to be the responsibility of continuing faculty. Five faculty members (all continuing lecturers) currently serve as advisors to

all undergraduate majors and minors; these advisors list undergraduate advisement on their role statements as a significant service contribution, meaning the regular advisement of 50-70 undergraduate majors and a smaller number of minors in any given semester; each receives a course release of 1 course/year for advisement. The DUS and all advisors have access to MyNevada, the University's online student records system, so checking a student's progress toward graduation while on the telephone, during an online chat or email exchange, or in the office, is possible. Our advisors receive frequent updates and as-needed training by CLA and university advisors. Our current advisement system has several advantages: advisors are experienced, active members of the faculty, familiar with the ins and outs of forms and procedures, and committed to the department and student success; students generally develop and maintain a relationship with a single advisor during their time in the department, which helps with retention and mentoring, and also creates a sense of belonging.

Several changes in advisement have been put into place since our last review. The CLA has recently increased the involvement of their own advising staff (which has several new additions) in advising for first-year students and new transfer students. A new online scheduling and record-keeping system has recently been added to better track advisees and reasons they seek advising appointments and to more evenly allocate advising appointments among advisors. We are also strongly encouraging students to see their advisors routinely for help in choosing courses, to track their progress using departmental worksheets, and to consult the department website for course descriptions. Currently, only one departmental advising appointment for our majors is required, but we are considering requiring a second appointment, during which students will discuss their choice of a concentration and get help in planning their remaining English coursework. We are also piloting a program this semester in which the DUS will visit English 303 classes (our final foundation course) and devote class time to curriculum planning.

Undergraduate Committee. The undergraduate committee, chaired by the DUS, generally is comprised of 5-8 members of the faculty, a combination of continuing lecturers and tenure-track faculty. The committee, which typically meets monthly, advises the DUS on curricular issues, engages in assessment of the undergraduate program, assists with recruitment and retention efforts, helps organize undergraduate events, reviews draft schedules of undergraduate course offerings, and deals with other issues as they arise. The committee also works with the department's three area committees, which research issues regarding staffing, curriculum, and assessment at the suggestion of the committee and the DUS. Area committees feed proposals for new courses and other curricular changes to the undergraduate committee for approval before these issues are taken up by the faculty as a whole.

B. Curriculum

Classroom Instruction

Current Curriculum Data

Foundation Courses: Number of Students Taught Each Fall

Course	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
281	27	35	83	N/A	91	102	128	90
282	78	111	54	56	58	0	0	0
298	93	96	87	88	79	79	59	77
303	60	65	51	N/A	78	48	53	N/A
311	N/A	26	29	31	43	30	17	25
312	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	13	6

English 321 (service course): Number of Students Taught Each Fall

Course	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
321	45	25	53	140	134	136	110	182

English 321 is an upper-level expository-writing course for non-majors which, as these numbers show, has been increasingly popular with students from other departments, and is, in fact, a requirement for Education and Business majors.

By Specialization: Number of Sections Taught Each Fall

Area	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Lower-division	13	11	10	11	8	8	2	14
Ling	5	6	6	5	5	7	5	5
Writing	12	14	12	14	16	13	14	13
Lit	9	10	19	10	12	9	11	10
Cap	5	7	3	3	3	4	3	8

Note: These figures do not include independent studies and internships, undertaken by eight to fifteen students per semester.

The department determined two years ago to teach more lower-level courses as potential recruiting tools for the major/minor. While it is too early to see the results of this move, that decision explains the recent increase in numbers of sections of these courses. The number of upper-level courses for majors has remained fairly consistent since the last self-study (save for an anomalous number of literature courses offered in 2010). Because capstones (described in more detail below), which draw students from other departments, tend to enroll well, we have added more of these in the last year, although with the advent of the Silver Core requirements, this distribution will need to be reevaluated.

Area Specializations

1. **Literature Specialization**. The required Transatlantic Literature surveys (ENG 311 and 312), which were added at the time of the last self-study, have been successfully implemented. A number of new courses have either been added or are working their way through the various stages of curriculum approval; many of these courses will fulfill Core Objectives for the University's new Silver Core, which will take effect in Fall 2016: ENG 202 Film Analysis and Interpretation (CO 7); ENG 437/637 Topics in Film Studies; ENG 488 Literature and Ethics (CO 12); and ENG 499B Senior Research Project in Literature (CO14). In addition to these new courses, sixteen of our established literature courses have been approved as satisfying core objectives by the Core Board, and others are working their way through the approval process. As we institute Student Learning Objectives for all the courses in the major, we are also removing courses not regularly taught from the catalogue. In order to help our students to complete the degree in a timely fashion and to align our undergraduate major requirements more closely with the expectations for the M.A., we have made some revisions to the major and are discussing others: 1) the department has changed the categories for the elective distribution requirements so they correspond with the M.A. categories; 2) We are engaging in an ongoing conversation about whether we would like to change the requirements for the major, and if so, what kind of changes we would like to make.

2. **Language and Linguistics Specialization**. As Table I.2.a.ii above indicates, enrollment in this specialization grown since our last self-study. Over the last decade the emphasis in this program has remained on sociolinguistics, historical linguistics, phonology, discourse analysis, and syntax. We have recently added a new hire in phonology, and phonetics is being taught this semester for the first time. As part of the transition to the Silver Core requirements, we have ensured that several of our courses, such as 412D Introduction to Phonology (CO9) and 413A Sociolinguistics (CO10), satisfy core objectives.

3. **Writing Specialization**. We are continuing to meet robust demand for upper-division courses in the Writing major. Our four-year plan suggests that students spread their required writing courses out over at least two or three semesters, and those who do are able to choose from more options each semester. We fleshed out the mid-range of the Writing major by adding a requirement in argumentation theory and practice, ENG 301, as well as an elective in professional writing, ENG 333. We are seeing increased interest in professional writing and non-fiction writing, perhaps due to the growth in the writing minor. At the upper level, we added a topics course in professional writing, ENG 400B; past topics have included proposal writing, client-based writing projects, and a survey of professional genre theory. Meanwhile, our core

topics course, ENG 400A, has offered a wider range of topics, including screenwriting, the graphic novel, community-based writing, multi-modal writing, and creative non-fiction. We have diversified our seminar offerings by adding ENG 407B, Fundamentals of Technical Writing, and ENG 409C, Contemporary Rhetorical Theory and Criticism, and are preparing a new dedicated course in Screenwriting. All of these upper-division courses are offered regularly and frequently enroll at capacity. In 2012 we created an advising document to help majors select among upper-division options based on their interests (i.e., in professional writing, rhetoric, teaching, or creative writing). On the creative-writing side, each semester our novelists and poets teach upper-division workshops that enroll at capacity via an application process in which faculty evaluate student writing samples while considering previous experience, gender, and genres of interest. Future areas for development in the Writing major include ways to more effectively streamline or "track" the major according to student interests; and, ways to accommodate non-majors who are drawn to our curriculum as a result of the President's Excellence in Writing initiative, the new Communication and Composition in the Disciplines program, and other campus initiatives.

4. **Minor Specializations.** Since the addition of the Transatlantic Survey requirement (ENG 311 and 312) to the literature minor, there has been a drop in the number of students taking this minor, though whether those courses represent a *cause* is not clear. The addition of these two courses brought the total of required courses in the minor to five (out of seven). We suspect that the multiple required classes for the literature minor make it difficult for students to add the minor later in their academic careers. The literature committee is in the process of proposing revisions to the minor that would reduce the number of required credits, currently 21, to 18, the number required for Writing and Language and Linguistics minors. Additionally, the proposal would eliminate all required courses except for 298, thereby allowing minors more electives while getting more quickly to experience upper level courses.

At its Spring 2013 retreat the department voted to research and develop a Film Studies minor, which would reflect and serve the interests of both students and several faculty members who currently teach film and screenwriting courses. Several new film studies courses – a lower-division non-major survey, which will fulfill a university core arts requirement, and an upper-division topics course – have been approved and will appear in the 2016-2017 general catalog. A proposal to create the minor is likely to come forward during the next academic year.

Enrollment in the Writing minor has more than doubled since the last self-study (35 to 72). In particular, we are enrolling students from Psychology, Biology, Communication Studies, Journalism, Theater, Art, and Criminal Justice. While we can't identify any single cause for this growth, we anticipate it will continue due to the campus-wide initiatives mentioned above; mitigating factors in that growth may include the new NSHE 120-credit cap on degree programs as well as ongoing changes in the administration and assessment of the Silver Core.

There have been no changes in either the Language & Linguistics or TESOL minors, both of which have seen fairly steady or increased student enrollment. We are in the process of deleting our two moribund minors from the catalog.

Foundation Courses. English majors in all of our specializations take three required foundation courses. Since the last self-study, the department has adopted the following SLOs for these courses.

English 281: Introduction to Language

Students will be able to:

- Distinguish between scientific and non-scientific claims about language.
- Analyze language on the phonetic, morphological and syntactic levels.
- Identify and explain the various factors that produce language change and language variation.

English 298: Writing about Literature

Students will be able to:

- Demonstrate a broad knowledge of specific literary genres (e.g., poetry, drama, fiction, nonfiction) and historical periods (e.g., Early Modern, Romanticism, Naturalism)
- Employ literary terminology appropriate to the study of various genres
- Write literary analyses and critical arguments based on close reading, using academic citation styles when appropriate
- Articulate the relationships among authors, texts, and readers
- Demonstrate an ability to use electronic and traditional resources for research and literary study.

English 303: Introduction to Literary Theory and Criticism

Students will be able to:

- Demonstrate skills in critical thinking and writing about literature in oral and written forms.
- Deploy a range of critical theories about literature and the various approaches (e.g., Marxist, feminist, formalist, postcolonial) by which it can be analyzed.
- Apply contemporary theory and criticism to texts.
- Describe the concepts of culture, race, gender, and class as they related to literary analysis.
- Explain the concept of canon formation.

The Language Committee has implemented a plan to offer only the more rigorous 281 as the foundation course and let 282 remain on books but not offer it. We have found that 281 offers both more uniformity of instruction and more recruitment potential for the Language Major and Minor specialization. We have retained 282 in the catalog because we continue to accept it as an equivalent to 281 for transfer students.

Upper-level Courses. As the table above indicates, we generally offer between 15 and 20 upper-level courses per semester. These courses are open to majors and minors who have completed English 298, as well as those with at least junior standing. We are in the process of devising

multi-year course rotations to be posted on our website to enable students to plan ahead more successfully and to help with advisement. The vast majority of our listed courses (approximately 63 [including capstones] out of 88) are upper-level literature courses, and we are working to eliminate courses that are not often taught or that duplicate other course material to streamline our offerings. We are also attempting, when we propose new courses, to ensure that their foci are broad enough that they can be taught in a range of ways by a range of instructors (e.g., our new course "Ethics and Literature"). While we would like to further consolidate our offerings, the amount of paperwork required to amend course titles and descriptions is a strong disincentive.

Capstone Courses. With the incoming Silver Core, the number of required capstone courses has been reduced from two to one, which will fulfill the CO 13 requirement (Capstone and Synthesis). In place of the second capstone, the Core has instituted CO 14 (Integration). The literature committee has submitted courses in fulfillment of CO 13 and CO 14, thus encouraging students to take their capstone courses within the major. Courses we that have been approved to fulfill the CO 13 requirement include former capstones ENG 427A Women and Literature; ENG 484A The Bible as Literature; ENG 490A Gender and Sexual Identity in Literature; ENG 491A Major Texts of the Environmental Movement; ENG 492A Language, Science and Society; ENG 492C Language and Culture; ENG 492A Language, Science and Society; ENG 497B Ethnicity, Gender, and American Identity (still pending); as well as several additional courses, including ENG 333 Professional Communications and ENG 401B Advanced Nonfiction. We have also received Core approval for a new course, ENG 499B: Senior Research Project in Literature, which will fulfill the University CO 14 requirement. All majors will have to take this class, but it is a *university* rather than a *department* requirement. The Language and Linguistics committee has discussed several capstone possibilities, but none have been formally proposed yet. For writing students, ENG 401B has been approved for CO13, and is currently the official capstone for the Writing major; while it is taught with different foci—including style, creative non-fiction, and academic writing—the course culminates in a portfolio that students can present to future employers or graduate programs.

Independent Studies. As a result of the Undergraduate Committee's concern at the time of the last self-study about the difficulty in overseeing and regulating independent studies and the possibility that they were causing fewer students to enroll in regularly offered courses, in Spring 2013, the department approved more stringent guidelines for independent studies. These guidelines ensure that independent studies do not replicate existing courses and that independent studies cannot be used to fulfill major requirements. A further stipulation that students only undertake independent studies with faculty with whom they have previously taken courses helps ensure that independent studies fulfill the spirit in which the option was first advanced—that is, they enable advanced work that goes beyond current course offerings.

Majoring and Minoring in English. Our reviewers in 2007 suggested that we implement changes to our curriculum whereby students could not both major and minor in English. We have made these changes; currently, we do allow students majoring in Literature or Writing to minor in Linguistics or TESOL and students majoring in Linguistics to minor in Literature or Writing. Student data support the success of this change, with the total numbers of students who major and minor in English small, and mostly smaller than it was before the change took effect, and the majority of students who both major and minor choosing a minor in TESOL.

Students who Major and Minor in English

Major	Minor							
Major	S12	F12	S13	F13	S14	F14	S15	F15
Lit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Writing	2 TESOL 2 Lit	1 Lit 2 TESOL 2 Writing	2 TESOL 1 Writing	5 TESOL	1 L&L 4 TESOL	1 L&L 5 TESOL	1 L&L 5 TESOL	1 L&L 4 TESOL
Lang & Ling	3 Lit 1 Writing	3 Lit 1 TESOL	2 Lit	0	0	0	1 Lit 1 Writing	0
Total	8	9	5	5	5	6	8	5

As the chart indicates, our overall numbers of students who both major and minor in English remain low.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). We have drafted and submitted SLOs for all our undergraduate courses, and they were approved in November.

Scheduling and Staffing. Since the last self-study, the department had a few semesters in which too many classes were scheduled on overlapping topics, especially in literature. Recent changes—including a literature rotation schedule based on our actual student numbers and the decision not to allow term lecturers to teach literature classes during the regular terms except in emergency situations—have improved this situation. In fact, in the Fall 2015 semester, virtually all classes were filled. We have also had trouble with some classes—especially in writing—closing early, but these issues are being addressed. Finally, during some recent semesters, a combination of staffing shortages (especially in undergraduate creative writing courses as a result of the new MFA program), leaves, phase-in retirements, and other issues has prevented our department from fulfilling our obligations to teach in Core Humanities, Core Writing, as well as to fully staff foundation courses with continuing faculty.

C. Academic Opportunities outside the Department

Internships. The department has focused on its Internship Program over the last few years by appointing a new director, actively researching and increasing the number of possible internships available to students, publicizing them more widely, and by revising the departmental expectations of interns. However, while there are over 20 internship possibilities available to our students, only an average of 5-8 per semester are doing internships, and fewer (approximately 3-4 per semester) are doing so as part of our English 498A internship course. These figures indicate that a number of our internship opportunities are going to graduate students or to undergrads who elect not to receive academic credit. One problem is that we have been actively

encouraging our majors to enroll in our "regular" upper-level courses and are concerned that increases in the number doing internships will diminish course enrollments.

Given Silver Core objective 14, which includes practical/internship work, we are discussing submitting English 498A for silver core verification. At the suggestion of the CLA advisors, we are also considering adding an undergraduate RAship program to the internship offerings, in which undergrads would assist faculty with their research projects, gaining experience in the field while preparing for a career. In general, the internship program could do even more to establish continuing relationships with suitable local organizations to provide a constant flow of fresh internship opportunities for its students. Furthermore, the program needs to be structured and publicized in such a way that the possibilities, requirements and expectations for an internship are clearer to both students and faculty, especially new students and faculty.

Honors Program and Research Awards. Since our last self-study in 2007, the Nevada's Honors Program reports accepting 29 of our undergraduate majors, with 32 English majors graduating with Honors during that period. (The discrepancy may be due to those who became honors students in 2005-6 or to students who double major.) Of these students, 10 received an undergraduate research award for research for their honors thesis. During this same period, the Core Writing Program offered 40 Honors sections of English 102, most of them taught by English faculty, and there is anecdotal evidence that these classes have served as an effective recruitment tool for the major.

Our last self-study reported that students from the College of Liberal Arts made up a smaller percentage of Honors students than those from the College of Science, and we are happy to note that -- despite the tremendous appeal of STEM to bright and ambitious students in an uncertain job market -- that trend appears to have reversed itself. In the period since 2007, a total of 284 students from the College of Liberal Arts pursued the Honors Program, compared to 234 from the College of Science and 217 from the College of Engineering. We might interpret these figures as meaning that students in fields seen as less practical are more anxious to add the cachet of Honors to their degrees; even so, these numbers suggest that the College of Liberal Arts as a whole produces students who are superbly suited to the rigors of the Honors Program.

Study Abroad.

USAC English Students		2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
		13	5	9	14	9	9	9	10

Every year between 5 and 14 undergrads year participate in a summer or semester abroad through the University Studies Abroad Consortium (USAC) based on our campus, in locations as diverse as Western and Eastern Europe, the UK, Central and South America, and various African and Asian countries. The breakdown in terms of specializations within English has varied. These numbers have remained basically flat over the last decades, generally totaling about 9-10 per year. There seems to be a general consensus among faculty that study abroad is advantageous for students in our major, and we might make a more concerted effort to promote the program to students concerned with fulfilling their CLA language requirement.

D. Student Organizations and Community.

Clubs. The department has several student-led clubs which gather students around a shared interest; all of these clubs have at least one faculty advisor. They include the following:

We have organized a Sigma Tau Delta chapter (as recommended by external reviewers), Alpha Pi, with a continuing senior faculty sponsor, that currently has 36 active members. Chapter officers meet twice per semester with the faculty sponsor. Students from our chapter have attended the national Sigma Tau Delta Conference and won writing awards. They have participated in book drives for low income students and schools and literacy drives in the Reno/Sparks areas. The chapter has an active Facebook page: https://www.facebook.com/EnglishHonorSocietyUniversityofNevadaReno?fref=ts

The Linguistics Club includes 15-20 members and holds monthly meetings. Last year, the club sponsored two workshops, sponsored two lectures by University faculty, and invited an outside scholar to campus for a public lecture. They have also added a new Facebook page [https://www.facebook.com/UnrLinguisticsClub/] and organized a language archive project at the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, in which 5 volunteer Club members are engaged with digitizing and archiving linguistic materials.

MFA students are now working on resurrecting the Creative Writing Club, which is already approved as a GSA-recognized organization. The students are talking with our departmental graduate organization, EGO, about planning joint events, programs, etc. This club has traditionally offered writing groups for undergrads and graduate students.

A new club, the Nevada Early Modern Organization (NEMO), while established primarily to serve graduate students, is attempting to put together an undergraduate club (EMU). Undergraduates participated in several of NEMO's events last year, including several campus lectures, screenings of films associated with undergrad courses, and a trip to the Shakespeare festival in Ashland, OR. A social event this fall drew 10 undergrads.

Every semester, the Blood, Love, & Rhetoric group gathers to read aloud a play from the early modern or long eighteenth century; these readers' theater events are usually well attended by students (undergraduate and graduate) as well as faculty. It's a popular event, often featuring a play being taught by one of the early British literature faculty, and it is a community-builder among our students.

Communications.

English Department Website. Redesigned several times since 2007, for the past three years the department's website has been maintained and updated by a former graduate student/current postdoc working on an hourly basis. The website serves several purposes:

1. Advertises department events: readings, lectures, student & faculty accomplishments, etc.
2. Provides program-specific information and resources for undergraduate, graduate, and Core Writing programs
3. Offers expanded course descriptions of the next semester's offerings
4. Lists faculty contact information and profiles of continuing faculty

In Spring 2015 we were notified that the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) had assigned a web designer from Integrated Marketing to redesign our website and bring it into conformity with the CMS ("Content Management System") which has become the University standard. Redesign is scheduled to commence in early November 2015 and expected to be completed in late January or early February 2016. We are told that the CMS makes it easy for users to update text fields and images, and that if we work closely with the designer, we can retain much of our functionality. We have been told, however, that the University has mandated the primary function of all websites to be student recruitment, although we are free to suggest functions and design elements that also contribute to current student retention and faculty purposes.

Listserv. Our undergraduate email list directs students to on-campus workshops, including career workshops, and provides a steady stream of information to undergraduate majors and minors on curricular matters, visiting speakers, and other cultural activities, and opportunities for internships, grants, and volunteer activities. Updates occur at least weekly.

Social Media. In the fall of 2013, the Director of Undergraduate Studies, with the help of an intern, developed a department Facebook page that posted event announcements as well as articles about the value of a Liberal Arts education and language research, as well as news about well-known authors—anything that might interest and engage our English students. Short video interviews with faculty have also been posted on the page. In addition, a departmental Twitter account was introduced, although this has not attracted the number of followers that the Facebook page has. The Facebook page is currently being maintained by the DUS and departmental staff. It serves as a way to let alumni and community members know about English news and upcoming events.

Scholarships. In our 2007 self-study, we reported administering five scholarship awards. That number has since expanded to ten: the Thelma Ireland, Anne B. Howard, Esther Early, Azro Cheney and James MacMillan awards have been joined by the Critical Writing Award, the Leonard English Scholarship, the Stan's Foundation English Scholarship, the J. Lee Taylor Creative Writing Award, and the DQ Writing Award. The MacMillan and Leonard include awards for both undergraduate and graduate students, and the Howard can be given either to an undergraduate or graduate student. Students at both levels may also apply for the Randall Reid Scholarship administered by the Sierra Arts Foundation.

   Last year, we disbursed $8,550 in funds, in amounts ranging from $50 to $2,600, to eleven undergraduate scholarship recipients. These scholarships are funded with a mix of formal donations through the Development Office and English Department funds. The Scholarship Committee, which includes the Directors of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies, solicits faculty nominations for some awards and student applications for others. Materials are then distributed to various departmental committees for judging and selection or, in one case, dispersal to outside judges. All awards are vetted by the University Office of Financial Aid to ensure institutional eligibility. As the culmination of this complex process, winners are honored at a festive Awards Ceremony, often attended by scholarship donors, which includes the presentation of Core Writing Awards and English Graduate Organization awards, and has also frequently included inductions into the English Honor society, Sigma Tau Delta. This event is one of many that have helped make the department more cohesive in recent years.

Visiting Scholars and Writers. With support from our department's Public Occasions Committee as well as the CLA's Hilliard Foundation and other funding sources, including a collaboration with UNLV's Emerging Writers Series, members of the department bring over twenty visitors to campus annually. Many of these visits include presentations in undergraduate classes. These visits allow faculty and students (both undergrad and grad) to meet in informal settings.

Other Department-Sponsored Events. Over the past years, we have sponsored brown bag sessions where faculty talk to students about applying to graduate school and professions in English, occasional poetry readings to celebrate the holidays (such as Valentine's Day and St. Patrick's Day), and pizza parties each semester to publicize future classes. In the last two years, we have also hosted a graduation luncheon off- campus; we have also implemented a spring honors award ceremony for students who have excelled in writing and literature classes. We would like to open a student lounge in FH where students could meet, but space is limited.

E. Assessment.

Recent Assessment Projects. In addition to the assessment of English 281 done in 2008 and discussed elsewhere in this report, the undergraduate committee assessed SLOs from English 303 and 298, and also engaged in an extensive 2010 assessment of ten portfolios compiled by graduating seniors who had completed undergraduate degrees in English. The UG committee compiled a rubric consisting of seven learning objectives on which all English majors were expected to have made satisfactory progress by the time of graduation. A team of four graduate students--two readers, a coordinator, and a research assistant—conducted norming and rating sessions, analyzed data, and compiled a detailed report. While the sample size is small, the project was highly successful in terms of troubleshooting the rubric and assessment procedures. The research team concluded that the rubric needed to be revised so that it either applied strictly to Literature majors' portfolios or to focus on general argumentation, critical thinking, and evidentiary skills. Second, a larger sample of student academic—rather than creative—writing that students produced in their upper-division English courses would have created more reliable system for determining if graduating seniors are meeting benchmark expectations for key critical and writing skills in English.

     Assessment efforts of the past three years have divided their focus: updating Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) both in the three specializations and in the foundation courses; surveying students on preferred times and courses; surveying student intention to continue as English majors and minors after taking foundation courses; and the assessment of one Capstone course (492A) in the light of its stated SLOs.

     In addition, an SLO for English 311 was assessed in 2014-15; a pre- and post-test demonstrated that it was fulfilled by the course. In the spring of 2015 the UG committee received essays from a section of 492A, our Capstone for majors. Using an assessment rubric, the committee reviewed 23 essays, although the main findings had to do with the need to devise a better assessment methodology. The UG committee concluded that future assessments should be as focused as possible in order to measure success in stated learning outcomes.

Silver Core Implementation. Last year (2014-2015), members of the English department made substantive revisions to our curriculum to ensure that our courses satisfy as many Silver Core objectives as possible. This was an extremely time-consuming and often frustrating experience. While several core objectives seemed tailored to courses in particular departments, English courses (beyond the Core Writing level) did not fit naturally into any category. We proposed many classes that met with obstacles along the process, resulting in multiple revisions, appeals, and at least 20 proposals were deemed ineligible or rejected by core board. For example, the CO9 (Science, Technology & Society) Core Curriculum Committee claimed that "there wasn't enough science" in several linguistics classes, then, when that issue was resolved, asserted that there wasn't enough technology or society in the course. Similarly, the CO7 (Fine Arts) Committee resisted the idea that literature was a fine art. The department also had great difficulty overcoming resistance to courses that work as both service and majors courses. Throughout the process, we also struggled with shifting and inconsistent guidelines from administrative committees.

There were some successes with the Silver Core committees, however. A total of 27 existing courses were approved for silver core credit (in some of these cases a single course fulfilled multiple COs). Three lower-level nonmajor courses were approved as satisfying CO7, Fine Arts. One course was approved for CO9, Science, Technology & Society, eight for CO10, Diversity and Equity, one for CO11, Global Contexts, Global Contexts, five for CO12, Ethics, seven for CO13, Integration and Synthesis, and one for CO14, Application. These courses are mostly literature classes but also include three linguistics classes, and two writing courses. We also proposed three new courses, which have now been approved by the Core Board: two new upper-level courses, an Ethics and Literature course (CO12) and a culminating writing course for literature students (CO14), and a nonmajors course (English 246, The Art of Literature; CO 7).

Ongoing and Future Assessment Plans.

Foundation Course Assessment. This year the undergraduate committee, with the help of area committees, is completing a multi-year plan to assess our three required foundation courses to evaluate their success in meeting posted SLOs.

A 2008 assessment of one section of English 281 using pretests and posttests revealed the following trends: 100% of the students (n=27) failed to meet or exceed expectations on a pretest on knowledge and skills that are taught in 281.Three separate post-tests given to members of the section revealed that 8 of 24 students did not meet expectations while only 9 exceeded expectations. Because of these surprising and disturbing results, the language committee has expanded the parameters of the assessment. A wider and more detailed set of data was obtained, which is currently being analyzed. The data will be broken down for specific grading in each area of linguistics studied in the course so that we can identify the specific areas of difficulty for the students. After analysis, we will meet to determine strategies to improve student engagement in topics they fail to master to expectations.

SLOs for other foundation courses (English 298 and English 303) are currently being assessed, with preliminary data available by December 2015.

In addition, the undergraduate committee, with the help of members of the area committees, plans to undertake a larger-scale assessment of the foundation courses, drawing on the data from the assessments described above. These efforts will focus on the courses' success in fulfilling SLOs and on their effectiveness in recruitment and retention of students.

Silver Core Objective Assessment. In keeping with the University's mandate that all Silver Core courses be assessed regularly, the Undergraduate Committee is in the process of devising a four-year assessment plan during which compliance with all Silver Core Objectives will be assessed. This plan will be put into place as soon as information from the University about implementation plans is put into place. One CO will be assessed per year over all the courses requiring it. Following is a preliminary schedule of assessment.

2016-17: CO 7
2017-18: COs 11 and 12
2018-19: CO 10
2020-21: CO 13 and 14

Assessment of each CO will involve the selection of a single CO-related SLO for each class, the collection of course assignments, the design of a rubric for assessment, the collection of results, and the analysis of data. Any problems will be addressed through recommended curricular changes.

F. Recruitment and Retention

Past Recruitment and Retention Efforts. Over the past five years, the Department has helped sponsor a free weeklong summer creative writing workshop for area high school students, which has proven enormously popular, drawing an enrollment of 30-40 students yearly, including a number from underrepresented groups. Since the advent of that program, some (we don't have exact numbers) of those students have applied to/enrolled at UNR. Several faculty are also active in the Washoe County Schools, judging local contests, guest lecturing in classes, and working with teachers, especially of creative writing.

Writing faculty recently devised four-year plans for double majors that included Writing and three other CLA majors, but the college did not allow these to be distributed during college advising sessions.

Recently, we have attempted to run more non-majors lower-level elective courses during the regular semester (they had mostly been taught during summer and winter off-terms) based on the idea that these classes, especially when taught by dynamic continuing faculty, might serve as effective gateways into our major and minor. We have had mixed success so far, partly because some of these classes have had to be canceled and also because not all of these classes fulfill distribution requirements for students in other majors. During the last year, though, we successfully submitted two existing lower-level, nonmajor courses for CO7 approval, English 205 (Introduction to Creative Writing) and English 261 (Introduction to Poetry). In addition, two new courses, English 202 (Film Analysis and Interpretation) and English 246 (The Art of Literature) have also been approved. We hope that these courses will not only serve those in need of courses to fulfill this university requirement but that they will serve to recruit students to the major and minor.

Ongoing Recruitment Efforts. While our student numbers remain stable overall in ways consistent with or partly exceeding other English departments nationally, we have recently committed to an intensive recruitment project for our major and minor. The undergraduate committee is in the process of prioritizing and implementing a multi-pronged recruitment approach that involves several simultaneous elements, including the following:

- *Web page redesign*: In conjunction with the English Department Web Committee and the University's Web Page redesign team, we plan to reconfigure the page so that it is more accessible for prospective students and user-friendly for current students. We plan to add a section on alumni news as well as information about careers for which an English major prepares students. We also plan to include interviews with faculty members who have received teaching awards.
- *More aggressive recruitment of interested high school students*. We plan to get lists of students who have declared English as a possible major in the "Nevada Bound" program and to contact them individually. We also hope to obtain similar lists from area high school English teachers.
- *Increased presence in local high schools*. We plan to pilot a program in which English faculty give guest lectures and/or writing workshops in local high schools as a way to encourage student enthusiasm about English and our faculty in particular, and to foster local teacher support for our recruitment efforts.
- *Visits to area community colleges*. In ways consistent with recent recruitment efforts by our PhD program, we plan to hold information sessions in local community colleges giving information about transferring credit, application procedures, and the nature of our program. Given that many of our majors are transfer students, we feel that this aspect of the recruitment program is especially important.
- *Publicizing the major in composition courses*. We plan to design and distribute flyers to faculty in Core Writing courses, who can offer them to their most promising students. These flyers will outline the advantages and ease of adding an English major to another major, as well as of minoring in English. If there is sufficient interest, we will supplement this flyer distribution with workshops for prospective majors and minors.

Ongoing Retention Efforts. We are in the early stages of implementing the following new programs to build community within the major and increase retention:

- *Reinstate an annual workshop series for majors and minors*. These workshops, which began this fall, include panels of faculty, students, and recent alumni focusing on the following topics: The English Major 101 (everything students new to the major need to know about course planning, advising, resume building, building close relations with faculty, etc.); Careers for English Majors (a panel of recent alums showcasing different career options for those with an English degree); Applying to Grad and Professional School (a hands-on workshop offering advice about soliciting letters of recommendation, preparing writing samples and applications, etc.; this workshop will focus on the range of graduate school options open to English majors).
- *Implement a Research Assistantship program for undergrads*, who will assist faculty with research in exchange for internship credits

- *Begin a peer mentoring program* (Ask an English Major) for students and prospective students who have questions about the major and minor. This program will be staffed by students in our honors society.

G. Analysis

Strengths. We are an extraordinarily collegial department with regular and frequent opportunities for both students (undergraduate and graduate) and faculty to interact both formally and informally. We have so far survived both intensive assessment demands and the Silver Core revision to curriculum. We have a growing film studies program as well as vibrant literature, rhetoric, linguistics, and writing communities. Our faculty and students are both award winning, and we have many of the best teachers on campus, which is why our faculty have won the Alan Bible teaching award several times. We have a UNR Foundation Professor and several faculty who have won the Tibbitts Distinguished Teacher Award. What's more, our faculty tend to be engaged and accessible undergraduate mentors, with an open-door policy and a willingness to talk about books and ideas, about graduate school and professional opportunities. Some of our most productive scholars and writers are active in outreach to local schools, at all levels. We are preparing students well for both graduate school and professional careers where writing and communication are central.

Challenges

1. Foundation Courses. We are in the early stages of a departmental discussion about the purpose and utility of our three foundation courses. An ad hoc committee will soon be assembled to do more detailed assessment.

2. Future of Undergraduate Advisement. The department's five undergraduate advisors are all approaching retirement age, with one currently phasing in retirement. We believe that the advisement needs of our undergraduate majors and minors can be serviced by three or even two advisors, assuming that the one course release per year (per 80 advisees) is maintained. English has adhered to the ADE-recommended model of continuing academic faculty as academic advisors, in contrast to some CLA departments and many university colleges that rely on classified staff or graduate students. Another option that several CLA departments have recently adopted involves a dedicated continuing lecturer or one who does some teaching. Either of these models would be preferable, we believe, to dispersing advisement among a large group of faculty, since the routines, schedules, jargon, information systems, and other details of the undergraduate curriculum requirements are best learned through repeated and intensive experience.

3. Building Student Community. While we do not yet have the English Club recommended by the last self-study, numerous other student-initiated organizations have emerged in the department over the last years. We are also considering encouraging organizations within the department that provide support to students who face particular challenges at UNR (e.g., English majors of color, nontraditional students, and/or first-generation college students).

4. Tracking Alumni. We would like to start to track what our graduates do, but we do not currently have the tools in place to do this. Several options for doing this more successfully include beginning a program in which the department compiles a list of each semester's graduates and tracks them via a questionnaire, which could ask both about careers and graduate schools attended as well as how well they feel they were prepared for their future occupations.

5. Recruitment and Retention. We have ideas for a number of ways to improve both recruitment and retention (listed above), and—despite limited resources and an overextended faculty—we are looking for ways (outlined above) both to attract more majors to a degree we all very much believe in and to build a strong sense of community among those majors.

6. Career and Graduate School Advisement. While we have long engaged in informal mentoring of students, help with graduate applications, etc., we have not put any more systematic structures in place. Making sure to run annual workshops on career and graduate school planning seems likely to help, but in many cases students need on-on-one help. To some extent, advisors can do this work, but not all students come in for advisement regularly. While we are eager to help our students in this way, it seems difficult to imagine adding yet more advising and service obligations to our already overburdened advisors, undergraduate committee, and faculty more generally.

IV. Graduate Program

A. Overview, Mission, and Structure

1. Objectives and Mission
The mission of the Graduate Program is to develop in students the ability to conduct significant research in the fields of literary criticism, creative writing and/or writing studies; the ability to teach a range of courses in Composition and in British, American, and World Literatures in English (as applicable to degree program and emphasis); and the ability to understand and contribute to issues and debates in the field of English studies.

We intend that students should gain broad knowledge of several of the historical fields in, literary genres of, and major critical approaches to British, American, and World Literatures in English, or, broad knowledge of Writing Studies issues and methodologies; specialized competence in the primary and secondary literature of an appropriate specialized sub-field of literature or Rhetoric and Composition. Students should develop a range of pedagogical methods and strategies appropriate to the teaching of particular courses. We also attempt to help students gain the ability to analyze literary and cultural texts with originality and rigor in the light of contemporary theory. At the doctoral level, students should acquire the skills necessary to write publishable-quality critical essays and complete a book-length dissertation. All students should gain a respect for the literatures and cultures of different historical periods, nationalities, genders, and ethnicities, should learn and practice appropriate use and acknowledgment of the scholarly work of others, and should demonstrate a commitment to their own and their students' intellectual growth.

2. Graduate Degree Programs and Emphases

Our Graduate Program consists of several distinct program degree emphases. We offer the PhD degree in the two emphasis areas of Literature, and Rhetoric and Composition; the MA degree in the four emphasis areas of Literature, Writing, Public Engagement, and Language and Linguistics; and the MFA degree in the two emphasis areas of Poetry and Fiction.

In the following paragraphs we offer brief summaries of these varied emphases and the MFA degree program.

Literature. In support of the MA and PhD programs of study in Literature, the department offers a wide range of courses on English, American, comparative, and global literatures. More than 20 graduate faculty work in this area. We have particular strengths in the areas of Renaissance and Modern literatures. Faculty members in the Literature emphasis also teach in a variety of programs across campus, including Core Humanities and our excellent Gender, Race and Identity program. At the master's degree level, the program of study requires breadth in literary studies and then allows for specialization in a particular field of interest. At the doctoral level, the program of study requires students to prepare fields in a period, a genre, a topic (typically an area in literary and cultural theory), and an author or major text. Students working toward the PhD work closely with their faculty committees in preparing comprehensive exam reading lists and scholarly dissertations. Students working toward the MA prepare a professional paper and work with faculty to meet their professional goals.

Rhetoric and Composition/ Writing. Focusing on those interested in careers in academic research and teaching, program administration (first-year writing, writing across the curriculum, and writing center), as well as community and workplace literacy, the Rhetoric and Composition field of doctoral study is designed to balance theory/practice and teaching/scholarship. In addition to seminars in classical and modern rhetoric, feminist rhetoric, research methodologies, composition pedagogy, rhetorical studies of cultural practices, and various other topics, the curriculum offers internships that place students in community and school settings. We also strongly emphasize students' development as writers, with workshop courses offered in the craft of writing, advanced nonfiction, and creative nonfiction. The Rhetoric and Composition faculty are committed to collaborative activity with students, engaging with them in local internship opportunities, conference presentations, scholarly research, program development and assessment, and writing projects. In addition, students receive active mentoring in teaching and administration, as well as opportunities to serve in leadership positions in the Core Writing Program and the University Writing Center.

The MA Writing program of study has supported students with a variety of profiles, and engaging in a range of projects, including memoirs, collections of short stories or poems, interview-based study of secondary teaching, survey of writing program administrators, hybrid-genre writing, and family history/life-writing. The viability of admitting MA Writing students to study creative writing is under department review at present, now that the MFA program is underway.

Public Engagement (formerly Rhetoric and Literature of Public Engagement). Our new Public Engagement emphasis—which emerged from our discussions about the strengths of our faculty across subfields—can be distinguished from traditional English programs by several unique features. It combines intellectual rigor, literary analysis, and rhetorical skill with service, activism, and leadership. The curriculum includes a core seminar in public intellectualism, an experiential learning component, and training in interdisciplinary literacy. Students choose coursework tailored to their own interests. For instance, a course in postmodern poetics might be useful to a student committed to creating a space for local spoken word; a course in rhetoric and Marxism might be useful to a student who does labor advocacy work; a course in environmental literature might be useful to a student active in local sustainability movements; and a course in literature and film might be useful to a student who wants to facilitate community reading groups. Stressing both a critical eye and an eye toward craft, this emphasis gives students the opportunity to explore their intellectual interests while providing them the critical skills needed for a range of careers and doctoral programs.

Language and Linguistics. The MA program of study in Language and Linguistics is designed primarily for students who have some background in Linguistics but did not major in the field as undergraduates. This is an excellent complement to BA and advanced degrees in Anthropology, Composition and Rhetoric, English Literature, Foreign Languages, Philosophy, Psychology, or Speech Pathology. The MA may (but need not) serve as preparation for further study in a Linguistics PhD program. The program of study provides students the opportunity to study the English Language and to master the analytical tools of Linguistics, which can be applied to the study of any language. In addition to a firm grounding in the basic concepts of Linguistics, students receive training in Phonology, Morphology, Syntax and Grammar, Social Linguistics, Discourse Analysis, History of the Language, and Old English.

Creative Writing. The Master of Fine Arts (MFA) degree in creative writing is a new, three-year, 60-credit hour, residential terminal degree program, which the department planned, proposed, and instituted since the previous departmental self-study and external review. Four tenure-track professors and one continuing lecturer offer instruction to students, who enter with a specialization in either fiction or poetry, after having completed a bachelor's degree. (We are currently running a tenure-track search for a new hire in fiction, and the successful candidate will join the faculty in 2016.) The program advertises friendliness to fiction writers working in the commercial genres, as well as to more traditional mainstream/literary writers; ours is one of the only residential programs in the nation to do so. In addition to their coursework, students are required to pass a comprehensive oral and written exam, based on a 30-text reading list, and to write and defend a thesis, defined as a book-length collection of creative work of publishable quality, supervised by a committee comprised of three faculty members from English and one from an outside department. In the first three years of the program, MFA students and faculty will begin a publishing project (likely a program-based small press, publishing electronic/print-on-demand titles solicited from the larger literary community). The MFA program directs and judges the new Lahontan Poetry Prize, a broadside contest run in partnership with the Department of Art's Black Rock Press; it

also organizes and presents the UNR Summer Youth Writing Program, which brings ca. 35 local high school students to campus annually in July to work with graduate students, faculty, and Reno-based writers on creative writing.

3. Analysis of Changes in the Graduate Program

The graduate program has experienced substantial changes in structure and quality since our last program review. The program has evolved as we experienced a number of changes in our program and emphasis offerings. First, there are two specializations we no longer offer. As recommended in our last self-study and review, we eliminated the MATE program, which had experienced a steep enrollment decline as the TESOL trained faculty retired and the Education Department began to take over this kind of instruction. Our remaining linguistics faculty are more theoretically trained linguists and have shifted the type of linguistic oriented options we offer. Also, owing to significant attrition of faculty in the area of Literature and the Environment in a climate where replacing them was not an option, we no longer offer this MA and PhD program emphasis. The loss of the L&E program was a significant one to our department as that program was nationally known and attracted top students from around the country and, indeed, the world. English studies in Literature and Environment is now integrated into the graduate program's remaining and new emphasis areas. This change from a distinct emphasis to a general strength reflects trends in the profession, as ecocriticism is increasingly mainstreamed. The department continues to offer one or two "green" seminars per year, and we accept a limited number of incoming MA and PhD students interested ecocriticism and environmental writing.

Despite these losses, we have two exciting new additions to the department since the last review, an MFA degree program and a MA emphasis in Public Engagement that we feel reflect the areas of strength for our current faculty.

Among the most important current structural changes related to our graduate program is the addition of our MFA degree, with our inaugural 2015 class. As reflected in the last departmental self-study and external review, it has long been our goal to add an MFA—we have for years seen substantial student interest in this area — but the recent addition of the program reflects growing departmental strengths in areas such as genre fiction and place-based literatures. The department laid the groundwork for the program over the span of several years, creating several new courses and hiring a tenure-track poet (Gehrke), even while the University had a recession-prompted moratorium on new programs in place. In 2013 the moratorium was lifted, and the department put forward the program proposal for administrative approval, which was granted by the Board of Regents in 2014. The MFA is the recognized terminal degree in creative writing; few students holding the degree, however, seek academic positions. Our program should be deemed successful if a significant number of graduates go on to publish creative work in prominent professional venues, and/or find a substantial audience through independent publishing. In addition, we can expect some graduates to find work in publishing/agenting.

Another structural change is the addition of a new MA emphasis, the Public Engagement emphasis. This emphasis was designed to capitalize on the wide variety of public oriented work that faculty in all areas were already undertaking. By emphasizing the popular writing, public readings, theater, blogging, and various community collaborations in which faculty are already participating, this emphasis is designed to highlight the many academic and non-academic career paths for those with a Masters degree in English. We intend to draw from activist oriented student populations and to overlap with the University's commitment to greater community engagement. Students in the emphasis choose from a variety of courses—in any area—that are

already on the books; however, they work with the instructor to orient their seminar papers and other projects to the theme of public, place, and power. With only one Public Engagement specific required course—English 740 Seminar in Public Intellectualism—students have considerable freedom to develop their program of study according to their academic and professional goals. In its first year, this emphasis has attracted three students; however, we believe with more advertisement, it has significant growth potential.

As a result of the loss of the L&E program and the process of getting the new programs up and running, the graduate student numbers experienced a decline in the total number of enrolled graduate students since the last review period. However, now that we have these new programs starting, we anticipate an increase in enrollment and, in fact, have experienced program growth this year, putting us back at about the number of students before the demise of the L&E emphasis with 75[3] graduate students this year. In terms of how this compares to enrollment prior to these structural changes, this figure puts us just under the level of our last program review, when we had 82 active students. As general national trends suggest a decline in English program graduate enrollment nationally of approximately 1.7% since 2008 (Council of Graduate Schools report 2003-2013), we feel our program has been able to successfully navigate and adjust to the changes we have experienced. The quality and reputation of our graduate program has continued to improve over the last 10 years, evidenced by the continued shift from a predominantly local student applicant pool to an applicant pool indicating a diverse national and international draw. For example, overseas and non-local U.S. applicants made up over 65% of this year's applicant pool. We feel this shift was accomplished through a more selective admissions process, a strong cohort of active junior faculty, and an increase in the number of teaching assistantships that support our PhD program.

In terms of our acceptance rate, we admit approximately two-thirds of MA applicants and typically admit about one-third of PhD applicants, as we tie PhD admittance to teaching assistantships, which limits admission to TA lines available. In the 2015 admission cycle, we admitted 39% of our PhD applicants, with the increase driven by an increase in funded TA lines for doctoral candidates. One of our goals in the coming years is to attract a larger applicant pool in all of our emphasis areas, and we are pursuing a range of recruitment strategies. These include designing and distributing new marketing materials at relevant events and conferences, targeted email campaigns, internal recruitment of promising undergraduates, and recruitment trips to nearby colleges in Nevada and California.

An analysis of graduate program developments over the past decade suggests that most changes in our graduate program have been for the better, though they are not without attendant challenges. For example, while we have become more selective in admissions and thus have substantially improved the quality of our students, programs, degree completion rates, and placement, we now routinely reject weaker applicants and, thus, impact our enrollment numbers and our ability to offer a greater range of seminars due to lowered enrollment patterns. Exacerbating the decline in the number of graduate seminars we can offer each semester is the relatively new mandate from the administration that classes must enroll to 50% (8 students per seminar) or they will be cancelled. In earlier times we could offer seminars even if enrollment was low.

---

[3] This number is based on students that are still making progress toward their degree in English, even if they are not enrolled in the current term (e.g. on medical leave or due to financial hardship). Students not actively making progress were excluded from this count.

Related challenges are associated with recruitment and funding. For example, while our programs are now strong enough to attract many excellent MA applicants, it is often the case that these applicants are offered funding from competing institutions, and thus we must offer them funding (in the form of a teaching assistantship) in order to persuade them to join our department. However, even as we recruit increasingly talented MA applicants we are often unable to persuade them to attend without funding—even when we are their first choice. Excellent students for whom we now compete are often given campus visit funding (something we do not have) from competing institutions, which puts us at a disadvantage in recruiting. This situation is a significant change from the recent past, when virtually all MA (often local) applicants accepted to the program chose to attend, despite the fact that few were awarded a TA. Now that many of our students come from outside the local area, this lack of funding makes it hard to compete with better financial offers.

Another example of the consequences of improvement and of a shift in University priorities in terms of assessment and accountability may be found in the radically expanded administrative work necessary to administer the graduate program—creating a situation where it has become more difficult to recruit graduate faculty to serve as Director of Graduate Studies (DGS). Whereas the position of DGS once consisted primarily of routine paperwork and student meetings, it now includes expanded responsibilities for policy, recruitment, admissions, departmental planning, mentoring, placement, assessment, and interfacing with increasingly bureaucratized university systems. The $4,500 stipend for the position has never been increased since it was created nearly 20 years ago; it is unlikely that the stipend alone would persuade a faculty member to serve.[4] And while the position is also supported with a release of one course per semester, the administrative work necessary to do the job well each semester exceeds the work and time required to teach a course—and work must be done during summer as well as during fall and spring. Despite this lack of adequate support, faculty have proven willing to serve in this administrative role. However, it is also important to recognize that, given the increasing workload, the challenges of mastering increasingly bureaucratized systems of administration and assessment, and the need for regular service during off-contract days during summer, the current course release and stipend are unlikely to function effectively as incentive for service as DGS. One option that might make the position more attractive and less potentially detrimental to research trajectory is to offer a one-semester leave at the end of the term of service, both for the DGS and for other departmental officers. At the very least, a release from one course that carries over one semester beyond the DGS service years would allow more mentoring from the transitioning DGS to the new DGS, often a period where the positional and institutional memory the retiring DGS can provide is most needed.

4. Administrative Structure of the Graduate Programs

The graduate programs are administered by the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS), who chairs the Graduate Committee, which acts on behalf of the department's Graduate Faculty in matters related to graduate education. Like other departmental program directors, the DGS is also a member of the department's Planning Committee.

---

[4] For comparison, a faculty member who taught a three-credit summer course would be paid considerably more than the stipend for a year's service as DGS (in 2015, summer courses paid $6510 for faculty at Rank III, $7170 for Rank IV).

Director of Graduate Studies (DGS). The DGS performs a variety of tasks necessary to the functioning of the graduate program, including: chairing the Graduate Committee (see below); serving on the Department Planning Committee, administration of the admissions and recruitment process and arranging and hosting recruitment events in fall and spring; functioning as a liaison between students (and student groups) and the graduate faculty, between the graduate faculty and the Graduate School, and between the students and the Graduate School; advising prospective, new, and continuing students throughout the year; administering the Graduate Mentoring Program; conducting the Job Placement and Graduate Preparation Workshops and aiding in placement in many other ways; reviewing and revising graduate program policy; informing the Graduate Faculty of issues related to the program; updating all program materials, including the graduate section of the department website and the "Graduate Advisement Procedures" document that articulates best practices for departmental advisement of graduate students; reviewing and approving all graduate progression paperwork for students; consulting on issues of scheduling, enrollment, curricula, and funding; attending orientations and conducting workshops; hosting graduation receptions; writing and distributing a monthly e-mail newsletter to apprise students of opportunities, deadlines, and changes to program requirements; creating and producing recruitment and marketing materials; administering the Summer Research Assistant Program and the graduate scholarships; fielding complaints and adjudicating grievances; conducting program assessment; and, contributing to other documents such as strategic plans. While many of these responsibilities occur during the contract period, the DGS must also continue some administrative work during the off-contract period in the summer.

Graduate Committee. The Graduate Committee is responsible for reviewing the department's graduate degree programs, curricula, policies, and procedures. The committee helps to guide improvements in the programs by proposing program reforms to the Graduate Faculty and, ultimately, by revising program policy and procedural documents to reflect those improvements. The Graduate Committee has also taken on an increasing role in course assessment over the last 7-10 years, as the University has moved toward a model focused on specific learning objectives. The committee is also responsible for conducting the admissions process and advising on the distribution of Teaching Assistantships to prospective and continuing students as well as helping plan and attending professionalization workshops and recruitment events.

Graduate Faculty. The Graduate Faculty consists of those faculty whom the Graduate School has approved to serve on and chair graduate student committees. The Graduate Faculty of the English Department meets annually (but is informed and consulted more often than that by email and in meetings of the continuing faculty) to discuss the graduate program and if necessary to consider changes to it.

Planning Committee. As a member of the Planning Committee, the DGS meets regularly (usually monthly) with the chair and other program directors to ensure that the needs of the graduate programs are being communicated to the department level, and to

ensure that the graduate program is being administered and evaluated in the larger context of departmental needs, challenges, and resources.

Analysis of Administrative Structure of the Graduate Program. The Graduate Faculty meets annually and is kept informed by a faculty listserv and updates during regular departmental meetings as needed throughout the year, the Graduate Committee maintains a substantial procedural document that is used to articulate best practices (we now regularly use and revise the "Graduate Advisement Procedures" document to address a range of advisement issues), and the DGS plays an active role in departmental administration via regular meetings of the Planning Committee and in regular consultation with other departmental officers. We feel that the current administrative structure of the graduate program is clear and effective.

5. Relation of Graduate Programs to other Departments, Nevada, and the Nation

English graduate students participate in activities and organizations across campus, and they sometimes pursue interdisciplinary studies in other departments. Our department's courses and faculty are a resource to graduate students in other fields (students in other departments sometimes take our courses, and our faculty regularly serve on graduate committees in other departments), and our students, faculty, and courses contribute to interdisciplinary programs and centers, including the Gender, Race and Identity Program; the Academy for the Environment; the Black Rock Press; and the University of Nevada Press. Our service to Nevada comes in many forms, chief among which is that graduates of our programs now serve as educators throughout the state. We make two main contributions at the national level: 1. We have several outstanding program emphases that attract and serve students from all regions of the country; 2. Many of our doctoral students are now academic faculty at colleges and universities across the nation.

B. Curriculum

1. The Structure of the Curriculum

Sequential and Telescoping Structure of Curriculum. While the requirements of each degree program emphasis differ considerably, there are several general principles that inform the structure of our programs. First, we intend that core courses should be laid out in a sequential and telescoping structure. For example, Literature students and MFA candidates should take English 711, Introduction to Graduate Studies, in their first fall in the program, so as to become familiar with general professional issues and research methodologies in the discipline. Likewise, students in the Rhetoric and Composition PhD or the MA Writing emphasis take English 730. Because this course offers exposure to a variety of approaches to writing in a variety of genres, it often helps students to focus their interests in ways that assist them in planning their subsequent, more specific, coursework. If students are teaching in our program, we also require they take English 737, a pedagogically focused teacher training course, in their first semester when many are new to teaching and to the challenges it offers. Second, we intend that each program should represent a balance between generalist and specialist training. For example, MA Writing students are required to take a certain number of electives from within a "basket"

of composition-related courses, and also required to take an equal number of courses that are in other areas of study. Likewise, the new MFA program is a "studio/research program" as designated by the Association of Writers and Writing Programs (AWP); the curriculum is built around a sequence of workshops in which students present original work to their peers and professors for critique and guidance in revision, and is supplemented by creative writing seminars examining topics and problems in the field, craft, and contemporary publishing, as well as elective courses taken in and outside of the department. Third, we intend that each program should represent a balance of coursework and other forms of study that are not based in coursework, such as comprehensive exams, theses, portfolios, professional papers, and internships.

Range of Courses Offered. The department offers graduate courses at the 600 and 700 levels. Courses at the 600 level are cross-listed with upper-division undergraduate courses; the graduate-level "section" of these 400/600 level courses tends to be quite small, usually 2-3 students. Courses at the 700 level are seminars that are capped at 15 students. Although program requirements allow students to take some of their credits at the 600 level, we strongly advise students (especially PhD students) to plan programs that contain few, if any, credits at the 600 level.

We try to offer a range of graduate courses, and to schedule and rotate those courses in ways that will be useful and interesting to our students. We have a course rotation model that guides our offerings, but which we interpret flexibly in the light of staffing issues, student needs, and special opportunities. Required and key elective courses are available on a regular basis, and in general students have had no difficulty getting the core courses they need in order to complete their programs in a timely manner.

In addition to taking courses within our departmental curriculum, our students are also encouraged to pursue coursework and interdisciplinary studies in other departments. This approach has the benefit of broadening our students' intellectual horizons and enhancing their ability to conduct interdisciplinary research, but has the negative consequence that every credit taken outside the department increases the risk that we may not be able to offer a course that would, if all students took all their credits only within the department, have sufficient enrollment to be offered.

Extracurricular opportunities. Students are also encouraged to participate in the many extracurricular opportunities we help fund and schedule, including conferences, symposia, colloquia, and readings and lectures by visiting writers and scholars. A number of our students help plan and participate in the College of Liberal Arts Graduate Symposium (CLAGS) conference held at UNR annually. We also encourage and support a number of student organized clubs such as EGO, the English Graduate Organization; NEMO, the new Nevada Early Modern Organization; the UNR Creative Writing Club; and Rhetoric@Reno. Rhetoric@Reno, through grant funds from the Nevada Humanities as well as professional organizations like Rhetoric Society of America and the National Communication Association, hosts high profile speakers each year. Additionally, they hosted the annual meeting of the Western States Rhetoric and Literacy conference in 2014. They have also worked with the College to bring Naomi Klein to campus and have organized a symposium of 16 senior faculty from around the country. These faculty will

deliver academic talks in relationship to Klein's work. The MFA Program and UNR Creative Writing Club have, for the last five years, helped organize and teach the UNR Summer Youth Writing Program, which brings ca. 35 regional middle and high school students to campus every summer for creative writing instruction and writing-related activities.

Graduate students may also choose to participate in independent studies ("Special Topics") and in internships (which, indeed, are a requirement within our Rhetoric and Composition doctoral program emphasis).

2. Developing and Adjusting the Graduate Curriculum

Adjustments to the graduate curriculum are made in a number of ways. Each standing field committee (e.g. literature, linguistics, writing) has come up with, based on curricular and program requirements and faculty specializations, an advisory course rotation for courses in their specialty area. Working with the DGS, field committee chairs and faculty members, the Associate chair devises with a rough rotation for the upcoming year. Students, faculty members, or field committees may provide feedback to the DGS, the Graduate Committee, and/or the department chair. The Graduate Committee reviews course offerings, and suggests adjustments to our pattern of course rotation and/or our staffing of courses. That committee also proposes adjustments to the curriculum as members of the Graduate Faculty retire and are hired, as we respond to changes in the discipline, and as we predict the sorts of courses will be most useful to our students' professional development and subsequent placement prospects.

3. Analysis of the Graduate Curriculum

We provide a range of interesting, carefully scheduled, well-taught courses, and thus have a solid curriculum. (Syllabi for graduate courses are available through the department.) However, one issue related to the curriculum continues to require attention.

Our most pressing issue is that we regularly have had instances over the last few years in which seminars were under-enrolled and had to be cancelled entirely. This is not a new problem. In fact, in 2006-2007 the Graduate Committee did an assessment of this problem, identified a number of possible causes, and took concrete steps in response. At that time it was determined that too many students were taking too many of their credits in the form of independent study, internship, and/or at the 600 level rather than at the seminar level. In response, the Graduate Committee alerted the graduate faculty to the issue, and encouraged more careful mentoring of student course selection, and we established a new Graduate Mentoring Program to help improve student course selection and thus strengthen student programs. We also reduced the number of independent study credits that may be counted toward the degree from 6 to 3, and we reduced the number of internship credits that may be counted toward the degree from 8 to 4. While these adjustments were necessary precursors to improving enrollment in seminars, the drop in enrollment over the last few years as programs and emphases shifted made it more difficult to fill grad seminars, especially as the administration has increasingly upped enrollment minimums. While we have hired a large number of new faculty in the R/C specialization and anticipate a growth in our graduate student population in that area as a result, recruitment efforts in this area can only now really begin as our new hires get added to the faculty. Likewise, our MFA and RLPE programs are just now up and running after several years of development and, while we

anticipate greater enrollments going forward, we still need to offer requisite courses for the new students in those programs that, this early in fledgling programs, teeter near the lower cut-off for seminar enrollment numbers to make. In response, we have encouraged some cross-pollination of students in different but related programs enrolling in seminars outside their narrow area of specialization. For example, a literature student also interested in creative writing can enroll in an MFA writing workshop. However, even with increases in enrollments, we will need to pay close attention to this issue, as some specializations continue be less popular from year to year and shortages of students for seminars in those areas may need to continue to be proactively addressed,

Finally, there is also the issue of what to do about the MA Writing now given the new MFA degree, as creative writers are now tending toward the new program. Some faculty would like it to continue as an option for creative writing, but the Rhetoric and Composition faculty would like either to make it an MA in rhet/comp which complements our PhD in rhet/comp or to eliminate it. This is something we have discussed over the past year both in standing committees and in the graduate committee and is something we need to resolve in the near future as we still continue to admit students into a program that is not well-defined.

C. Graduate Students

1. Number, Distribution, Quality, and Diversity of Students

As of Fall 2015, we have a total of 75 graduate students, 26 in the MA, 11 in the MFA program and 38 in the PhD program. The distribution of students by degree program and program emphasis are as indicated in the following table. Though we no longer admit students into the L&E program, we still have students finishing this specialization in the program who are included in this summary.

Distribution of Graduate Students by Degree Program and Emphasis

PROGRAM / EMPHASIS	NUMBER OF STUDENTS
MA/ Literature	16
MA/ Writing	8
MA/ RLPE	1
MA/ Language and Linguistics	1
Total Number of MA	26
MFA/Fiction	7
MFA/Poetry	4
Total Number of MFA	11

PhD/ Literature	14
PhD/ Rhetoric and Composition	19
PhD/ Literature and Environment	5
Number of PhD students	38
TOTAL graduate students	75

Most of our MA students go on to advanced graduate studies (in English, American Studies, Creative Writing, Law, Environmental Studies, Women's Studies, Educational Administration, Film Studies, Library Science, etc.), or to successful careers in education, publishing, non-profit administration, and a variety of other fields. Most of our doctoral students now enter the national job market, and a majority of them have succeeded in securing tenure-track assistant professorships.

Our graduate program has always attracted students of various ages, from newly minted BAs in their early twenties through retirees. In recent years we have seen a great deal more geographical diversity in our students, as the reputation of our program and faculty with colleagues at other universities has helped to recruit students from around the country. The inclusion of so many students from so many places and so many different kinds of undergraduate backgrounds has enriched our programs immeasurably. In terms of ethnic diversity, our programs remain weak. There are two primary reasons for this. The first is that the Reno area is not ethnically diverse, which has made the recruitment of minority faculty and graduate students very challenging. Second, the only form of support the Department of English has to offer prospective graduate students is the TA, which requires extraordinary fluency in English because most of the courses taught by students on TA are in composition. We have had cases in which international graduate student applicants were sufficiently promising to be accepted to the program, but not sufficiently fluent to be teachers of writing in English.

Since our last program review, we have been more actively trying to find solutions to this lack of diversity within our faculty and student populations. We now have a department diversity officer and she meets with university diversity representatives as well as the department directors to come up with new avenues for recruitment of diversity candidates for the graduate program. For example, we sent her to the California Diversity Forum last year to in an effort to make us more visible to minority students and we also did a direct marketing campaign discussing the advantages of our program via email to McNair Scholars across the U.S. As we revamp our website to be ADA compliant this year, we hope to change the image of the department somewhat by making more obvious connections to what we can offer ethnically diverse applicants. While this is only a start, we hope that we will begin to attract a more diverse student population with efforts such as these. We are also trying to become more attractive to ethnically diverse faculty. Without greater diversity in our faculty, it will remain hard to be attractive to a diverse student population.

2. Graduate Special Students. The university permits "graduate special" students—that is, students who have an undergraduate degree but are not yet matriculated into any graduate program—to enroll in graduate courses. The graduate special option works fairly well for students who are testing the waters of graduate studies before they apply; have applied and not

been admitted, and so want to strengthen their skills and credentials before reapplying; have not been in school in years, and need to refresh their skills; have weak disciplinary training in English but ambitions to do graduate work in English; or, have no interest in a degree, but wish to take graduate-level courses for the purpose of self-enrichment. We often recommend students that are interested in the program yet perhaps lacking proven skills necessary for graduate study try this path before pursuing official enrollment. Because there is no screening of would-be graduate special students on the basis of preparation or training, many of these students are much less prepared for coursework than degree seeking students, something that had created problems in the past in advanced seminars. Since our last program review, we have worked to insure this does not create difficulties for faculty of or students enrolled in advanced seminars by allowing graduate special students to enroll in 700-level courses only by special permission of the instructor.

3. Recruitment. Graduate student recruitment has been effective in the sense that our programs and faculty have in recent years attracted qualified applicants in most program emphasis areas and in that our graduate enrollments are up this year, as were applications. The table below summarizes these trends since 2009.

Number of graduate program applications and entering students by year
Fall 2009 admission Total Applications: 32 PhD 18 MA = 50 total Total Entering Graduate Class: 22
Fall 2010 admission Total Applications: 35 PhD 28 MA = 63 total Total Entering Graduate Class: 25
Fall 2011 admission Total Applications: 33 PhD 15 MA = 48 total Total Entering Graduate Class: 17
Fall 2012 admission Total Applications: 23 PhD 17 MA = 40 total Total Entering Graduate Class: 14
Fall 2013 admission Total Applications: 21 PhD 14 MA = 36 total Total Entering Graduate Class: 20
Fall 2014 admission Total Applications: 17 PhD 15 MA = 32 total Total Entering Graduate Class: 12
Fall 2015 admission Total Applications: 23 PhD 19 MFA 15 MA = 57 total Total Entering Graduate Class: 25

We feel confident that with the debut of our new MFA degree and Public Engagement MA emphasis, we have begun to regain some of the students lost with the demise of the Literature and Environment program. The MFA program can be counted on to admit ca. 10 students per year in future classes. (Research shows that established MFA programs can expect 100-200 applicants per year, from a pool of 3500-4000 aspiring students nationally; we expect

demand for the program to grow quickly and remain strong for the foreseeable future.) We were also recently able to add faculty in our Rhetoric and Composition specialization. This is now an area for us of potential growth, but one which, given the junior status of these professors, will take time to fully realize its potential. One area, however, that has hurt our ability to recruit qualified applicants is the loss of the Graduate School's Excellence Fellowship, a fellowship which offered students full funding for the first year but required no teaching during that year. The Excellence Fellowship was a casualty of the budget crisis of the past decade and, with its loss, we lost a great opportunity to competitively recruit excellent candidates.

However, we have been working hard to emphasize the strengths of our department, particularly the close mentoring we provide and the very supportive community of students and faculty we offer. We have found this is one of the most attractive features of our program and have been able to showcase this aspect of our program in our recruitment efforts over the last several years. For example, since our last review, we have initiated a "Recruitment weekend" for our admitted students, typically taking place 3-4 weeks after they have been notified of acceptance. The weekend serves to give prospective students the chance to learn more about our program directly from our faculty and students. We arrange for students to be housed with our current graduate students (who play an integral role in organizing and making this event a success), meet with the chair and DGS as well as faculty in their interest areas, learn about the campus and its resources (e.g. a Knowledge Center tour and tour of graduate student housing) and, most importantly, to socialize with faculty and graduate students. We also try to arrange optional tours of the area, for example a tour of Lake Tahoe led by current students or a visit to the Nevada Museum of Art. This campus visit weekend format has been an incredible recruiting tool for us and the experience is often decisive, as our recruitment rate among prospective students who visit is extremely high. For example, we had 17 admitted applicants attend this past year's event, with 14 of them subsequently accepting our offer of admission, with most generally citing this weekend as one of the deciding factors.

Unfortunately, despite this success, we do not currently have the resources to maximize the value of these campus visits in the graduate student recruiting process. Where we lose out recruitment opportunity is not with those who visit but rather with those who do not. We often lose these students to competing institutions that are able to host such prospective student recruitment weekends, or that are able to pay for the cost of prospective student travel for the purpose of the campus visit. We have expressed to the Graduate School the need for travel and/or hosting funds to improve the effectiveness of our recruitment efforts, and while we did receive $200 from them toward this event for the first time for last term's weekend, this is far from sufficient. Until we are able to get more funding, English has been making available some funds (around $1500) to the Graduate Committee to help defray the travel expenses of prospective doctoral students who wish to attend this weekend. However, this year we were only able to offer about $150-200 per student and several were unable to make the trip from the opposite coast where airfare runs around $500-600 minimum. Also, we are typically not able to offer much, if any, support to competitive MA applicants. Thus, we lose one of our most effective recruiting tools before we are even able to wield it. Not surprisingly, the recruitment rate among those students was much lower.

4. Funding

Teaching Assistantships (TA). At present, our department has 44 TAs (42 in the English state budget and permanently assigned to English, 2 from the Core Humanities budget which must be renewed annually), which means that slightly over half of our active graduate students receive the support of the TA. This number of TA lines is up 6 permanent lines from our 2008 report, with these new lines coming just this past year. In 2015, students on TA receive a stipend of $17,000 per year (significantly up from $14,000 at our last program review), health benefits, and a fee waiver that reduces their fees for all credits taken to $60-70 per credit hour. So, the news has been positive for our students on TAs as of late, with a $1500 salary increase in the last fiscal year and with more lines dedicated to our programs. Students on TA teach three courses each year (or lead four discussion sections in the Core Humanities program). Save for the marked exception (for example, a local Franciscan friar in our PhD program), we adhere to the MLA directive that all doctoral students should be offered a TA, and that the TA for doctoral students should be renewable for up to five years.

Letter of Appointment (LOA). Students who are not awarded a TA but who require funding and/or who need to gain teaching experience may apply to the Director of Core Writing or the Director of Core Humanities to teach on a course-by-course basis on a "letter of appointment." Students teaching on LOA currently receive $900 per credit hour taught (so, normally, $2700 per course), no health benefits, and a fee waiver that reduces their credit based fees. However, the fee waiver applies only to the number of credits they teach, and is capped at a total of six credits; for example, if a student takes eight credits and teaches one three-credit course as an LOA, only three of the eight credits taken are eligible for the fee discount. Given the shamefully low pay (which has only increased $100 per credit hour taught since our last program review), the lack of health benefits, and the limitations on the fee waiver benefit, it is remarkable that any qualified person would accept such a position, or feel motivated to excel in it if they did. Still, many of our MA students are excited just to be able to have a teaching position and view it as an opportunity for training. An additional problem with the poor compensation offered by the LOA is the troubling manner in which it strains graduate student morale. Students who are on TA and students who apply for but do not receive a TA (and thus often are driven to the LOA option) are in classes together, share offices, and are even housemates. The gap between what the TA offers one student and what the LOA offers the next is so dramatic as to create a kind of LOA underclass of student teachers who, perhaps understandably, feel that their work is neither valued nor compensated appropriately.

Other Funding. Around 10 graduate students receive an opportunity to teach one course in the summer, which in 2015 paid $4785. For those not teaching, our Summer Research Assistant program provides modest funding for up to 12 students, who receive $1200 for performing 80 hours of work in support of a faculty member's research project. We have also just introduced a new academic year RA program offering up to 4 students the opportunity to work on a research project of one of the Department's directors, with a similar pay structure to that of the summer positions. Students may also receive $300 from the department to support travel to conferences, and they may apply to the Graduate Student Association for modest amounts of additional research and/or travel funding. Doctoral students may apply to the College of Liberal Arts awarded Bilinski Fellowship, which several of our students have won in recent years. We also have several modest departmental fellowships for graduate students: the Ronald Dissertation Fellowship is given annually to one ABD student and is usually accompanied by an

award of $1000; the Douglass Memorial Scholarship is a teaching-based award that also usually pays $1000; the James Macmillan Scholarship is based on a writing competition and has undergraduate and graduate categories, so each year at least one graduate student (and often two) receives this award, which is accompanied by a prize that is typically a bit less than $1000.

  Historical Trends in Graduate Student Funding. In 2004 we were able to launch a Summer Research Assistantship Program that matches a graduate student and a faculty member to work on a research project over the summer months. Although the overall financial support for graduate students generated by these RAs is modest at $1200—and is typically available to only 10-12 students—the program does provide some students with funding in the summer, and it has allowed many students to gain valuable professional experience. As mentioned above, in Fall 2015, we extended this RA program to include a limited number of academic year slots, with these positions targeted particularly to students not receiving TA support (so toward MA students). Both of these opportunities provide both support and professionalization and so have, we believe, been useful on several fronts to our students.

  Although the stipend for Teaching Assistantships was stagnant for several years, the stipend was (happily) increased by $1500 in the 2015-2016 AY, bringing the current stipend to 17,000. Also, after a long period during which the number of permanent TA lines available to our department had remained essentially flat (since the early 1990s), we recently received 6 new TA lines as well as a renewal of two year-to-year TA lines for TAs to work in the Core Humanities. This lack of growth in the TAs up to this point had substantially impeded recruitment (we have lost some excellent prospects for lack of funding), slowed the work of many students toward their degree (because they lacked funding and so had to work other jobs and attend school part time), and reduced the opportunities for students to gain teaching experience (which has substantial negative consequences for placement) so the addition of these new TA lines helps greatly with these issues. Year to year, we are only able to offer the number of TA lines that come open based on current TA movement (e.g. graduation or timing out of 5 year TA period), which often was as low as 7 in a given year and rarely larger than 9 or 10 TAs. With these 6 new permanent and 2 new annual lines, this year we were able to offer 16 TA positions to incoming students. This significantly assists both in recruitment and retention and provides a best practice model for our students who are able to gain both valuable training and experience that will help them on the market. However, while we have been extremely pleased by the uptick in the number of permanent lines awarded to the department, they have come with the stipulation that they only be used for PhD students, a request that limits their utility in recruitment. For example, this year, we had some extremely promising MA and MFA applicants, as well as PhD applicants, but we were unable to offer any of these new TA positions to those applicants, even though, in some cases, they were potentially more promising than some of the PhD applicants whom we determined we did not want to admit. Had we had more flexibility in our TA offers, we may well have been able to recruit a stronger field of MA and MFA applicants. In addition, we feel the terminal degree status of the MFA is not well recognized by the University, a problem that limits how funding and recognition is distributed to this degree program by the Graduate School.

  As of Fall 2015, roughly 58% of our graduate students (44 out of 75 students) receive the support of the TA, a percentage we think speaks well of our dedication to provide professionalization and training to our graduate students that will help them as they look toward placement. We have, in this regard, improved our position since our last program review where

only 45% of our students were supported by a TA. While we are heading in the right direction, we still feel more flexibility in the assignment of these positions by degree program and less reliance on LOAs to staff our entry level courses by increasing TA lines available would benefit the students at both the undergraduate and graduate level.

5. Student Participation in Departmental Activities

Graduate students play many important roles within the department. As a group, students are represented by the English Graduate Organization (EGO), which organizes readings and social events. The officers of this group communicate with the DGS and the department chair regarding their goals, activities, and ideas about program improvements. Many of our students have also served important roles within the University-wide Graduate Student Association (GSA). We try never to miss an opportunity to have a PhD (or, where appropriate, MFA) student member on our hiring committees, and we pay travel funding to make it possible for those students to attend the MLA conference in order to be part of the interview process. When job candidates are on campus for interviews, they are always scheduled to meet with graduate students, and student feedback regarding candidates is taken seriously by our hiring committees and by the department more generally. We also encourage graduate students to both socialize and professionalize in graduate student groups that parallel departmental specializations. There are many opportunities for graduate students to integrate with faculty and with each other (including monthly happy hours as well as a wide range of professional events), and the atmosphere—our graduate students will tell you—is one of collegiality and support. Most of our faculty have an open-door policy, and are accessible, helpful, and compassionate mentors to graduate students, even those students with whom they are not directly working. Our graduate students tend to be our strongest recruitment tool: prospective students see and appreciate the good morale, and want to be part of the special community we have here.

D. Advisement of Graduate Students

1. Advisement Mission, Policies, and Procedures.

The department takes very seriously its professional and ethical obligation to provide graduate students with the support, advice, and professional mentoring without which no graduate program can fully succeed. This advisement comes in many forms, both formal and informal, but the following are prominent examples of advisement mechanisms in our graduate program.

Director of Graduate Studies (DGS). Under normal circumstances the DGS has multiple communications with every prospective student, meets with new students individually when they arrive, and remains available to meet with continuing students at key stages of their program: course selection, committee formation, and the preparation of the Program of Study (see below), final plans and paperwork for graduation. It is the norm for the DGS to meet with an individual student many times during their course of study, and to answer their questions by email often throughout their time in the program.

Graduate Committee. The Graduate Committee (which consists of members of the Graduate Faculty representing all program emphasis areas) typically meets monthly

during the academic year to consider a variety of issues related to the graduate program. While some of these meetings are devoted to the admissions process, most are focused on addressing concerns about the program's functioning, and devising and implementing short- and long-term program improvements.

Graduate Faculty. The Graduate Faculty of the department is kept updated (though email and at meetings of the continuing faculty) about issues of concern in the graduate program. These updates often have to do with changes in the profession—or the University, college, or department—that affect our program. Or, they may have to do with problems with or changes to our assessment of best practices for graduate advisement. The Graduate Faculty also meets once each year, at a time determined by the Chair and the DGS. In advance of this meeting the DGS, on behalf of the Graduate Committee, circulates any documents that need to be reviewed, and at its meeting the Graduate Faculty considers proposed clarifications or adjustments to the program.

"Graduate Advisement Procedures" Document. In addition to our formal documents describing the graduate programs and their requirements, we maintain an internal document, called "Graduate Advisement Procedures," that articulates our consensus regarding best practices for graduate advisement in our department. This document clarifies a variety of issues related to graduate mentoring, and is thus helpful to newly hired graduate faculty as they learn how best to meet their important responsibilities in advising graduate students. The Graduate Advisement Procedures document is used by the Graduate Faculty to clarify our priorities, and to keep open a conversation about how to excel at our important work as graduate mentors. When we see opportunities for improvements in the program, we use this document as a starting point for discussion, and we adjust it as needed to reflect our new understanding of best practices. The Graduate Advisement Procedures document is included as Appendix F.

Graduate Mentoring Program. The Graduate Mentoring Program, which was implemented Fall 2007, exists to ensure that (upon arrival) graduate students receive support and advice from a faculty member within their degree program emphasis. In particular, students often need guidance in the early semesters of their program, before they have selected a chair, and before they have defined the focus of their work. Although the DGS is always available to consult with students, Graduate Mentors are assigned directly to individual students, assist them on a regular basis until such time as the student has identified a chair, and are well positioned to offer advice that is specific to the student's program emphasis. The first meeting between the Graduate Mentor and the student occurs during a "Welcome Meeting" that takes place in the first few weeks of the student's first term and brings together the DGS, the assigned faculty mentor and the incoming student. Subsequently, the Graduate Mentor meets with the student at least once each semester until such time as the student has a chair in place, and communicates with the DGS. Since its inception, we have found this practice to be helpful both to incoming graduate students and to faculty, who have an opportunity to get to know and advise students that they may not have otherwise encountered. While the grad mentors are selected on the basis of shared emphasis with the student, it is not the case that the student shares more specific research interests, something they look for more carefully in

59

chair and committee selection. Yet, it is beneficial to both students and faculty members to work outside of narrow specializations and this arrangement, in addition to the obvious benefits of new program orientation, can also engage students and faculty in conversation and advisement that orients them more broadly to those working in the field. Another advantage of the mentoring program is that it gives faculty in thinly-enrolled research areas an opportunity to contribute to the graduate program.

Chairing and Committee Structure/ Program of Study Process. Graduate students select a chair (major advisor) and other committee members from among the University's Graduate Faculty. For MA students, the committee consists of three faculty members, one of whom is not from English; for PhD students, the committee consists of five faculty members, two of whom are not from English. Rather than simply evaluating comprehensive exams and thesis or dissertation work (which they also do), these committees play a key role in graduate student mentoring and professionalization by helping students to develop their ideas, skills, and professional opportunities as well as simply ensuring that students meet minimum standards and requirements. While we have found this system to work well, one issue we do encounter with this model of graduate advisement is that the advisement load on graduate faculty varies significantly from person to person, and there is no compensation for faculty with disproportionately high numbers of advisees, except perhaps in annual merit, which has not been funded reliably since 2008.

One important occasion on which the committee has an opportunity to offer advice is when the student's Program of Study form is being prepared. This form, which lays out the full program, must be approved by all members of the committee, by the DGS, and by a representative of the Graduate School. As a result, the Program of Study provides an opportunity for a number of faculty members, in different roles, to provide feedback regarding the student's professional plans. We encourage students to complete the Program of Study form as soon as possible after they have formed their full committee; we advise MA students to form their committee in the second semester of full-time study, PhD students in their third semester of full-time study.

Academic Job Placement Workshops. Each year the DGS, along with the Graduate Committee and the Graduate Faculty, organizes workshops oriented toward post-graduation placement. These workshops focus on various aspects of the job search process (overview, application letters, CVs, writing samples, conference and phone interviews, on-campus interviews, etc.), and typically include participation by several faculty members (recently hired faculty are often most helpful in this role), and the distribution of various handouts (including sample letters and CVs). Beginning last year, we decided to enlarge the scope of these workshops to include a separate workshop focused on non-academic job preparation and PhD program application preparation to better serve the needs of our MA student population. This workshop was one of our best attended and will now be a regular part of our workshop rotation.

Other Mentoring Mechanisms. Other mentoring mechanisms within the department include the two-week summer TA training conducted by the Director of Core Writing, and occasional professionalization sessions on topics such as presenting conference

papers, publishing book reviews, and preparing dissertation proposals. The graduate section of our website includes not only formal program requirements, but also additional mentoring and advisement tools such as one-page program checklists and sample timelines of progress toward the degree. We also find that faculty mentoring, both by the DGS and Graduate Faculty more generally, on an individual basis is greatly valued by our students and something that our faculty provide on a regular basis outside our formal mentoring structure. Likewise, we offer to match each student up with a more advanced student as a "buddy," and the EGO organization also provides peer support through an initial email introduction during the summer prior to enrollment and in a welcome letter the DGS gives to each new student at the first meeting.

Beyond the department, the Career Studio, the Graduate School, and other university units also offer workshops and trainings that are useful in the mentoring of our graduate students. These opportunities are announced in an email newsletter sent on a regular basis by the DGS to all graduate students.

2. Assessment of Academic Advising in the Graduate Program. Assessment of advising within the program is an ongoing process that is accomplished primarily through the work of the Graduate Committee on behalf of the Graduate Faculty (see 1a.-1d., above).

3. Procedures for Resolution of Student/Advisor Conflicts. Any complaints or concerns regarding the graduate program in general or individual students or faculty members specifically should be expressed to the DGS. If appropriate, the DGS adds such concerns to the agenda for discussion by the Graduate Committee, and the DGS may also consult with the Planning Committee and the department chair. Working with the concerned parties and acting with the informed advice of the Graduate Committee and/or the chair, the DGS then attempts to negotiate a solution to the conflict. If the mediated solution is not satisfactory to the student or to the faculty member, they have recourse to express their grievance directly to the department chair.

E. Assessment of Graduate Program

Graduate program assessment is an ongoing process, and occurs in a number of ways. As described above, the Graduate Committee routinely examines and evaluates the effectiveness of the program, and devises and implements changes whenever an opportunity to strengthen the program is identified. The graduate faculty is likewise included in an ongoing discussion regarding the quality of our program, and the Graduate Advisement Procedures document is used, discussed, and revised in order to solve problems, clarify procedures, and articulate our consensus regarding best practices in graduate advisement. The membership of the DGS on the Planning Committee also ensures that graduate program needs are considered and reflected in updates to department strategic plans.

Of course we also participate in a formal assessment of our program each year through the University's assessment process in the form of evaluating how specific course SLO are met through papers and portfolios, formalizing SLOs for every graduate course in the catalog, and contributing to the department's annual assessment report

We also assess the graduate program by evaluating various measures of student success, including retention, time to degree, research productivity, and success in teaching. In general,

students who start our MA or PhD programs tend to stay, with the retention rate for our MA program over the last 3 years averaging 85% and, for our PhD, 95%. Our time to degree average for doctoral students was 6.3 years for 2014-2015, and has typically hovered around 6.5 to 7 years since 2008-2009. Our MA time to degree was 2.2 years for the 2014-2015 academic year. Again, this rate has typically ranged between 2.2 and 3 years since our last program review. While there is still room to improve, the majority of our students remain in their programs and are able to graduate within or close to the recommended time frame. While research productivity and teaching success are monitored qualitatively, the frequency with which our students present conference papers, publish articles and reviews, and receive research-based honors and grants suggests strong performance in this area.

Our placement record is also strong, although we have tended to rely on qualitative data here as well. However, we are working on a better placement tracking system going forward. Most of our MA students now go on to advanced graduate studies (often at distinguished institutions and/or in excellent programs), while many others go on to success in a wide variety of fields including education, publishing, and non-profit administration. Most of our doctoral students now enter the national job market; of those who do, nearly all have received offers, most of which have been tenure-track assistant professorships. Others more tied to the local area have continued their careers here at University of Nevada, Reno working in fields such as Core Writing and Writing Center Administration or in positions in local organizations, such as the Nevada Museum of Art. For the majority who pursue tenure-track positions, our former doctoral students have been hired at a wide variety of colleges and universities, including University of Massachusetts; University of Texas, San Antonio; University of Alaska, Southeast; Saint Mary's College; Gonzaga University; Loyola Marymount; UC Davis; Whitman College; Washington State; University of Michigan, Flint; Texas Christian University; Pittsburg State; Eastern Michigan; Western Oregon; Northern Illinois; Northern Arizona; Minot State; University of Tampa; and University of Philadelphia, to name just a few.

V. Core Writing Program

A. Mission and Objectives

The Core Writing Program (CWP) came into being in 1989 with the Core Curriculum and its requirement that all first-year students take a course to help them learn to write effectively in academic, researched argumentative forms (the course now known as ENG 102, or Composition II). At the same time, a prerequisite course (ENG 101 or Composition I) was recognized as preparation for such academic research and writing. Freshman English Courses previously administered and taught as part of the Department of English curriculum were thus built into the new Core Curriculum.

Currently, the CWP delivers instruction designed to address two Core Curriculum outcomes:

- Students will compose and communicate effectively in a range of media for a variety of rhetorical and creative purposes; and,

- Students will demonstrate an ability to frame and analyze a problem, find and interpret relevant information, develop and evaluate possible solutions, come to well-grounded conclusions, and craft an appropriate argument, report, application, or other expression of such inquiry.

ENG 102 serves as a "gateway" first-year course; it is the prerequisite for the Core Humanities (CH) sequence, and by extension, for the capstone courses that complete the Core Curriculum (which require CH 201). The CWP also supports other University of Nevada, Reno programs and initiatives by running special sections of first-year writing courses: for the Honors Program, for the "Powerful Academic Community" (PAC) Living Learning Communities (LLC) program, for the "Women in Science and Engineering" (WISE) LLC effort, and summer sections for athletics and the "Dean's Future Scholars" program in the College of Education.

Beginning in Fall 2016, the Core Curriculum will be replaced by the Silver Core Curriculum,[5] comprised of 4 "veins":
- Silver Vein I: Fundamental Practice (CO1, CO2, CO3)
- Silver Vein II: Primary Areas of Focused Inquiry (COs 4-8)
- Silver Vein III: Advanced Areas of Focused Inquiry (COs 9-12)
- Silver Vein IV: Integrative Experience (COs 13 and CO 14)

The Core Writing Program is charged with laying the foundations for Core Objective 1 (CO1) and Core Objective 3 (CO3):
- CO1: Students will be able to effectively compose written, oral, and multimedia texts for a variety of scholarly, professional, and creative purposes.
- CO3: Students will be critical consumers of information, able to engage in systematic research processes, frame questions, read critically, and apply observational and experimental approaches to obtain information.

Only Core Writing courses have been verified for CO1 and CO3, and their purpose is to build a foundation for CO1 and CO3 throughout the Silver Core. As with the old Core, ENG 102 remains the gateway course—the course students must pass—in order to satisfy their graduation requirement. Depending on initial placement (see section D), students may have to take up to 2 prerequisites before placing into English 102.

B. Administrative Structure

In oversight of the Core Writing Program, the Core Writing Committee, two assistant directors, and two curriculum coordinators aid the Director of Core Writing. The Director of Core Writing supervises one Administrative Assistant III (full time) and, as necessary, draws on the support of other departmental administrative assistants.

---

[5] For a full explanation of the Silver Core Curriculum, please see:
http://www.unr.edu/provost/curriculum-central/silver-core-general-education-requirements

Director of Core Writing (DCW). The DCW runs the program. Since the early 1990s, the DCW has been elected from among the senior tenure-track faculty in Rhetoric and Composition. Prior to that time, senior continuing faculty (lecturer or tenure-track) from various specialties served in a comparable position. For the department, the DCW supervises the following for all first-year writing courses: curriculum development; placement; program assessment; teacher preparation, mentoring, and evaluation; scheduling and staffing; dispute mediation and grade appeals; and K-12 outreach. The DCW chairs the Core Writing Committee, and is responsible for teaching ENG 737, a practicum required of all new teaching assistants. Beyond these supervisory and teaching responsibilities, the DCW serves on committees within the department (always the planning committee, and sometimes others, including the graduate committee, the writing committee, the CCID committee, and/or various ad hoc committees), in the University at large (Core Board and its ad hoc committees), and sometimes in the community or region (e.g., the Education Collaborative, state Board of Education efforts).

Assistant Directors (ADs). The two ADs are hired in national searches where background in composition theory and practice is a requirement, with administrative experience a preference. The AD positions are staffed by Term Lecturers who are on 3-year non-renewable contracts. ADs typically teach a 3/3 load in the CWP and have a 2-course reassignment to work with the DCW on a range of activities: training, mentoring, and observing new teachers; evaluating placement portfolios; coordinating orientation activities; acting as first point of contact for dispute mediation; collecting and compiling teaching resources; and each pursues one or more major program activities as directed (e.g., in assessment or outreach).

Curriculum Coordinators. The curriculum coordinators are teaching assistants who each serve a one-year term. The Curriculum Coordinators teach a 1/1 load with a one-course reassignment to assist with mentoring faculty in each curriculum group, delivering professional development workshops, and assisting the DCW with any special projects (e.g. assessment, textbook review and selection). Currently there are coordinators for ENG 100J, ENG 101 and ENG 102.

Online Coordinator. A full-time TA position of Online Coordinator has been created to help organize, mentor and support teachers working in 365 Learning, our in-house online course provider. The online coordinator position is funded through both the English department and 365 Learning. The Online Coordinator assists ENG 098, ENG 101, and ENG 102 teachers and also provides face-to-face and/or online writing tutoring support for online students.

LOA (Letter of Appointment) Coordinator. The position of LOA Coordinator has also been created to provide LOAs with a dedicated CW staff member who is charged with supporting their needs. The LOA coordinator receives a small stipend for her/his work.

Since 2004, there have been 5 DCWs, and a sixth took office in fall of 2015. Reasons for this rapid turnover include: a small number of tenured and tenure-track rhetoric and composition faculty; the structure of the position; and departmental and institutional perceptions of the position. The department has addressed the lack of depth in the rhetoric and composition faculty pool by hiring 5 new TT rhetoric and composition faculty since 2010 (and another will be hired this year). One of the most recent hires, the current DCW, has research interests in writing

program administration. Our new junior TT faculty members have expressed interest in eventually taking on leadership roles in the CWP.

Currently, all the Director positions in the English department (the DCW, the Director of Undergraduate Studies, and the Director of Graduate Studies) serve three-year terms. While these rotating terms are set-up to ensure equitable distribution of administrative work, a 3-year rotation is not necessarily the optimum way to run a CWP. The CW committee and the rhetoric and composition faculty are discussing potential changes to DCW position including making it a more permanent position and/or making the term a minimum of 5-6 years. There is interest among the rhetoric and composition faculty, including the current DCW, to make the CWP a site for research as well as teaching and pedagogy to help change the perception of the program from one of "mere" service to one of contributing to the intellectual culture of the institution.

C. Course Staffing

The Core Writing Program relies on various ranks of instructors to meet its staffing needs:

LOAs. Instructors teaching on Letters of Appointment are hired on a semester-by-semester, ad-hoc basis. LOAs can receive a grant-in-aid to cover the cost of some graduate classes. The typical teaching load for an LOA is no more than 9 credits per semester. LOAs who teach more than 9 credits per semester are eligible for NSHE benefits after 45 days of employment.

Term Lecturers (TLs). Term Lecturers are hired from national searches. TL contracts are for one-year, renewable, based on satisfactory performance, for two additional years, making the typical appointment for a TL three years. TLs receive full health and retirement benefits. There is no possibility for a TL appointment to be reviewed after the 3rd year. A typical teaching load for a TL is 4/4 in the CWP.

Continuing Lecturers (CLs). Continuing Lecturers are no longer hired in the English department. Continuing lecturers have renewable contracts with no term limits; they receive full health and retirement benefits. Typically, a CL will teach 1-2 courses in the CWP per year. A typical load for a CL in the English department is 3/3.

TAs. Teaching assistantships are competitive in the English department. A TA receives a tuition waive and a stipend as well as health insurance benefits paid for by the University. TAs teach a 2/1 load in the CWP during their first year and then might move on to teach in CH. The typical load for a TA is 2/1.

Tenure-track and tenured (TT) faculty. Tenure track and tenured faculty teach in the CWP as part of their regular teaching load. A typical load for research faculty is 2/2.

Table V-A provides a breakdown of the percentages of courses taught, by rank.

	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	Fall 2015

LOAs	19%	20%	24%	40%	41%	50%	45%	43%	41%
TLs	43%	39%	24%	24%	21%	18%	25%	28%	31%
TAs	32%	32%	38%	30%	28%	25%	24%	24%	25%
TT*	6%	9%	9%	6%	10%	7%	6%	5%	8%

Table V-A Percentages of courses taught by rank
* includes continuing lecturers

Since 2007, the CWP has come to rely more and more on LOAs for a significant portion of its teaching pool. The marked increase in reliance on LOAs since 2010 is largely a result of rapidly expanding enrollments and the failure of university hiring policies to keep pace with that growth. The 2007 self-study reported efforts on the part of the English department to raise the minimum pay for LOA taught courses to $3500/course. Despite these repeated requests, the compensation for an LOA teaching a 3-credit course has only seen a nominal rise from $2200 in 2007 to $2800 in 2015. This pay rate is, quite honestly, an embarrassment for UNR and an insult to our talented LOAs. As of this writing, industry standards for the field recommend a minimum pay of $7,350 per traditional 3 credit hour courses.[6] UNR, a national Tier 1 university, *has not even reached the halfway mark in compensating close to half of its instructional pool for writing.*

National standards also maintain that a healthy department (in this case, Core Writing) is optimally staffed when fewer than 25% of its courses are taught by part-time contingent faculty.[7] Current research into retention has shown that students taught by part-time contingent faculty do not make strong connections to the University in their first-year, one of the key indicators of first-to-second-year retention.[8]

The 2007 self-study predicted that "As enrollments continue to grow, unless English is allocated more permanent positions, the number of sections staffed on short-term instructional funds (term lecturer or LOA positions) will continue to grow." This prediction has been borne out in an even more dramatic fashion. The percentage of TLs teaching in the CWP has decreased since 2007 while the percentage of LOAs has increased and has been hovering in the low 40% range since a record high 50% in 2012-2013. Because enrollments are only expected in increase in the coming years, there is no reasonable expectation that the reliance on LOA labor will resolve itself through enrollment fluctuations. Additionally, as part of President Johnson's Writing Initiative, the CWP is charged with reducing course caps in all 101 and 102 sections down to 19 students.

While the CWP is committed to providing the highest quality instruction to its students, the staffing situation often pits the realities of finding qualified teachers with the high expectations we hold for our staff. For example, UNR is geographically isolated from any other doctoral granting institutions from which we might draw on a constant stream of well-qualified instructors making our potential pool of LOAs necessarily shallow. To keep the excellent instructors we do have, we are in constant competition with TMCC who has similar staffing needs and draws from the same limited pool of candidates. Another complication to our staffing situation is that our TL policy mandates that instructors must leave the CWP after their 3rd year

---

[6] http://www.mla.org/mla_recommendation_course

[7] http://www.aaup.org/report/contingent-appointments-and-academic-profession

[8] http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/useofparttimefaculty; http://www.aaup.org/report/contingent-appointments-and-academic-profession; Jaegar, A.J. and M.K. Eagan. "Examining Retention and Contingent Faculty Use in a State System of Higher Education." *Educational Policy* 25 (2010): 507-537.

of full-time employment. UNR loses many of its best teachers to this policy. Full-time lecturers who "term out" can only continue teaching for the CWP as LOAs.

The staffing situation in the CWP is desperate. The program cannot continue on its current path for more than a year or two before being faced with the very real prospect of having to cancel courses for lack of qualified instructors. Even if we were to continue with our gross over-reliance on LOAs, there are simply not enough qualified instructors in the Reno/Tahoe area to cover our increasing enrollment demands as well as our mandate to reduce course caps.

D. Curriculum

The Core Writing curriculum has been designed and is continually revised to accord with national, professional best practices. The curriculum consists of the following:

ENG 098: Preparatory Composition
UNR's foundational developmental writing course, ENG 098 is the composition course that freshmen are placed in if their ACT English score is below 18 or their SAT Verbal/Critical Reading score is below 440. The course is three credits and is described in the catalog as follows: "The writing process including paragraph development, sentence structure, usage, and grammar. Credit does not apply to any baccalaureate degree program. (Formerly ENGL 1; implemented Fall 2005)."

Students in 098 are expected to achieve the following outcomes:
> Build rhetorical awareness by writing for and within a community;
> Develop the writing process, including prewriting, writing, revising, and editing;
> Compose knowledge from a variety of reliable sources including personal expertise;
> Demonstrate critical reading skills when interpreting, analyzing, discussing, and evaluating a variety of texts;
> Evaluate their own and others' work;
> Establish productive strategies for generating, organizing, revising, and editing; and,
> Write understandable, efficient sentences that follow the general conventions of usage, spelling, grammar, style, and punctuation in standard written English; check for conventions about which they are unsure.

In ENG 098 students produce 10 to 15 pages of polished writing, usually collected in a portfolio comprising 4 or 5 major assignments ranging from narratives to arguments (the exact assignments chosen by the instructor). Readings are assigned from a variety of sources usually 10 to 20 pages per week, depending on the balance of reading and writing their instructor has selected.

ENG 100J   Composition Studio
An intensive developmental writing course, ENG 100J is a five-credit-hour, one-semester composition course that Core Writing students are placed in if their ACT English score is 18 to 20 or their SAT Verbal/Critical Reading score is 440 to 500. The course is described in the catalog as follows: "The writing process, including audience, purpose, and context in academic genres; emphasis on planning, drafting, revising, and editing. Addresses global and local

conventions and correctness." Students in 100J are held to the same requirements as students in ENG 101 but are provided a "scaffold" of extra class time, instructor interaction, and peer interaction to help them achieve those requirements. Students in 100J are expected to achieve the following outcomes:

Write arguments focused on a specific purpose;

Write arguments that anticipate the needs of different readers;

Recognize the differences among kinds of writing situations and be able to reproduce the conventions associated with a specific situation when writing an argument to address it;

Compose knowledge from a variety of reliable sources including personal expertise when writing an argument;

Demonstrate critical reading skills when interpreting, analyzing, discussing, and evaluating of a variety of texts;

Develop standards of "good writing" by which students can evaluate their own and classmates' essays during revision;

Use productive strategies for generating, organizing, revising, and editing when writing arguments; and,

Write understandable, efficient sentences that follow the general conventions of usage, spelling, grammar, style, and punctuation in standard written English; check for conventions about which they are unsure.

In ENG 100J students produce 16 to 20 pages of polished writing, usually collected in a portfolio comprising four or five major assignments ranging from literacy narratives to proposals (the exact assignments chosen by the instructor). Persuasive argumentation, library research, and documentation are introduced in ENG 100J, but these are the center of ENG 102. Readings are assigned from a variety of sources but tend to focus on non-fiction essays. Students generally read from 20 to 40 pages per week, depending on the balance of reading and writing their instructor has selected.

ENG 101   Composition I

The first of the standard two-semester composition sequence, ENG 101 is the course in which most first-year students enroll. The course is three credits and is described in the catalog as follows: "Writing the expository essay; emphasis on revising and editing for development, coherence, style, and correctness." Students are expected to achieve the following outcomes:

Recognize, articulate, and respond to different rhetorical contexts (CO1 & CO3);

Practice strategies for purposeful, concrete development of topics, for example by using writing to record, explore, organize, and communicate (CO1);

Interpret, analyze, discuss, and evaluate a variety of readings (CO3);

Use multiple drafts and peer review to improve their own texts (CO1);

Use generating, organizing, revising, and editing strategies that are appropriate to specific writing situations (CO1);

Use reflection to examine personal experience, expertise, writing process, and sources to compose (CO3);

Write understandable, efficient sentences (CO1); and,

 Control general conventions of usage, spelling, grammar, and punctuation in standard

written English (CO1).

In ENG 101 students produce 16 to 20 pages of polished writing, collected in a portfolio comprising 4 or 5 major assignments ranging from literacy narratives to proposals (the exact assignments chosen by the instructor). Persuasive argumentation, library research, and documentation are introduced in ENG 101, but these are the center of ENG 102. Readings are assigned from a variety of sources but tend to focus on non-fiction essays. Students generally read 20 to 40 pages per week, depending on the balance of reading and writing their instructor has selected.

ENG 102: Composition II /ENG 102 Honors: Composition
ENG 102 is the Core English course all freshmen must take or for which they must demonstrate equivalency. The course builds a foundation for Core Objective 1—Effective Composition & Communication: "students will be able to effectively compose written, oral, and multimedia texts for a variety of scholarly, professional, and creative purposes." ENG 102 is three credits and is described in the catalog as follows: "Exploration of essay forms with particular attention to interpretation and argument; emphasis on analytical reading and writing, critical thinking, and research methodologies." Students are expected to achieve the following outcomes:

Continue and improve the writing practices learned in 101: prewriting, composing, revising, responding, editing, attending to language and style, and writing with audience   and purpose in mind;
Engage in critical reading and interpretation of a wide range of texts;
Be able to summarize, analyze, synthesize, evaluate, and apply what they read—both orally and in writing;
Use writing as a means of understanding, organizing, and communicating what they read;
Frame complex research questions or problems;
Demonstrate awareness of their own beliefs, concepts, and biases; and,
Be able to produce a coherent, well-supported argument that shows critical thinking and careful consideration of alternative viewpoints.

In ENG 102 students produce 20 to 25 pages of polished writing across at least four major writing assignments, one of which must be a substantial research paper of eight or more pages that consults eight or more scholarly sources. The course is theme-based, with each instructor selecting the topic and suitable readings (primarily non-fiction); instructors will submit a description of their theme to the Core Writing Program ahead of registration for the subsequent semester in order to allow students the ability to pick among the given options. Course themes ought to be narrow enough to develop directed readings and sustained inquiry into a subject area. At the same time, instructors should assign written work that is sufficiently broad enough to allow for all students (including those who have no extant knowledge of the theme) to work within it. Students generally read 30 to 60 pages per week, depending on the balance of reading and writing their instructor has selected, should engage with a substantial amount of scholarly, research-based, and/or argumentative work (preferably in a number of disciplines), and should not be assigned fiction for more than 20% of the semester's reading load.

Students taking ENG 102H are granted permission through the Honors Program, and are registered in separate sections. While the general course outcomes are the same, instructors must abide by four additional requirements:

- Honors students are required to present their work in multiple media, both oral and written. To that end, students will participate in a research symposium at the end of the semester for which they must prepare either a poster or digital presentation (such as PowerPoint or Prezi).
- write a minimum of 25 pages of formal (revised, graded, and excluding drafts) writing in a semester.
- Because it is imperative that Honors students understand how to find and evaluate credible academic research, final research papers for the course must include a minimum of eight scholarly sources.
- In order to properly engage with academic discourse communities, final research papers much employ correct MLA or APA citation

ENG 104   Introduction to Investigative Writing

This one-credit course is limited to students with an AP score of 4 or 5 on the Literature and Composition Exam and introduces them to techniques of investigation and interpretation using campus resources. As an exploration of ways of shaping research into language for various audiences and purposes, students will produce a substantial research paper of eight or more pages that consults eight or more scholarly sources. Students are expected to achieve the following outcomes:

Frame complex research questions or problems;

Demonstrate awareness of their own beliefs, concepts, and biases;

Be able to produce a coherent, well-supported argument that shows critical thinking and careful consideration of alternative viewpoints;

Recognize, evaluate, and use a variety of information sources: expert people, publications of information agencies, popular and specialized periodicals, professional journals, books, and electronic resources;

Conduct research that shows evidence of the ability to synthesize, use fairly, and credit the ideas of others using the appropriate citation style; and,

Write coherently, drawing from diverse sources, assimilating information and ideas and producing work that represents the student's position on the material.

Because ENG 104 serves to provide students with credit for ENG 102 in the process, this course may be themed, though limited time in class makes cohesion difficult. Primary emphasis is on the revision-based production of a substantial, independent research-based argumentative essay. Additionally, the number of sections of ENG 104 is typically very small (frequently one), usually only offered in the Fall semester, and typically taught by the ENG 102 course coordinator.

ENG 113/ENG 114   Composition I and II for International Students

International students attending UNR are placed into appropriate Core Writing courses based on TOEFL scores, interviews, and special placement arrangements, all through the Intensive English Language Center. International students therefore have the same access to Core Writing

Program courses as any other student and are expected to complete these courses in the same way.

However, those students for whom English still poses special challenges may be directed into (or elect) to take an alternative sequence of composition courses: ENG 113 and 114. For international students, these courses fulfill the University's composition requirements through ENG 102. As such, course outcomes are identical to ENG 101 and 102, and are described in tandem on the Core Writing Program website. In the deployment of this course content, however, instructors are expected to show increased sensitivity to the needs of second-language users and tailor scaffolding assignments to their differential language skills during what is also for many of these students a period of intense cultural adjustment. Assignments could include narratives of encounter or an explanation of something important in the student's national or ethnic culture. Whatever the instructor's choices, reading, writing, and revision activities in ENG 113 and 114 should still match those of ENG 101 and 102 respectively.

Note: Instructors for ENG 113 and 114 are selected through special application and after particular qualifications, training, and/or experience have been verified.

*ENG 100I, 105, 106 (AY 2009-14)

The ENG 100I, 105, 106 series arose in response to changes in ACT cut-scores, which were lowered three points in 2010; this meant students who scored 18-20 would now be placed in ENG 101 instead of ENG 098. The DCW and Core Writing committee at the time were concerned that these students would lack sufficient support for success. So, they piloted a 5-hour sequence that supplemented the standard 101 curriculum with two hours of concurrent remediation: an hour of additional work on critical reading and an hour of additional work on editing/writing. The pilot wasn't suitable for systematic assessment; however, a comparison of 102 grades in spring 2012 indicated at least that the pilot students did no worse in 102 than their 101-assigned peers. So, the 100I/105/106 sequence was instituted as the standard placement for incoming students scoring 18-20 on their ACT.

Though curricularly sound and in line with national trends toward concurrent remediation, the 100I sequence proved problematic from an administrative standpoint. The proliferation of the one-credit-hour 105 and 106 courses led to the hiring of more adjunct faculty (as full-time faculty could not easily accommodate these one-hour courses); this led to almost 60% of Core Writing courses being instructed by adjunct faculty, a figure six times in excess of professional standards (NCTE/CCCC/MLA). Further, students enrolled in the 100I sequence found themselves in three different courses with three different instructors and three different groups of classmates. Instructor satisfaction and student evaluation scores for the course were understandably low. So, in 2013, Core Writing revised the 100I series to become 100J, with a single instructor and group of students together for 5 hours. Reliance on adjunct faculty decreased from 58% of sections taught to 42% of sections taught in a year, largely because of the 100I to 100J change. Students in Fall 2013 rated 100J an average of 4.3 (out of 5) versus 3.6 for 100I/105/106; similarly, there was a noticeable improvement in student and instructor satisfaction as indicated by comments.

Since 2007, the CWP has offered the following courses:

	098	100I/	105	106	101	102	102H	104	113	114	Total

		100J									
Fall 07	28	n/a	n/a	n/a	60	35	5	1	2	1	132
Spring 08	5	n/a	n/a	n/a	26	64	0	0	1	2	98
AY 07/08	**33**				**86**	**99**	**5**	**1**	**3**	**3**	**230**
Fall 08	29	n/a	n/a	n/a	60	37	5	1	2	2	136
Spring 09	5	n/a	n/a	n/a	25	63	0	0	1	1	95
AY08/09	**34**				**85**	**100**	**5**	**1**	**3**	**3**	**231**
Fall 09	28	2	3	3	52	32	5	1	1	1	128
Spring 10	4	2	2	2	22	57	0	0	1	1	91
AY 09/10	**32**	**4**	**5**	**5**	**74**	**89**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**2**	**219**
Fall 10	20	22	20	23	60	32	5	1	2	1	186
Spring 11	4	2	5	5	21	66	0	0	1	1	105
AY 10/11	**24**	**24**	**25**	**28**	**81**	**98**	**5**	**1**	**3**	**1**	**291**
Fall 11	19	24	29	29	57	38	6	1	1	1	205
Spring 12	4	3	2	3	18	69	0	1	1	1	102
AY 11/12	**23**	**27**	**31**	**32**	**75**	**107**	**6**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**307**
Fall 12	20	22	29	29	63	37	5	1	1	1	208
Spring 13	4	3	3	3	18	80	0	0	1	1	113
AY 12/13	**24**	**25**	**32**	**32**	**81**	**117**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**2**	**321**
Fall 13	22	22/37	29	26	67	39	5	1	1	1	250
Spring 14	3	2	2	2	14	81	0	1	1	1	107
AY 13/14	**25**	**24/37**	**31**	**28**	**81**	**120**	**5**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**357**
Fall 14	18	30	1	1	67	42	5	1	1	1	167
Spring 15	2	1	n/a	n/a	14	89	0	1	1	1	109
AY 14/15	**20**	**31**	**1**	**1**	**81**	**131**	**5**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**276**
Fall 15	16	31	n/a	n/a	88	41	5	2	1	1	185

Table V-B: Number of courses run, by semester and year

Enrollment: Analysis and Challenges

The course caps for the courses during this last self-study cycle have varied from a high of 25 in 102 courses to a low of 19 students in 098 and 100I and 100J. Industry standards recommend composition courses be capped at no more than 20 students in mainstream sections and 15 in developmental sections. The ideal is for all writing courses to be capped at 15 and for no writing instructor to have more than a total of 60 students per semester.[9] As noted in section C, current practice in the CWP does not align with professional recommendations.

President Johnson's Writing Initiative, launched in 2014, actively seeks to lower course caps in all 100J, 101, and 102 sections to 19 students over the next several years. This initiative will bring the CWP in line with national standards. However, lowering course caps across the board exacerbates the staffing problem outlined in section C.1. President Johnson has promised

---

[9] http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/postsecondarywriting

resources in the terms of continuing lecturer and term lecturer lines to help address this need. It remains to be seen if there is a significant allocation of new lines to help offset UNR's projected enrollment growth and the simultaneous lowering of course caps.

As table V-B illustrates, the CWP consistently offers more courses in the fall than in the spring. For AYs 2012-15,[10] the CWP offered, on average, 85 more courses in fall semester. CW has been asked to run a heavy fall schedule because of an interpretation of NSHE's continuous enrollment policy that states that every student must be continuously enrolled in a core writing course until s/he has satisfied the core requirement.[11] The CWP has asked for a more liberal interpretation of the policy to be that every first-year student be enrolled in their Core Writing requirement by the end of their first-year (30 credits). Allowing students who place immediately into ENG 102 to wait until spring semester to satisfy their CW requirement would allow the CWP to equalize the number of courses offered fall and spring semesters making scheduling more predictable and allowing the program to rehire LOAs from fall to spring semester, helping to retain our already transient LOA pool.

E. Placement

Students are placed in Core Writing by their scores on standardized college entrance examinations (ACT verbal or SAT II verbal/critical reading). The cutoff scores for the various first-year writing courses are set by the NSHE and used at all Nevada institutions of higher education:
- English 098: An ACT score of 17 or below or an SAT of 430 or below;
- English 100J: An ACT score of 18-20 or an SAT score of 440-500
- English 101: An ACT score of 21 to 29 or an SAT of 510-670
- English 102(102H): An ACT score of 30 and up or an SAT of 680 and above.

If students feel that their scores do not reflect their actual skills, they can attempt alternative placement by portfolio (a minimum of three pieces written in the last year or two, reviewed by experienced instructors in the CWP).[12]

F. Program Assessment and Development

Assessment Projects. Over the years, the CWP has been able to build and maintain a strong tradition of writing program assessment:

From 2012-2014 Core Writing oversaw the completion of a 100I assessment project, performed three minor assessments of 100I, 100J, and 101, and conducted a major 102 assessment.

- The 100I-series assessment was performed by Jane Detweiler and a team of

---

[10] AY 2013-14 was left out of this calculation because of the anomaly of additional courses being offered during the 100I-100J transition

[11] http://www.unr.edu/academic-central/core-curriculum

[12] Our placement web page outlines all options and explains the process in detail: http://www.unr.edu/cla/engl/cwp/student_resources/course_placement.htm.

graduate students, and the results can be found in that report, which was submitted in June 2013 (on file in the CWP office)

- The major 102 assessment was undertaken in 2013-2014 with the cooperation of the Matthewson-IGT Knowledge Center; it investigated student use of source material in research arguments, as this was indicated as a weak area in the 2005-2006 assessment of 102. ENG 102 instructors were assigned either to treatment or control groups, resulting in roughly 800 students in each section. The treatment group received a special curriculum designed around the metaphor of the research space as a conversation (the Burkean Parlor); the curriculum used a visual mapping exercise to concretize this metaphor, among other techniques. The control instructors taught research writing as they normally would. Student research papers from treatment and control groups were compared by a group of normed raters from Core Writing and the MIKC; students in the control group did significantly better at creating thesis statements that placed their argument in the context of previous research. A pre/post survey delivered by the MIKC determined that students in the treatment group showed greater increases in confidence with finding and using sources, and with marshaling those sources toward a research argument. Details are available in the report, submitted June 2014 (on file in the CWP office).

- The minor assessments were associated with logistical changes in 100I/j and a pilot starter syllabus in 101. The 100I/j assessments were discussed above in the narrative about the transition between those courses. Basically, students were found to perform as well in 102 whether they had taken the 100I-series pilot or 101. And in the case of the pilot 100J project, average student-evaluation scores for course satisfaction were nearly a point higher (on a five-point scale) for 100J than for the 100I-series that semester. Further, all pilot 100J student were able to freely recall at least one student learning outcome during a midterm survey; the average recollection was three outcomes. (This mini-assessment addressed concerns expressed in the 100I-series assessment about the incoherence of that sequence.) Finally, students in the 101 starter-syllabus pilot (a syllabus focused around the theme of critical literacy) received an average grade of 3.5 in ENG 102 the following semester compared to 3.3 for a random sample of non-pilot ENG 101 students. These results were not statistically significant under t-test (2-tailed, type 2); nevertheless, we can conclude that the more rigorous starter-syllabus readings and assignments did not negatively affect students.

- In spring 2016, ENG 102 will be assessed as part of the new Silver Core Curriculum assessment for accreditation by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NCCU). In preparation for the accreditation review and assessment, and to ensure the validity and reliability of this assessment, a pilot version of the study was completed spring 2015, with the full assessment to follow in spring 2016.

Development efforts. The CWP assessment projects are complemented by ongoing program development efforts, some of which offer other indirect measures of success. The current DCW,

the CWP, and the department overall benefit from the strong tradition of excellence built by past directors:

- **Orientations.** The Summer (held over the course of one week) and Winter (one full day) Orientations prepare incoming TAs and LOAs to teach in the CWP.
- **Mentoring Program.** All new TAs and LOAs are assigned a mentor (one of the term lecturers, who have this as a standing service obligation as part of their position). Mentors observe new CWP instructors at least once during their first year teaching in the program.
- **Annual Teaching Observations.** Since Fall 2005, it has been program policy that all TAs and LOAs in the CWP are observed at least once a year, and personnel files containing reports of these observations are maintained in the program office.
- **Student Evaluations.** Until Spring 2015, teaching evaluations were maintained for five years in the CWP office. Beginning in Spring 2015, the University switched to an online evaluation system. The summaries of quantitative measures are reviewed each year to monitor relative success of pedagogical practice.
- **Creating Opportunities to Celebrate Student Success.** The CWP holds an annual writing contest as a means of collecting examples of the very best student writing produced in program courses. The CWP has invested $600 in program funds annually to fund prizes for the top twelve essays in each year's competitions.
- **Recognition of Teaching Excellence.** In 2014, the then current DCW, Maureen McBride, was awarded the Dean's Award for Outstanding Teaching and Service by a Member of the Contingent Faculty.

G. Analysis

The CWP is a solid program with an established tradition of providing quality educational experiences for all students. As such, the CWP is constantly looking for ways to enhance and improve the work it does. Over the next several years, the CWP will focus on the following goals:

1. Enacting President Johnson's writing initiative by lowering course caps;
2. Continuing the long-standing practice of using direct and indirect assessment to monitor, adjust, or change CW curriculum and pedagogy;
3. Designing more instructor support for teaching themed ENG 102 courses;
4. Exploring ways to improve the mentoring program;
5. Creating more opportunities for graduate students interested in writing program administration to get hands-on experience;
6. Encouraging graduate and faculty research in, about, and on the CWP; and,
7. Redefining coordinator and assistant director roles to more adequately address current programmatic needs.

VI. Department Resources, Physical Plant, and Facilities

A. Funding

The base budget for the Department of English is about $3.9 million annually. This figure includes personnel funding—salaries, benefits, and stipends for continuing faculty, classified staff, and state-funded teaching assistantships—and a modest operating budget of $56,680 per year (down from the operating budget reported in our 2007 self-study of $67,000). By long-standing Nevada budgeting policy, the department and college have virtually no flexibility in how the vast majority of the base budget—the personnel funds—may be used. If the department fills a classified staff position with a new hire who has the necessary experience, we must bridge the gap between the entry-level salary and the appropriate salary level for the first year (after that the cost is assumed centrally).

Our base budget covers only a portion of the personnel funding that is necessary for English to carry out its responsibilities. We now request between $700K and $900K annually in supplemental instructional funding to cover salaries for contingent lecturers and LOA instructors; for 2015-2016 this request was funded at $827,423 (plus benefits). We also offer English 098, for which we may not use state instructional funds, through Extended Studies, which provided $61,773 (plus benefits) in 2015-16 to cover two salaries for contingent lecturers and LOA instructors. A more accurate total figure of our full budget, then, would be over $4.7 million.

Compensation for Faculty and Instructional Staff. For many years, faculty salaries for continuing positions in the department were nationally competitive. Because of a generous faculty merit system, promotion raises of ten percent, and a state practice of providing COLAs for most state employees most years, salary compression was not a problem for faculty. However, budget reductions since the last self-study have resulted in many years without merit increases – indeed, there has been *only one year* in which faculty received a merit raise since 2007 – and even COLAs. Although the average salary of our full professors still slightly exceeds the national average for full professors at public doctoral institutions and the average salary of lecturers at the senior rank [0(IV)] exceeds the national averages for lecturers (unranked) at public doctoral institutions, the department's salaries for assistant professors in years 5-6 and new associate professors are no longer nationally competitive. This has seriously disadvantaged our junior faculty and had a deleterious effect on retention and morale. It is critical that the University reinstitute merit raises and address the issue of equity and compression.

In the last decade teaching assistantship stipends have increased from $14,000 to $17,000, and these appointments now include health insurance. These have been positive developments**.** Wages for LOA instructors are continue to be low—$2700 per three-credit course. Since the last self-study in 2007, our annual instructional funding request has formally proposed a rate of at least $3500 per course each year, to very limited avail: the University just this year raised the stipend from $2445 to $2700.

B. Classified Staff

English has four classified staff positions to provide the administrative, clerical, and logistical support necessary for a department employing over a hundred people and serving thousands of students each semester. Our excellent current staff includes the following:

- AA IV (office manager)—Cami Allen (hired 1997; promoted to office manager 2007)
- AA III (Graduate/Undergraduate programs)—Roxie Taft (hired 2013)
- AA III (Core Writing Program)—Brenda Kishpaugh (hired 2012)
- AA I (Front Office -- 0.75 percent)—Charlotte Altamirano (hired 2013)

Many English departments our size have one full-time classified employee to support the graduate program and another to support the undergraduate program, and increased responsibilities for formal advising and assessment do require increased staff support.

We are concerned about the university infrastructure of which these classified positions are a part. There aren't enough classified employees to support the increasingly bureaucratic work of the institution. The university nevertheless regularly "freezes" open classified positions for up to a year before they can be filled. This places an undue burden on already swamped classified employees who—it seems to be assumed—will be able to do additional work month after month. This practice requires faculty in administrative roles to decide, again and again, whether we will ignore an administrative mandate, ask classified employees to work additional hours and scrounge money to pay them somehow, or reallocate faculty research, teaching, or administrative time to handle clerical responsibilities. This is not a wise use of faculty time. The inadequacy of the infrastructure is one of several reasons that few faculty are interested in taking on positions of administrative responsibility.

We are also concerned about the increase in turnover among classified employees. Of our current employees, only the office manager has worked in the department for more than two years. In the last seven years, we have hired and trained *ten* new classified employees. State employment is no longer as competitive with private business—or with the county or city—as it once was. Classified employees are now less likely to work at the University for decades, and given the inadequate university infrastructure this is understandable. However, every time we lose a classified employee we lose many hours to training—and risk losing the position itself for months. The state's failure to maintain a competitive salary structure for classified staff and failure to staff the University adequately may soon have negative consequences for the stability of our programs.

C. Physical Facilities

Frandsen Humanities was remodeled and restored in the late nineties, and in 2000 the English department moved back into one of the finest buildings on campus. Over the next few years classrooms in the building were made "smart" with the addition of overhead projection systems and podiums with networked computers and audiovisual equipment. Due to their small size, the two rooms dedicated to Core Writing classes were the last to be fitted with technology; the department contributed some of its own funds to help with the costs, thereby expediting the improvements.

Frandsen was designed with thirty-four individual faculty offices (including those for the chair and directors) and four group offices. As the department has grown, we have reallocated office space in Frandsen is as follows:

- Thirty faculty offices used as individual offices.
- Five faculty offices have been converted to two-person offices. For the last two years, first-year tenure-track faculty have had to share offices.
- One storage room has been converted to an individual office.
- Four group offices house about 70 people, generally distributed as follows
  - FH 06—6 desks: 6 lecturers
  - FH 07—11 desks: 7 lecturers, 13 LOA instructors
  - FH 08—5 desks: 15 LOAs
  - FH 24—15 desks: 44 TAs

The 13 lecturers in the group offices each have their own desks. The TAs and LOA instructors are assigned two and three to a desk. The lecturers each have desktop computers and voicemail (though not individual phones); the TAs and LOAs have access to a total of 7 shared computers, which means nearly 7 TAs/LOAs to 1 computer.

These crowded spaces make it difficult for instructors to meet effectively with students or to discuss their work confidentially. Many term lecturers, TAs, and LOA instructors hold office hours in a departmental conference room. Others have used the student union or the library, but with each of these facilities moving much farther from Frandsen, it will be less feasible for faculty to meet with students there between classes.

Both esprit de corps and the quality of instruction will improve as soon as we are able to provide new tenure-track faculty with private offices, term lecturers with less crowded office spaces, and TAs and LOAs with their own desks. Fortunately, space for the English Department has been allocated in the Thompson building next door, which will be able to house 4 term lecturers, 6 TAs, and 18 LOAs beginning in the 2016-17 school year.

D. Virtual Resources

In 2010 English hired a professional website designer in the Bay Area, NovoTech Services, at $475/month who completely revamped the look of the department's site. While much more contemporary in appearance, the pages were difficult or impossible to update for content without a time-consuming process of sending them to the designer, whose newly posted copy often required much editing and proofreading, and whose design concept struck some department members as too generic and unsuited to an academic site.

In 2012 we hired a former PhD student and then-current postdoc with web development experience to completely redesign the pages in close consultation with the department's web committee. This new webmaster also served as a clearinghouse to receive and post new content. The new design was clean and functional, and the department's pages took on a livelier tone with frequent and timely updates, a slide show of upcoming events on the main page, and a Google calendar.

In late 2014 the department was notified by the University's Office of Communications that one of their web developers had been assigned to the College of Liberal Arts and, one-by-one, would be completely redesigning CLA departmental websites using the newly adopted Content Management System (CMS). The English Department's Tech Committee (the new name

for what has been the Web Committee) met with the designer in early Fall 2015. We were told that the new overarching mandate for all university websites was student recruitment, and that our pages would be redesigned in conformity to this goal. We argued that our website also linked us to current students, faculty, alumni, potential donors, and the general public, and were told that these purposes could also be served if we worked closely with the designer. We reviewed other CLA websites this developer had redesigned, and seeing many possibilities for continuing the same types of content we deem important, are reasonably confident that we can retain the website functionality we desire. We were told that, once implemented, the CMS will allow copy and images to be easily updated by one or more department faculty or staff members, while the design elements would be standardized and locked into place.

Current schedule is for the redesign to commence in late Fall 2015 or early Spring 2016, with an approximately three-month timeline to completion. We intend to work as closely as possible with the designer during this process.

VII. Working toward the Future: A Summary

In this self-study we have reported and analyzed both accomplishments and failures of the last dozen years. We have articulated our priorities for the future and our concerns about the practical impediments we face as we aim to achieve those goals. To summarize:

Accomplishments—since 2008.

-
- New faculty, new expertise and energy: since 2008, we have hired ten new tenure-track faculty members, and we will add three more this year.
- Increased research visibility: more publications by major presses and in major refereed journal, and the hiring of accomplished junior faculty who continue to publish and to engage with the profession after their arrival.
- The establishment of the Associate Chair position as one response to the increasing difficulty of the chair's position during a time of student and faculty growth and ongoing bureaucratization of the institution as a whole.
- The establishment of a stipend for the Director of Undergraduate Studies.
- The successful launching of the MFA program, and the admission of a strong first cohort of MFA students.
- One new classified staff position.

Goals—to 2022.

- Continue to build research profile and visibility; increase applications for external funding; house an academic journal in the department.
- Increase the percentage of continuing faculty who are tenure-track and the percentage of all faculty positions that are continuing rather than contingent; explore the possibility of

converting some term lecturer positions into continuing lecturer positions, and develop and launch the process for those conversions.

- Develop and implement a plan for undergraduate advising.
- Prepare faculty to assume administrative responsibilities—at appropriate points in their professional lives—in the coming decades.
- Continue and strengthen our efforts to hire a diverse faculty and recruit more students from underrepresented groups at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.
- Continue to strengthen undergraduate programs: add courses to reflect developments in the discipline; implement workshops that prepare our undergraduates for a variety of professional futures; continue recruitment efforts; develop means of assessing upper-division work in the different English majors; develop stronger intellectual and social community among undergraduates.
- Continue to strengthen graduate programs: obtain TAs for a higher percentage of graduate students; compete more aggressively for top applicants; continue recruitment efforts to bring strong students into the program, both local and from elsewhere.
- Achieve more stable funding for the instructional portion of the department's mission. Secure full-time classified staff support for the undergraduate and graduate programs.
- Add office space so that every continuing faculty member has an individual office, contingent lecturers are no more than 4-6 to an office, and TAs and LOAs have their own desks.

Concerns.

- UNR is likely to continue to expand enrollments without commensurate increases in resources. In English, the fragile balance of instructional positions will reach the breaking point within a decade—or sooner should the University grow more rapidly than projected. This will have serious negative consequences for the quality of all our programs. Continued unfunded growth will compromise the quality of the undergraduate majors and Core Writing program. The graduate programs cannot grow at all without new teaching assistantships.
- The system of supplemental instructional funding will be of increasing concern as long as our programs rest so heavily on these funds and they are allocated so late in the annual cycle of course scheduling, student registration, and faculty hiring.
- The base rate for LOA instructors remains a concern and an embarrassment.
- Few English faculty are prepared and willing to assume major administrative roles in the near future. At the same time, it is likely that growth and increasing demands will make it necessary to reallocate more research and teaching time to administration.
- With the continuing lecturers who have been responsible for undergraduate advising all nearing retirement, the problem of advising is becoming urgent.
- The university's inadequate level of classified staffing and its practice of freezing staff positions, coupled with increased demands on department office staff, may well lead to more turnover and thus be of increasing concern in the future.
- Nevada is likely to continue to assume that escalating mandates for data reporting and analysis, the building and maintaining of professional-quality websites, and other

technical support work be met by a voluntary reallocation of faculty teaching and research time.

- Development is the one area where we do not yet have a coherent strategy. Pursuing external funding far more aggressively might help us to mitigate the effects of NSHE's unfunded growth. However, this would require a further reallocation of faculty time from teaching and research.

Appendices

APPENDIX A

BYLAWS

Department of English
University of Nevada
Reno, Nevada

I. Bylaws

    A. Authorization:

        Department bylaws are authorized by section 8 of the bylaws of the College of Liberal Arts, and by Section 6 of the bylaws of the University of Nevada, Reno.

    B. Scope:

        The bylaws provide for the administrative structure and personnel policies and procedures for the department of English, and shall be consistent with the college and the university bylaws, the NSHE Code, the laws of the state of Nevada and the United States, and Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity policies.

    C. Adoption:

        These bylaws shall be adopted and in full force upon: 1) a secret ballot in which two-thirds of the active faculty (as defined in section III A. below) must vote and two-thirds of those voting must vote yes, and (2) approval of the dean of the college and the president.

    D. Amendment:

        Any member of the department's continuing faculty may propose amendments to these bylaws. Proposed amendments shall be submitted in writing to the chair and shall be distributed to the continuing faculty at least five working days before they are discussed in a faculty meeting. Voting shall be by mail ballot. An amendment shall be in full force upon: (1) a secret ballot in which two-thirds of the active faculty (as defined in section III.A. below) of the department must vote and two-thirds of those voting must vote yes and (2) approval of the dean of the college and the president.

    E. Suspension:

        Any member of the continuing faculty may propose that a portion of the bylaws be suspended. Any such proposal shall be submitted in writing to the chair and distributed to the continuing faculty at least five working days before it is discussed in a faculty meeting. Voting shall be by mail ballot. For the proposal to

be approved, two-thirds of active faculty of the department must vote and two-thirds of those voting must vote yes.

F. Interpretation:

Should one-third of the continuing faculty question the interpretation of these bylaws, the department may seek a ruling from the dean of the college. Should a majority of the continuing faculty disagree with the dean's ruling, the department may appeal to the provost for a final ruling.

II. Mission

The mission of the Department of English shall be to pursue and disseminate research into language, literature and culture, with equal priority devoted to teaching and scholarship, and secondary priority to service and related professional activities.

III. Faculty

A. Composition of the Department

1. The Department of English is composed of all continuing faculty members with a primary assignment in the department of .50 FTE or more as described in Section 22 of the UNR Bylaws. Each shall have an equal vote in department elections, in hiring decisions, and on matters of policy. For matters of voting, "active faculty" includes all continuing faculty not currently on formal leave or sabbatical. Unless otherwise specified in these bylaws, a simple majority vote of the active faculty shall be sufficient to approve matters brought before the continuing faculty for a vote. Faculty on formal leave or sabbatical may vote should they choose to do so and in doing so will be considered active faculty for the purposes of computing a simple majority vote.

2. As needed to carry out its mission, the department will hire contingent faculty on one-year contracts and/or instructors on letters of appointment. Individuals in these positions shall not have a vote in department elections, in the hiring of continuing faculty, or on matters of policy.

B. Responsibilities and Role Statements

The responsibilities of each faculty member "shall consist of an assigned combination of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service or professional development" (CLA bylaws section 18). Each faculty member will have a statement of professional responsibilities or role statement that documents these responsibilities and serves as the basis for annual evaluation (as specified in CLA bylaws section 20). Faculty assignments typically reflect the priorities in

the department's mission statement. For continuing faculty, these are roughly reflected in the standard percentage divisions of 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service for tenure-track faculty and 60% teaching, 20% professional development, 10% service, and 10% specific service assignment for non-tenure-track faculty. Role statements for contingent faculty will reflect their teaching and service responsibilities. The typical teaching load for tenure-track faculty shall be 2/2, with the expectation of significant supervision of graduate students and significant research or creative work. The typical teaching load for continuing non-tenure track faculty shall be 3/3, with the expectation of a significant service contribution to the department, as negotiated with the chair, and professional development. To carry out the necessary work of the department, continuing faculty are expected to serve actively on at least one permanent or standing departmental committee annually unless they are on leave. Continuing faculty are also expected to serve on all tenure, retention, and promotion committees for which they are eligible. Under certain circumstances such as research grants, fellowships, and administrative assignments, faculty may negotiate variations on these norms as part of their annual role statements, but such variations should be tied to the life of the project or assignment and will not affect the department's standards for tenure and promotion. The revised role statement must include responsibilities in all areas. If a faculty member's role statement embodies a model significantly different from the typical one, this will be noted by the Personnel Committee in the annual evaluation.

C. Meetings

The continuing faculty shall meet at least once per semester, at a time scheduled so far as possible not to conflict with faculty teaching schedules. It shall meet as necessary during the fall and spring semesters to discuss hiring priorities, budget, annual evaluation, curriculum, and other matters of policy. Any member of the continuing faculty may, upon submission of a written request to the Planning Committee, ask that discussion of a department issue be placed on the agenda for a forthcoming department meeting. Any member of the continuing faculty may, upon submission of a written request to the Planning Committee, have the chair call a department meeting to consider any department issue. Meetings shall occur only on contract days.

1. Agendas for faculty meetings shall be distributed five working days in advance. Annotated meeting agendas recording attendance and formal decisions made by faculty vote shall be circulated after department meetings, approved formally at the next meeting, and kept on file in the department office.

2. A faculty member unable to attend a meeting may ask another member of the continuing faculty to vote on his or her behalf by proxy. Written proxy authorization must be submitted at the faculty meeting to which it applies.

3. Faculty meetings shall be run according to the most recent edition of Robert's Rules of Order.

D. Hiring

1. Continuing faculty: once the dean has approved the department's request to fill a replacement or new continuing faculty position, the chair shall appoint a search committee from the continuing faculty to conduct a search for the best applicants to fill the position. The committee may include a nonvoting graduate student member. The committee shall advertise, screen and select applicants for interviews, make recommendations to the department concerning finalists to be brought to campus for interview, and then recommend a candidate for the position. The department's vote on candidates shall be by secret ballot. To be hired, a candidate must be supported by two-thirds of the active faculty.

2. Contingent faculty: once the dean has approved the request to fill a contingent position, the chair shall appoint a search committee from the continuing faculty and contingent faculty to conduct a search for the best applicants to fill the position. The committee may include a nonvoting graduate student member. The committee shall advertise, screen and select applicants for interview, conduct phone interviews, and recommend a candidate for the position to the chair. These hiring decisions need not be voted on by the active faculty. The department shall not hire an individual in a contingent position for more than a total of three years.

3. Letters of appointment: the chair shall hire instructors on letters of appointment and do so in consultation with the Core Writing Director if the instructors will teach first-year writing courses. These appointments need not be approved by the active faculty.

IV. Administration and Committees:

A. Department Chair

In accordance with Section 3, Chapter 6, Paragraph 62 of the UNR Bylaws, chairs of departments "as administrators shall be directly responsible to their supervisor or supervisors for the operation of their departments." In accordance with Chapter III, section 13.A of the Bylaws of the College of Liberal Arts, "Chairs and directors shall be responsible to the dean for implementing college policies and procedures, and responsible to faculty for implementing policies and procedures mandated by department or unit bylaws." The department chair shall be an ex officio member of all department committees. The department chair shall discuss curricular, scheduling, budgeting, and planning issues with the Planning Committee. The chair will work with the Planning Committee to produce a budget that the faculty will then review and discuss. He or she shall be responsible for administering all department budgets.

1. Appointment: The continuing faculty shall recommend a candidate or candidates for department chair to the dean of the college, who in turn recommends a candidate to the provost, for final appointment by the president. The department chair serves for a period of three years. When a vacancy occurs in the office, the Planning Committee shall ask three members of the continuing faculty to form an election board. The board shall seek nominations from the continuing faculty and then distribute ballots to the continuing faculty for a confidential written vote. The nominee receiving the majority of votes shall be recommended to the dean. In the case of three successive tie votes, or votes which do not produce a majority candidate, the decision among the candidates shall rest with the dean. Under normal circumstances a chair may serve no more than two terms in succession.

2. Removal: Should one-third of the continuing faculty at any time desire that the chair step down, they may upon written notification (five working days) to the continuing faculty call a meeting to vote upon the question. Should a majority of the continuing faculty in secret ballot vote affirmatively, the recommendation shall be made to the dean. Upon approval by the dean, new nominations shall be made and an election held.

3. Faculty Recourse: In the event any faculty member objects to a decision or action or omission on the part of the chair, she or he may submit the case to the dean, providing the faculty member (1) submits to the chair a copy of any written objection, and (2) notifies the chair of any interview with the dean on the issue.

4. Temporary Chair: Should the chair need to be absent for a brief period, he or she shall appoint a temporary chair. Should the chair be absent for an extended period of no more than one year, the department shall recommend an acting chair to the dean following procedures outlined in IV.A.1. The period for which the chair is absent shall not count as part of his or her term.

B. Directors

The department's instructional programs shall be administered by three directors: the Director of Core Writing, the Director of Undergraduate Studies, and the Director of Graduate Studies. The directors work in consultation with the department chair and serve on the Planning Committee. Each director shall present a report to the department at a meeting prior to the end of the spring semester. Each director shall be elected by the continuing faculty to a term of three years. When a vacancy occurs in the office, the Planning Committee shall ask three members of the continuing faculty to form an election board. The board shall seek nominations from the continuing faculty and then distribute ballots to the continuing faculty for a confidential written vote. The nominee receiving the majority of votes shall be appointed by the chair. Should no candidate receive a majority, a runoff election shall be held between the two candidates who

received the most votes. Should any of the directors be absent or unable to perform the duties of his or her position for an extended period not longer than a year, the department chair, in consultation with the Planning Committee, shall appoint an acting director. A period of one year for which the director is absent shall not count as part of his or her term. Under normal circumstances a director may serve no more than two terms in succession in one of these positions.

1.   The Director of Core Writing has responsibility for implementing the Core Writing Program. He or she shall further be responsible for supervising the teaching of graduate teaching assistants and instructors hired on letters of appointment, and for other duties related to the supervision and administration of the university English requirement. The Director of Core Writing shall be either a regular or ex officio member of all committees whose business is relevant to the first-year writing program and shall chair the Core Writing Committee.

2. The Director of Undergraduate Studies has responsibility for implementing the undergraduate program in English. She or he shall be either a regular or ex officio member of all committees whose business is relevant to the undergraduate program and shall chair the Undergraduate Committee. He or she shall act as departmental liaison to undergraduate students in the department.

3. The Director of Graduate Studies has responsibility for implementing the graduate program in English. The director shall be either a regular or ex officio member of all committees whose business is relevant to the graduate program and shall chair the Graduate Committee. He or she shall further be responsible, in consultation with the Graduate Committee, for overseeing the appointment of graduate students to teaching assistantships. She or he shall act as departmental liaison to graduate students in the department.

C. Committees

The department shall have permanent, standing, and temporary committees. Permanent committees include the Planning, Core Writing, Undergraduate, Graduate, Personnel, Tenure, Retention, and Promotion committees.

1. The Planning Committee shall be responsible for departmental planning, as required by the college and university, programmatic issues, and coordinating the work of the department's permanent, standing, and temporary committees. The committee shall be composed of the department chair and the directors of Core Writing, Undergraduate Studies, and Graduate Studies.   At regular intervals set by the university, the Chair, working closely with the Planning Committee, will initiate and coordinate departmental program reviews. The Planning Committee will be assisted in this by other permanent committees and individuals as appropriate.

2. The Core Writing Committee shall be responsible for reviewing and revising the department's first-year writing course offerings, policies and procedures, and curriculum; for assessing the Core Writing Program; and for making recommendations to the faculty concerning these and related issues. The committee shall be chaired by the Core Writing Director, and shall include current Core Writing Program officers (e.g., assistant directors and curriculum coordinators) as members. Other members of the committee shall be appointed from the continuing faculty by the department chair, in consultation with the director, in order to ensure as far as possible (1) continuity of experience; (2) a representative mix of faculty ranks and areas of expertise; and (3) opportunities for breadth of service across the department.

3. The Undergraduate Committee shall be responsible for reviewing the department's undergraduate degree programs, course offerings, policies, and procedures; for assessing the undergraduate program; for administering the department's undergraduate scholarships and awards; and for making recommendations to the faculty concerning these and related issues. The committee shall be chaired by the Director of Undergraduate Studies. Members of the committee shall be appointed from the continuing faculty by the department chair, in consultation with the director, in order to ensure as far as possible (1) continuity of experience; (2) a representative mix of faculty ranks and areas of expertise; and (3) opportunities for breadth of service across the department.

4. The Graduate Committee shall be responsible for reviewing the department's graduate degree programs, course offerings, policies, and procedures; for assessing the graduate programs; and for making recommendations to the graduate faculty of the department. Members of the committee shall be appointed from among the graduate faculty of the department by the chair, in consultation with the director, in order to ensure as far as possible (1) continuity of experience; (2) a representative mix of faculty ranks and areas of expertise; and (3) opportunities for breadth of service across the department. The committee shall evaluate the needs of new graduate students, advise the graduate faculty and students regarding examinations and other requirements, and help evaluate the progress of graduate students toward degrees. The committee shall determine graduate admissions and, in consultation with the Director of Core Writing, shall recommend to the chair on the appointment and reappointment of teaching assistants.

5. The Personnel Committee shall be composed of the department chair, who shall chair the committee, and four members of the continuing faculty, three tenured and one non-tenure-track faculty member who has been retained. Committee members shall be appointed by the chair to two-year terms, on a staggered schedule. All continuing faculty who have been tenured or retained shall serve on this committee in turn. The committee shall evaluate the performance of each faculty member annually in conformity with section 20 of the CLA bylaws and section 40 of the university bylaws. Each member shall be

asked to submit materials relevant to teaching, research, and professional service during the year under review. On the basis of this evidence, the committee shall evaluate each faculty member's performance and make a corresponding recommendation regarding merit. The evaluation in all areas, including the overall evaluation, shall be determined by majority vote of the Personnel Committee. The committee must rank or group its evaluations.

6. The Tenure Committee shall consist of the tenured faculty and shall be chaired by the department chair. The committee shall make recommendations on tenure and on the reappointment of probationary tenure-track faculty members; the chair shall forward these recommendations to the dean with any minority reports or dissenting opinion. Every probationary tenure-track member of the faculty shall be assessed each year. The committee shall evaluate the progress toward tenure of each probationary tenure-track faculty member each year and conduct the third-year review of each tenure-track faculty member, as required in section 21 of the CLA bylaws. The committee shall formally evaluate the application for tenure of each probationary tenure-track faculty member, as specified in section 22 of the CLA bylaws.

7. The Retention Committee shall consist of all non-probationary faculty members and shall be chaired by the department chair. The committee shall make recommendations on the retention of non-tenure-track faculty; these recommendations shall be forwarded to the dean with any minority reports or dissenting opinion of the chair that may be offered. Every probationary non-tenure-track faculty member shall be assessed each year. In the third probationary year, the candidate's progress toward retention will be thoroughly reviewed by both the department and by the College Personnel Committee, as specified in section 21 of the CLA bylaws. The chair shall forward to the dean with any minority reports or dissenting opinion of the chair that may be offered. The committee shall formally evaluate the application for retention of each probationary non-tenure-track faculty member, as specified in section 23 of the CLA bylaws.

8. Promotion Committees shall be constituted as follows: for promotion to Rank IV, all faculty members at Rank IV; for promotion to Rank III, all faculty members at Rank III and above; for promotion to Rank 0 (IV), all faculty members at Rank IV or Rank 0 (IV); for promotion to Rank 0 (III), all faculty members at Rank III or Rank 0 (III) and above. They shall be chaired by the department chair, if she or he is eligible to serve (otherwise he or she shall be an ex officio non-voting member). The committees shall formally evaluate application for promotion, as specified in sections 22 and 23 of the CLA bylaws. Promotion Committees shall make recommendations which shall be forwarded to the dean with any minority reports or dissenting opinion of the chair that may be offered. Each faculty member shall be eligible to be considered for promotion each year and may submit information relevant to this consideration to the appropriate promotion committee.

9. Standing Committees and Temporary Committees shall be responsible for the matters assigned to them. The former shall include field committees, to address curricular, advising, and research issues in the various specializations within our degree programs and discipline. The latter shall include ad hoc committees, to address specific issues such as bylaws revision. Members of such committees shall be appointed from among the continuing faculty of the department by the chair, in consultation with the Planning Committee, in order to ensure as far as possible (1) continuity of experience; (2) a representative mix of faculty ranks and, when appropriate, areas of expertise; and (3) opportunities for breadth of service across the department.

V.   Personnel Policies and Procedures

All personnel actions and decisions shall conform to the requirements of the department, college, and university bylaws, the NSHE Code, and Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity policies.

A. Annual Evaluation

The performance of each faculty member shall be evaluated annually by the Personnel Committee in conformity with section 20 of the CLA bylaws and section 40 of the university bylaws. Each member shall be asked to submit materials relevant to teaching, research, and professional service during the year under review. A faculty member shall have the right to read the evaluation before signing it and the right to meet with the department chair regarding it. Annual evaluation helps to gauge progress toward tenure/retention or promotion but a favorable evaluation does not necessarily mean that all the requirements for tenure/retention or promotion are being met. A summary showing the distribution of faculty evaluations for the year shall be available to evaluated faculty upon request.

> 1. Teaching: faculty must submit syllabi and student course evaluations from all courses taught. Student evaluations should be administered following departmental guidelines. Faculty must also submit a list of all graduate, honors thesis, and similar advisory committees, with notations regarding each student's progress during the year. Faculty may also submit evidence of teaching awards, pedagogical grants, and other teaching-related activity.

> 2. Research: faculty must submit copies of any published work to be credited that year. Professional publications other than books may be credited once, either when accepted or published. Book-length works should be credited three times, usually in the year formally accepted, the year published, and the year following publication. Works of textual editing, edited collections, and co-authored book-length works will be evaluated and credited on a case-by-case basis. Manuscripts shall be regarded as accepted from date of formal acceptance of the final manuscript by the publisher. Faculty should clarify the status of materials when

they are submitted. The relevant distinctions include: work in progress, work in circulation, accepted work, published work, reprinted work, work previously credited. Continuing non-tenure-track faculty must submit evidence of professional development activities to be credited that year. Faculty may also submit evidence such as research awards, conference papers, and grant proposals.

3. Service: faculty must submit a list of service roles and assignments, with brief descriptions of work done and, as appropriate, copies of non-confidential documents completed in the role.

B. Tenure and Promotion: Tenure-track Faculty

1. Acting under the provisions of the Code and department, college, and university bylaws, Tenure and Promotion Committees shall evaluate the performance of tenure-track faculty in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Such committees shall make qualitative judgments in reviewing each of these areas.

a. Teaching: A record of effective teaching as suggested by course syllabi, written evaluations submitted by students, visit reports by peers, and service on graduate committees, all evidence assembled according to uniform methods. In addition, candidates may present other relevant evidence.

b. Research: Achievement in research or creative work, necessarily including peer-reviewed publication at the national level. Achievement is evidenced by published books or articles, other professional publications, grants and awards, and papers read at professional meetings. Professional publications include but are not limited to scholarly articles, essays, fiction, poetry, and reviews. Manuscripts shall be regarded as accepted from date of formal acceptance of the final manuscript by the publisher.

c. Service: Active participation in department, college, university, and/or national service. Involvement in professionally related community service and other professional activities shall be considered.

2. Criteria for Tenure: The faculty member shall demonstrate a record of achievement in teaching, scholarly and/or creative work, and service as defined in CLA bylaws section 18 and consistent with the faculty member's role statement and the department's mission. That record shall include scholarly and/or creative work published prior to the faculty member's appointment at the university. The Tenure Committee must evaluate the candidate as "excellent" in teaching or research and at least "satisfactory" in the other two areas.

3. Criteria for Promotion to Assistant Professor (Rank II): To be eligible for promotion, a faculty member in Rank I shall have obtained a terminal degree in

an appropriate professional field and have demonstrated potential for achievement in teaching, research, and service.

4. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor (Rank III): To be eligible for promotion, a faculty member in Rank II shall have established "a substantial record of achievement in teaching, scholarly and/or creative work, and service" (CLA bylaws 22.E.2). The Promotion Committee shall obtain external reviews of the faculty member's achievement in research. The committee must evaluate the candidate as "excellent" in teaching or research and at least "satisfactory" in the other two areas.

5. Criteria for Promotion to Professor (Rank IV): To be eligible for promotion, a faculty member in Rank III shall have established a national reputation through "sustained record of excellence in a professional field" since promotion to Rank III. "The record shall document publications or creative work judged significant by peers in the field; distinguished professional service; and distinction in teaching and related activities. The record may document exceptional administrative achievement as well" (CLA bylaws 22.E.3). The Promotion Committee shall obtain external reviews of the faculty member's achievement in research.

C. Retention and Promotion: Non-tenure-track Faculty

1. Acting under the provisions of the Code and department, college, and university bylaws, Retention and Promotion Committees shall evaluate the performance of non-tenure-track faculty in continuing positions in the primary area of teaching, and in professional development and service. Such committees shall make qualitative judgments in reviewing each of these areas.

a. Teaching: A record of effective teaching as suggested by course syllabi, written evaluations submitted by students, and visit reports by peers, all evidence assembled according to uniform methods administered by the department. In addition, candidates may present other relevant evidence.

b. Professional Development: A record of achievement in the following areas: presentation of lectures or readings outside the classroom; reading of papers or membership on panels at professional meetings; publication of scholarly or creative work (including work published prior to the faculty member's appointment at the university); development of new areas of teaching and scholarly expertise that results in publications, presentations, or new courses.

c. Service: Active participation in department, college, university, and/or national service. Involvement in professionally related community service and other professional activities shall be considered.

2. Criteria for Retention: The faculty member eligible for retention shall demonstrate a record of achievement in teaching, professional development, and service as defined in CLA bylaws section 18 and consistent with the faculty member's role statement and the department's mission. The Retention Committee shall obtain external reviews of the faculty member's achievement in teaching, which is the major area of responsibility, and either professional development or service

3. Criteria for Promotion to Rank 0(III): To be eligible for promotion, a faculty member in Rank 0(II) shall have established "a substantial record of achievement in his or her major area of responsibility" (CLA bylaws 23.D.2). The Promotion Committee shall obtain external reviews of the faculty member's achievement in teaching, which is the major area of responsibility, and either professional development or service.

4. Criteria for Promotion to Rank 0(IV): To be eligible for promotion, a faculty member in Rank 0(III) shall have established a "sustained record of excellence in his or her major area of responsibility" since promotion to Rank 0(III) (CLA bylaws 23.D.3). Professional development since promotion to Rank 0(III) shall consist of achievement in at least two of the areas listed above (20.C.1.b.). The Promotion Committee shall obtain external reviews of the faculty member's achievement in teaching, which is the major area of responsibility, and either professional development or service.

APPENDIX B

English Department Committees, 2015-2016

Planning
Eric Rasmussen (chair)
Valerie Fridland
Ann Keniston
Ashley Marshall
Melissa Nicolas

Personnel
Eric Rasmussen (co-chair)
Ashley Marshall (co-chair)
Elizabeth Francis
Justin Gifford
Gailmarie Pahmeier
Lynda Walsh

Undergraduate
Ann Keniston (chair)
Joe Calabrese
Dennis Cronan
David Fenimore
Don Hardy
Susan Palwick
Peggy Urie

Graduate
Valerie Fridland (chair)
Mike Branch
Cathy Chaput
Chris Coake
Steve Gehrke
Justin Gifford
Cheryll Glotfelty

Language
Dennis Cronan (chair)
Ian Clayton
Don Hardy
Valerie Fridland
Lorena Stookey

Literature
Katherine Fusco (chair)
Phil Boardman
Ann Keniston
Dan Morse
Angela Bennett Segler
Lorena Stookey
Peggy Urie

Writing
Lynda Walsh (chair)
Kathy Boardman
Steve Gehrke
Chris Mays
Melissa Nicolas
Gailmarie Pahmeier
Susan Palwick
Mary Webb
Jim Webber

Core Writing
Melissa Nicolas (chair)
Justin Lewis
Jim Webber
Chris Field (assistant director CWP)
Tom Hertweck (assistant director CWP)

Public Occasions
Gailmarie Pahmeier (chair)
Chris Coake
Elizabeth Francis
Steve Gehrke

Scholarship
Susan Palwick (chair)
Valerie Fridland
Ann Keniston
David Fenimore
Gailmarie Pahmeier

MFA
Chris Coake (chair)
Mike Branch
Steve Gehrke
Ann Keniston
Gailmarie Pahmeier
Susan Palwick

Film Studies
Mike Branch
David Fenimore
Katherine Fusco

Web / Technology
David Fenimore (chair)
Phil Boardman
Joe Calabrese
Ian Clayton
Angela Bennett Segler

CCID
Bill Macauley (chair)
Kathy Boardman
Justin Lewis
Chris Mays
Melissa Nicolas

Public Engagement (RLPE)
Cathy Chaput (chair)
Justin Gifford
Cheryll Glotfelty
Lynda Walsh

Department Diversity Officer
Katherine Fusco

Assessment Coordinator
Kathy Boardman

Search Committees

Global Anglophone
Dennis Cronan (chair)
Jen Hill
Ann Keniston (part-time)
Dan Morse
Peter Picetti (PhD student)
Ashley Marshall

Creative Writing
Chris Coake (chair)
Steve Gehrke
Ann Keniston (part-time)
Susan Palwick
Daniel Enrique-Perez (World Languages)
Christina Camarena (MFA student)
Eric Rasmussen

Rhetoric/Composition
Bill Macauley (chair)
Kathleen Boardman
Melissa Nicolas
Jim Webber
Merrilyne Lundahl (PhD student)
Eric Rasmussen

APPENDIX C

Department of English
Tenure Committee
Guidelines for Review of Probationary Faculty

The Tenure Committee meets each spring to review the progress toward tenure of each member of the tenure-track faculty. This meeting will occur in February for third-year reviews (which are due in the dean's office in March) and in late April or early May for the reviews of other probationary faculty (the progress-toward-tenure letters are not due in the dean's office until late June).

The preceding fall semester, the department chair asks members of the committee to prepare written reports on that year's progress in each of the areas of evaluation: teaching, research or creative activity, and service. These guidelines describe how the process works and what these reports should include.

General Guidelines for Reports

- Reports should cover work accomplished since the previous progress-toward-tenure report

- Reports should be dated and indicate which year they cover (i.e., third year in the process toward tenure/retention).

- Faculty writing reports are not required to recommend a specific evaluation term (i.e., satisfactory, commendable, or excellent) but should be prepared to participate in the committee's discussion, which does necessarily take evaluation terms into account.

- Reports must be completed, in writing, no less than one week prior to the committee's spring meeting in order to allow committee members to read them prior to the meeting. The department chair will announce the deadline at the time the date for the spring meeting is set. Reports should be submitted electronically to the department chair, who will make them available for review by the committee before the meeting.

- Committee members will read each of that year's written reports in preparation for the meeting.

- Reports are provisional, confidential documents addressed to the committee. They should not be distributed beyond the committee prior to the committee meeting. After the meeting and any revision, reports written in the third and fifth years will be forwarded to the college as specified below.

- Following the committees' spring meetings, the department chair will write to each probationary faculty member on behalf of the committee and meet with each individually to discuss progress toward tenure/retention and how to address any areas of concern.

- Following the committees' spring meetings, third-year reports may be revised in light of the full committee discussion before they are forwarded to the college as part of the probationary faculty member's third-year review. Fifth-year reports may be updated as needed the following September for inclusion in the promotion and tenure/retention file, which goes to the college at the beginning of the sixth year.

Teaching

The person preparing the report should do the following:

- review the progress-toward-tenure report submitted the previous year

- observe the faculty member's teaching in the fall semester—all courses

- review the faculty member's teaching evaluations from the previous spring and fall semesters and syllabi (these are available from the department office in February, after the Personnel Committee completes its review for annual evaluation)

- meet with the faculty member after observing classes to discuss teaching

The report should do the following:

- describe the classes observed

- evaluate syllabi and, if appropriate, other course materials

- describe general trends in student course evaluations

- note progress (or lack of progress) on any issues of concern noted the previous year

- include a brief concluding summary paragraph that may be used in the letter that the chair will write to the faculty member on behalf of the full committee

Research or Professional Development

The person preparing the report should do the following:

- review the progress-toward-tenure report submitted the previous year

- read the research—for lecturers, professional development—materials submitted by the faculty member for annual evaluation (these are available from the department office in February, after the Personnel Committee completes its review for annual evaluation)

- meet with the faculty member to discuss research or professional development trajectory and work in progress

- for reports in the third and fifth years only, review all work to date

The report should do the following:

- evaluate the research or professional development materials read

- describe the research or professional development trajectory, placing materials read in that context

- note publication or acceptance of work that was under review the previous year, completion of work that was in progress, and initiation of new projects

- note progress (or lack of progress) on any issues of concern noted the previous year

- include a brief concluding summary paragraph that may be used in the letter that the chair will write to the faculty member on behalf of the full committee

Service

The person preparing the report should do the following:

- review the progress-toward-tenure report submitted the previous year
- read the service materials submitted by the probationary faculty member for annual evaluation (these are available from the department office in February, after the Personnel Committee completes its review for annual evaluation)
- meet with the faculty member to discuss the preceding year's service

The report should do the following:

- describe and evaluate the faculty member's service in the department, college, university, and profession, and community service related to his/her professional fields
- note progress (or lack of progress) on any issues of concern noted the previous year
- include a brief concluding summary paragraph that may be used in the letter that the chair will write to the faculty member on behalf of the full committee

External Reviews

The Tenure Committee has the responsibility of obtaining external reviews of the faculty member's achievement in the appropriate areas, as specified in the department's bylaws. Reviewers must meet the university's expectations—i.e., they must be tenured faculty holding at least the rank to which the faculty member is applying, at peer or more prestigious institutions, with suitable expertise.

The faculty member applying for tenure and the committee shall each submit a list of at least five potential reviewers to the department chair, who shall also create a list of at least five potential reviewers. Following consultation with the committee, the chair shall contact potential reviewers. The final list of external reviewers should include a mix of individuals recommended by the faculty member and individuals recommended by the committee and the department chair. It is university policy to obtain four to six letters in tenure cases.

APPENDIX D

Literature Specialization   **effective Fall 2016**
Student Worksheet

Name: _____ **ID#** _____ **Catalog Year:**

Advisor Name & E-Mail__|_____|_____
Underline courses in progress; circle when completed. Check often against MyNEVADA report.
Consult advisor about discrepancies.

Six Required Courses		*Six Major Electives*		*Approved Substitutions*
1. 281		These electives must be		_____ for_____ ____
2. 298		distributed across at least four		_____ for___ _____
3. 303 *(prereq 298)*		groups below. One course in		_____ for___ _____
4. 311 *(prereq 298)*		literature before 1800 (courses		_____ for___ _____
5. 312 *(prereq 298)*		shown in **bold** below) not to		
6. (Choose one) 411B, 412A,		include Shakespeare.		
413A, 414A, **415A**, 416B,				
432A, 440A				_____
7. #499B (CO 14)				**= TOTAL 39 credits**
SUBTOTAL 21 credits		**+ SUBTOTAL 18 credits**		

English Major Elective Groups

1. Poetry
    431A, #432A (CO12), 435A, 444A, 461B, 462B, 462D, 462E
2. Fiction
    470A, 470B, 471C, 472A, 472B
3. Drama
    433A, 433B, 464B, 465A, 465B, 466B, 468A
4. Rhetoric/Writing (only one rhetoric and writing course may count toward the major elective requirement)
    301R, 333, 400A, 400B, 401B, 305/403A, 306/403B, 307/404A, 308/404B, 405A, 406A, 407B, 408B, 408C, 409A, 409C
5. Literary Criticism and Theory
    421A, 422A, #486A (CO 10, CO 11), #488 (CO 12), #490A (CO 10, CO 13)
6. American Literature
    429C, 436A, 450A, 451A, 451B, 454A, 462B, 462D, 462E, 472A. 472B, 475A, 493A, 494A, #495C (CO 10), #497B (CO 10, 12, 13)
7. British Literature, Pre-1800
    415A, **431A**, #**432A** (CO 12), 433A, 433B, **435A**, **440A**, **441A**, **442A**, **443B**, **464B**, **465A**, **465B**, **470A**, **482A**
8. British Literature, post-1800

430A, 444A, **#445A** (CO 12), 447A, 450A, 470A, 470B, 471C

9. Comparative and Global Literature

  428A, #480A (CO 11), 480B, **482A**, 483A, **#484A** (CO 12, CO 13), #486A (CO 10, CO 11)

10. Linguistics (only one linguistics course may count toward the major elective requirement)

  411B, 412A, 412B, #412D (CO 9), #413A (CO 10), 413B, 413C, 414A, **415A**, **415D**, #416B (CO10)

11. Interdisciplinary Studies

  #427A (CO 10, CO13), 475B, **#484** (CO 12, CO 13), #491A (CO 12, CO13), 491C, #492A (CO 12, CO 13), #492C (CO 10, 13)

Depending on the topic or theme covered in the following courses, one of them may substitute for a course in groups 1 through 11:

  425A, 425B, 498A

Minor (or Double Major) _____ **Minor or 2nd major advisor** _____

NOTES:

Courses marked with # fulfill silver core objectives.

Independent studies may not be taken to fulfill major requirements.

Literature Minor   Effective Fall 2016
Student Worksheet

Name _____   ID# _____ Catalog Year _____

Major _____Minor Advisor Name & E-Mail
_____

See [catalog](#) for course descriptions. Underline courses in progress; circle when completed. Check often against [MyNEVADA](#). See [advisor](#) about discrepancies. Although we discourage English majors from also minoring in English, students majoring in Literature or Writing may minor in Linguistics or TESOL. Students majoring in Linguistics may minor in Literature or Writing. No course may simultaneously fulfill requirements in major and minor.

Literature (18 credits)

Required Course: ENG 298

Electives: **5 courses in English from at least 3 of the groups below.**

1. Poetry
     431A, #432A (CO12), 435A, 444A, 461B, 462B, 462D, 462E
2. Fiction
     470A, 470B, 471C, 472A, 472B
3. Drama
     433A, 433B, 464B, 465A, 465B, 466B, 468A
4. Rhetoric/Writing (only one rhetoric and writing course may count toward the minor elective requirement)
     301R, 333, 400A, 400B, 401B, 305/403A, 306/403B, 307/404A, 308/404B, 405A, 406A, 407B, 408B, 408C, 409A, 409C
5. Literary Criticism and Theory
     303, 421A, 422A, #486A(CO 10, CO 11), #488 (CO 12), #490A (CO 10, CO 13)
6. American Literature
     429C, 436A, 450A, 451A, 451B, 454A, 462B, 462D, 462E, 472A. 472B, 475A, 493A, 494A, #495C (CO 10), #497B (CO 10, 12, 13)
7. British Literature, Pre-1800
     311, 415A, 431A, #432A (CO 12), 433A, 433B, 435A, 440A, 441A, 442A, 443B, 464B, 465A, 465B, 470A, 482A
8. British Literature, post-1800
     430A, 444A, #445A (CO 12), 447A, 450A, 470A, 470B, 471C
9. Comparative and Global Literature
      312, 428A, #480A (CO 11), 480B, 482A, 483A, #484A (CO 12, CO 13), #486A (CO 10, CO 11)
10. Linguistics (only one linguistics course may count toward the minor elective requirement)
     281, 412A, #413A (CO 10), 413B, 413C, 414A, 415A, 415D, #416B (CO10)

11. Interdisciplinary Studies
#427A (CO 10, CO13), 475B, #484 (CO 12, CO 13), #491A (CO 12, CO13), 491C, #492A (CO 12, CO 13), #492C (CO 10, CO 13)

Depending on the topic or theme covered in the following courses, one of them may substitute for a course in groups 1 through 11:
425A, 425B, 498A

NOTES:
Courses marked with # fulfill silver core objectives.
Independent studies may not be taken to fulfill minor requirements.

[Insert other major/minor worksheets]

APPENDIX E

Four-Year Graduation Timetables for Undergraduate Emphases

Literature: Recommended Schedule

First Year

Fall Semester (16-18 units)

- ENG 101 – Composition I (3 units) *
- Core Curriculum Math (3 units – CO 2) *
- Foreign Language 111 (4 units)
- Core Curriculum Social Science (3 units – CO 6)
- Core Curriculum Fine Arts (3 units – CO7)

Spring Semester (16-17 units)

- ENG 102 - Composition II (3 units) *
- Core Curriculum Natural Science A (3-4 units)
- Foreign Language 112 (4 units)
- General Electives (3 units)
- College Breadth Requirement (100-200 level) (3 units)

  * English and Math course placement is based on test scores. Please consult the Core Curriculum chapter in this catalog.

Second Year

Fall Semester (15-16 units)

- CH 201 - Ancient and Medieval Cultures (3 units- CO5) **OR**
- CH 202 - The Modern World (3 units- CO5)
- Core Curriculum Natural Science (3 units- CO4)
- Foreign Language 211 (3 units)
- ENG 298 - Writing About Literature (3 units)
- ENG 281 - Introduction to Language (3 units)

Spring Semester (15 units)

- CH 203 - American Experiences and Constitutional Change (3 units- CO5, CO8)
- Core Curriculum Science, Technology & Society (1-3 units- CO9)
- Foreign Language 212 (3 units)
- Minor (100-200 level) (3 units)
- ENG 303 - Introduction to Literary Theory and Criticism (3 units)

+ under the Silver Core, students take only two of the three CH courses. See the catalog for details.

Third Year

Fall Semester (15 units)

- ENG 400-level (3 units)
- College Breadth Requirement (3 units)
- ENG 311 - Transatlantic Survey I (3 units)
- Minor (3 units)
- ENG 486A Postcolonial Literature (3 units-CO 10, 11)- if offered, **OR ENG 345 (CO 10),** ENG 427A (CO 10, 13), 492C (CO 10, 13), or 495C (CO 10)

Spring Semester (13-15 units)

- ENG 400-level (3 units)
- ENG 312 - Transatlantic Survey II (3 units)
- Minor (3 units)
- Minor (300-400 level) (3 units)
- ENG 432A- Chaucer (3 units- CO12), if offered **OR** ENG 445A (CO 12), 484A (CO 12, 13), or 497B (CO 10, 12, 13)

Fourth Year

Fall Semester (12-15 units)

- ENG 400-level (3-6 units)
- ENG 427A Women and Literature (3 units- CO 10, CO 13) **OR** other Core Curriculum Capstone Course (3 units- CO13)
- Minor (300-400 level) (3 units)
- If not CO 11 not already fulfilled: ENG 486A Studies in Postcolonial Literature and Theory (3 units – CO 10, CO 11), **OR** ENG 480A—Studies in Comparative Literature (3 units – CO 11)

Spring Semester (15 units)

- ENG 400-level (3-6 units)
- ENG 499B - Senior Research Project in Literature (3 units- CO 14)
- General Elective (3 units)*
- Minor (300-400 level) (3 units)

*Electives may be "Core Enhancement Courses," used to satisfy any Core Objective.

%Under the Silver Core, students take only one capstone.

Recommended Schedule: Language and Linguistics

First Year

Fall Semester (16-18 units)

- Core Curriculum English (3 units) *
- Core Curriculum Math (3-6 units) *
- Foreign Language 111 (4 units)
- Core Curriculum Social Science (3 units)
- Recreation Elective or Music Lesson (1 unit)

Spring Semester (16-17 units)

- ENG 102 - Composition II (3 units) *
- Core Curriculum Natural Science A (3-4 units)
- Foreign Language 112 (4 units)
- Core Fine Arts (3 units)
- College Breadth Requirement (100-200 level) (3 units)

     * English and Math course placement is based on test scores. Please consult the Core Curriculum chapter in this catalog.

Second Year

Fall Semester (15-16 units)

- Core Humanities (3 units)+
- Core Curriculum Natural Science (3-4 units)
- Foreign Language 211 (3 units)
- ENG 281 - Introduction to Language (3 units) **OR** ENG 282 - Introduction to Language and Literary Expression (3 units)
- ENG 298 - Writing About Literature (3 units)

Spring Semester (15 units)

- Core Humanities (3 units)+
- Core Curriculum Diversity (3 units)
- Foreign Language 212 (3 units)
- Minor (100-200 level) (3 units)
- ENG 303 - Introduction to Literary Theory and Criticism (3 units)

+ under the Silver Core, students take only two of the three CH courses. See the catalog for details.

Third Year

Fall Semester (15 units)

- ENG 400-level (6 units)
- General Elective (3 units)#
- College Breadth Requirement (3 units)
- Minor (3 units)

Spring Semester (13-15 units)

- ENG 400-level (6 units)
- General Elective (3 units)#
- Minor (3 units)
- Minor (300-400 level) (3 units)

Fourth Year

Fall Semester (12-15 units)

- ENG 400-level (9 units)
- General Elective (3 units)#
- Minor (300-400 level) (3 units)

Spring Semester (15 units)

- ENG 400-level (9 units)
- General Elective (3 units)#
- Minor (300-400 level) (3 units)

#Electives can be "Core Enhancement Courses," used to satisfy any Core Objective.

%Under the Silver Core, students take only one capstone.

Recommended Schedule: English, Secondary Education

First Year

Fall Semester (16-18 units)

- ENG 101 – Composition I (3 units) *
- Core Curriculum Math (3 units – CO 2) *
- Foreign Language 111 (4 units)
- Core Curriculum Social Science (3 units – CO 6)
- Core Curriculum Fine Arts (3 units – CO7)

Spring Semester (16-17 units)

- [ENG 102 - Composition II](#) (3 units) *
- Core Curriculum Natural Science A (3-4 units)
- Foreign Language 112 (4 units)
- General Elective (3 units)
- College Breadth Requirement (100-200 level) (3 units)

 * English and Math course placement is based on test scores. Please consult the Core Curriculum chapter in this catalog.

Second Year

Fall Semester (15-16 units)

- CH 201 - Ancient and Medieval Cultures (3 units- CO5) **OR**
- CH 202 - The Modern World (3 units- CO5)
- Core Curriculum Natural Science (3 units- CO4)
- Foreign Language 211 (3 units)
- ENG 298 - Writing About Literature (3 units)

- ENG 281 - Introduction to Language (3 units) **OR**
- ENG 282 - Introduction to Language and Literary Expression (3 units)

Spring Semester (13-15 units)

- CH 203 - American Experiences and Constitutional Change (3 units- CO5, CO8)+
- Core Curriculum Science, Technology & Society (1-3 units- CO9)
- Foreign Language 212 (3 units)
- Minor (100-200 level) (3 units)
- ENG 303 - Introduction to Literary Theory and Criticism (3 units)

+ under the Silver Core, students take only two of the three CH courses. See the catalog for details.

Third Year

Fall Semester (15 units)

- General Elective (3 units)*
- EDUC 415 - Teaching Writing in Schools (3 units)
- ENG 411B - Principles of Modern Grammar (3 units), if offered, **OR one of the following:**
- ENG 412A - Linguistics (3 units) **OR**
- ENG 412B - Applied Linguistics (3 units) **OR**
- ENG 413A - Sociolinguistics (3 units) **(CO 10) OR**
- ENG 414A - History of the English Language (3 units) **(CO 11) OR**
- ENG 416B - Language and Gender (3 units) **(CO 10) OR**
- ENG 492C - Language and Culture (3 units) **(CO 13) OR**
- ANTH 485 - Language and Culture (3 units)
- ENG 400-level Elective (fulfilling CO 10, 11, 12, or 13 as needed) (3 units)
- College Breadth Requirement (3 units)

  * Electives can be "Core Enhancement Courses," used to satisfy any Core Objective.

Spring Semester (15 units)

- ENG 411B - Principles of Modern Grammar (3 units), if offered, **OR one of the following:**
- ENG 412A - Linguistics (3 units) **OR**
- ENG 412B - Applied Linguistics (3 units) **OR**
- ENG 413A - Sociolinguistics (3 units) **(CO 10) OR**
- ENG 414A - History of the English Language (3 units) **(CO 11) OR**

- [ENG 416B - Language and Gender](#) (3 units) **(CO 10) OR**
- [ENG 492C - Language and Culture](#) (3 units) **(CO 13) OR**
- [ANTH 485 - Language and Culture](#) (3 units)
- Minor (3 units)
- [ENG 433A - Shakespeare: Tragedies and Histories](#) (3 units) **OR**
- [ENG 433B - Shakespeare: Comedies and Romances](#) (3 units)

Fourth Year

Fall Semester (15 units)

- ENG 400-level electives (fulfilling CO 10, 11, 12, or 13 as needed) (6 units)
- Minor (300-400 level) (6 units)
- [ENG 462B - American Poetry](#) (3 units) **OR**
- [ENG 472A - The American Novel I](#) (3 units) **OR**
- [ENG 472B - The American Novel II](#) (3 units) **OR**
- [ENG 493A - American Ideas](#) (3 units) **(CO 13)**

    *Under the Silver Core, students take only one capstone

Spring Semester (15 units)

- ENG 400-level elective (fulfilling CO 13 or 14 as needed) (3 units)
- ENG 400-level elective (3 units)
- Minor (300-400 level) (6 credits)
- General Elective or Minor (3 units)

APPENDIX F

<center>

Graduate Advisement Procedures
(English Department/ rev. 11/4/11)

</center>

A Note about this Document

This is an internal document that describes and guides English Department graduate faculty in their work as mentors to graduate students. It is designed to reflect current practices and to articulate our consensus about best practices, and it is revised occasionally to reflect our developing sense of how to improve our work. It is not a formal policy document, nor is it intended for the use of graduate students. Formal policies and program requirements (formerly known as the "Graduate Bulletin") may be found in the "Graduate" area of the department website: http://www.unr.edu/cla/engl/program/graduate /Graduate.asp (where you will also find information that is specific to each of our graduate program emphases). Graduate School policies, procedures, deadlines, and other helpful information may be found on their site at: http://www.unr.edu/grad/.

1. Early Advising and Committee Formation

Soon after agreeing to serve as committee chair, the faculty member should meet with the student to discuss his or her program of study. Advise the student as needed on selection of graduate courses and meeting of degree requirements. Remember that requirements are written in terms of minimum number of courses or credits; if you think a student should take particular or additional courses, give that advice as soon as possible.

The chair and the student should also discuss the formation of the student's graduate committee. Most students will already have some members in mind but may not be aware of the possible options or of factors to consider in setting up the committee. English faculty who are not members of the university's graduate faculty may, as appropriate, serve as second or third departmental members with the approval of the associate dean of the Graduate School. Outside committee members must be members of the Graduate Faculty; the Graduate School does not make exceptions to this rule. Ideally, the committee members should be chosen with the areas of examination and, in the case of PhD students, dissertation topic in mind.

As a general guideline, MA students should choose a chair and begin forming the rest of the committee in their second semester (of full-time studies, or its equivalent if they are part-time students); doctoral students should choose a chair and begin forming the committee in their third semester of full-time studies.

2. Preparing for Comprehensive Exams

The committee chair and the student work together to formulate the topic(s) and reading list(s) for the comprehensive exam. To gain a better understanding of departmental practice, new and recent faculty members are advised to consult with faculty within the emphasis. (For details on how the exam is structured within various degree programs and emphases, consult the department website.) The ideal time to construct the reading list varies with degree program and area of emphasis. Students should work out their lists no later than the semester prior to taking the comprehensive exam.

The reading lists and areas for examination should, to the degree possible, serve as a synthesis of the student's coursework and as preparation for further studies or professional work

(in the case of the MA) or for the dissertation (in the case of the PhD). Responsibility for the comprehensiveness of the list(s) lies with the committee chair, not the committee as a whole, although of course each member of the committee must have the opportunity to review lists in draft form and offer suggestions about them.

3. Initiating Work on Professional Papers, Portfolios, Theses, Dissertations

In the case of MA committees, the chair and the student should discuss expectations for the professional paper or portfolio early on. Students choosing the thesis option will need even more help, and they will need it earlier if they are to complete the thesis and graduate on schedule.

In the case of PhD committees, the chair and the student should discuss dissertation topics early on. Because of the nature of the comprehensive exams, students should have at least a general idea of the focus of their dissertation when they select their areas of examination and prepare their reading lists. A specific topic is preferable, but often this emerges or is clarified during the preparation for exams; most important is that the comprehensive exam reading lists be related to the general dissertation area so that the comps preparation establishes a research platform for the dissertation.

4. Drafting the Comprehensive Examination

The chair, in consultation with other members of the student's committee, writes the comprehensive examination (in most areas of the MA and all areas of the PhD). Typically, all committee members are invited to contribute questions (outside members often, but not always, defer to English faculty here), and the chair draws from these questions in formulating the examination. Alternatively, the chair may draft the exam and then circulate it to the committee for additions, comments, and suggestions. The chair may also want to circulate the revised exam to the committee to make sure there are no concerns about the final form of the test before it is administered.

5. Administering the Comprehensive Examination

The chair administers the written examination and coordinates evaluation of the exam by the full committee (in most emphasis areas of the MA and all emphasis areas of the PhD).

MA examinations are open book. Examinations at the MA level are "one-day" exams (the exception here is the MA Language emphasis—see program requirements for details), which may be administered by email or in hard copy. "One-day" is understood to mean an eight-hour day, so exams should be collected within eight hours after being distributed. However, exams should be constructed so as to require approximately four hours of actual writing time, thus leaving additional time for breaks, and for proofreading, verifying citations, etc. An MA exam fails if more than one negative vote is cast. If a student's written comprehensive examination is sufficiently weak that the committee feels the need to require a retake of all or substantial part(s) of it, the examination should be considered a failed examination.

PhD examinations are open book. Each of the four area exams is designed to take about four hours to write, with additional time allowed for revision. The student will be allowed a full day (24 hours) for each of the four area exams. All four exam days must occur within a period of thirty days. A PhD exam fails if more than one negative vote is cast. If a student's written comprehensive examination is sufficiently weak that the committee feels the need to require a retake of all or substantial part(s) of it, the examination should be considered a failed examination.

As required by the Graduate School, the DGS must record a grade of "S" or "U" in 795 ("Comprehensive Examination") when a student takes a comprehensive exam. It is the chair's responsibility to communicate the result of comprehensive exams to the DGS. If the student passes the comprehensive exam, the DGS will record an "S" in 795. If a student's comprehensive exam is sufficiently weak that the committee determines that a portion of the exam must be retaken, the exam should be considered a failed exam, and the DGS will record a "U" in 795 that semester.

The exam may be retaken no sooner than two months after the committee's determination that the initial exam failed. The exam may be retaken in whole or in part, as required by the committee, and should consist of new questions. If the student chooses to retake the exam, the committee should provide clear, helpful feedback about the deficiencies of the first exam and the expectations for the retake. The student must again register for 795. (Should the student retake the exam during the same semester it was initially failed or during the summer, the second registration for 795 will occur in the subsequent semester.) If the retake is also a failed exam, the DGS will again record a "U" in 795. The Graduate School allows students to retake comprehensive examinations only once; no further retakes are allowed

6. Oral Examination

Once the student has passed the written comprehensive examination and (for the MA) successfully completed the professional paper, portfolio, or thesis, the student's committee conducts an oral examination. If possible, the oral examination should occur within one month of the written exam. Chairs should meet with students in advance to provide guidance regarding how best to prepare for (and what to expect during) the oral examination. Students should also be reminded to bring necessary paperwork with them to the oral exam in order to have it signed by their committee members. If a student's oral examination is deemed unsatisfactory by the committee, the oral exam may be retaken once provided the student has not previously received a "U."

7. Thesis/Dissertation Prospectus

Under the guidance of the chair, the doctoral candidate should write a dissertation prospectus soon after completing the comprehensive exams. The entire committee should review the prospectus once it meets the chair's expectations. The committee should discuss the prospectus with the student either as part of the oral examination or at a separate meeting. The prospectus should be approved by the committee before the student begins writing the dissertation.

Master's students who have chosen the thesis option should draft a thesis prospectus for approval by the committee. The committee should respond to the prospectus, either in writing or by meeting with the student.

8. Dissertation Definition

A dissertation is a substantial scholarly project that employs theories and research methodologies widely recognized and published in literary or rhetorical studies. Drawing upon a tradition of inquiry, the dissertation addresses a problem or question of interest to scholars working in that field and in the larger discipline, and pursues conclusions that advance scholarship in that area.

9. Guiding the Dissertation in Progress

The chair serves as the primary reader of the chapters of the dissertation as they are written. Unless the chair and the student have set a different timetable, the chair should respond to an individual chapter draft within one month. Other members of the committee may also serve as readers, depending on their areas of expertise and the decisions of the committee regarding how to handle the writing and evaluation of the dissertation. The entire committee must have a chance to read and evaluate a penultimate draft well in advance of the dissertation defense. The chair should advise the student to allow plenty of time for committee members to read and respond to drafts. Particularly when committee members have not read chapters as they were written, it is imperative that they have at least one month to evaluate the manuscript prior to the defense.

When serving on graduate committees, faculty mentors are most helpful to students when they communicate in clear and explicit ways about their expectations and concerns. This concern for clear communication extends not only to exchanges between committee members and the student, but also to communication among faculty members on the committee, and especially to communication between committee members and the committee chair. For example, when the committee meets with a PhD student to discuss the dissertation prospectus, it is also important to discuss such issues as whether committee members prefer to read the dissertation chapter-by-chapter, in multiple chapter units, or as a complete manuscript. Once faculty have read the dissertation draft (in parts or in full), it is important that they communicate their concerns to the student's chair, and not only to the student. If the chair receives comments from all members of the committee, they are better positioned to synthesize, clarify, and convey the committee's concerns to the student in ways that will be clear, helpful, and consistent. While we do not wish to discourage committee members from communicating directly with students, we do wish to prioritize the role of the chair in communicating the committee's expectations and concerns to the student.

10. Dissertation Defense

Once the committee has approved the dissertation (in a penultimate or final draft), the chair and committee conduct an oral exam, or dissertation defense. In some instances this dissertation defense includes a formal presentation of the dissertation by the student. (The options for the format of the defense differ by emphasis, so please consult emphasis-specific requirements). Regardless of the format of the defense, the chair should publicize the dissertation defense to the department (either directly or through the DGS) in advance.

If there is more than one dissenting vote, the dissertation is not approved. The student may, however, defend a revised dissertation at a later date. Students should be reminded to bring necessary paperwork with them to the dissertation defense in order to have it signed by their committee members.

11. Graduate School Deadlines and Paperwork

It is the responsibility of the student to be aware of Graduate School deadlines, complete all necessary forms (including, as necessary, the Graduate Credit Transfer Evaluation, Program of Study, Admission to Candidacy, and Application for Graduation), obtain all needed signatures, format the dissertation properly, and so on. The committee chair, who must sign all forms and the final dissertation, should nonetheless be informed on these matters and advise the student to complete the necessary paperwork in advance of Graduate School deadlines. Students should be encouraged to familiarize themselves with the requirements posted on the Graduate School website

(http://www.unr.edu/grad/), which also contains a section on "Important Dates" that is especially useful to students as they approach the completion of their degree.

12. Guidelines for Students Wishing to Switch Program Emphasis

In order to complete a switch of emphasis within the MA or PhD degree program, students must do the following: 1) meet with the DGS to discuss the proposed change; 2) secure a willing committee chair in the new emphasis; 3) revise the statement of purpose from their original application (making clear the rationale for the proposed switch) and submit it for consideration by the Graduate Committee, which must approve the plan.

13. Evaluation of the Progress of PhD Students on Teaching Assistantship

Comments in this section apply only to full-time doctoral students who are serving as Teaching Assistants.

During the student's third year, the chair should meet with the student to ensure that they are making adequate progress toward the degree. In preparation for this meeting the chair of the student's committee should consult with the Director of Core Writing and/or the Director of Core Humanities to receive feedback regarding the quality of the student's work as a teacher. If the student has not yet taken comprehensive examinations, they should at this time be advised that the renewal of their T.A. into the fifth year is likely to depend upon successful completion of the comprehensive exams no later than the end of the fourth year. Likewise, if the student's teaching is considered unsatisfactory, they should at this time be advised that the extension of their T.A. into year five is likely to depend upon substantial improvements in their teaching by the end of year four. Following this meeting, the chair should provide the DGS with a brief report on the adequacy of the student's progress (progress toward the degree and progress in teaching). If the student does not have a committee chair by the time of this third-year review, the DGS will urge the student to begin assembling the committee immediately, and will function in the role of the chair for the purposes of the review. PhD students should have completed Graduate Credit Transfer form in the first semester, program of study ideally in the third semester, languages before enrolling in 795, examinations by the sixth semester, and begun dissertation work by seventh semester.

The report to the DGS should comment specifically on the following items:
1. Languages completed? How?
2. Graduate Credit Transfer Form completed? How many hours transferred in?
3. Program of study?
4. Course work completed or planned for completion by what date?
5. Progress on dissertation if started?
6. Teaching quality?
7. Other items of concern?

If by the middle of the fourth year a student has not successfully completed comprehensive exams and/or is still not performing adequately as a teacher, the graduate committee will consider whether the student's T.A. should be extended into the fifth year. If extenuating circumstances have hampered the student's progress, the Graduate Committee will discuss these circumstances with the chair and will take them into account in considering whether or not the T.A. should be renewed.

14. Mentoring Beyond the Degree

At the master's level, the committee chair should provide support and advice as the student decides among professional work, advanced graduate work, and other options. Particularly in cases in which the student intends to pursue advanced graduate work, the chair should be available to offer advice on the application materials the student will need in order to have an opportunity to succeed at the next level of their studies.

At the doctoral level, the committee chair serves as the graduate student's advisor and mentor regarding matters of professional development and job placement. Early on, and throughout the student's progress through the program, the chair and the student should discuss strategies for professional development and the practical realities of the academic job market. In particular, the chair should advise the student about when to begin presenting papers at conferences, when and where to begin submitting articles for publication, and when and how to prepare to apply for academic jobs. Other English faculty may of course be of assistance here, as will the DGS and the department's Academic Job Placement Workshop Series, held each fall.

APPENDIX G
Memo about Professionalization and Placement Workshops

Dear students and faculty in English,

Each year the English Department hosts Job Placement Workshops. This year we decided to change things up a bit in order to meet a more diverse set of student needs. We want this series to be adaptable to differing academic and professional goals. So, we are planning two faculty-led workshops, one this fall and one in early spring to hopefully help prepare you for wherever your future takes you. Also, we will work with students currently on the job market on a more individualized basis.

Upcoming Professionalization and Placement Workshops

Workshop 1: What do your written materials say about you?   TIME: 10/3, 1:00-3:00 AB202

> **This will be a two-part workshop. First, we will talk a bit about the job search process and how to develop a dossier. In the hands-on second half of the workshop, we will also workshop student materials in a one-on-one 'speed dating' format, allowing each student a number of different faculty member insights. To participate, students should bring a target job ad and materials such as CV, cover letter, statement of purpose, or other relevant documents.   This is aimed both at MA and PHD students at all stages of program progress. For those about to go on the market, we will provide a review of materials to send out in response to academic job ads. For early PhD students, For MA students looking to find jobs or apply to graduate school, we can help you hone your CV or statements toward the intended audiences.**

Workshop 2: introduction to the process, timing, readiness, and resources TIME: TBA

> **This will be a workshop focused on different aspects of professionalization. We will discuss how to prepare for and what to expect when you enter the market or when you are applying for further graduate study. This workshop will include discussion of how to market your academic skills for work in other industries as well as the academic market.**

**** We are also not forgetting those of you planning to be on the market this year. If you are planning to apply for academic jobs this fall, please email me directly (fridland@unr.edu) and let me know. Once I get a sense for how many of you there are, I can better design appropriate workshops or individual mentoring depending on number and need.*****

NB: What follows are sample outlines / fliers from the last few years, representing standard practice.

Department of English
Academic Job Placement Workshop #1
Fall 2013

Overview, Readiness, and Resources
Friday, September 13, 1:00-3:00, FH 107
Mark Bousquet, Cheryll Glotfelty, Ashley Marshall

<u>Reading</u>: If you haven't already, do make time to review the following websites, where you'll find a wealth of carefully distilled information.

Sources of Information for Job Candidates in English:
http://www.mla.org/jil_jobseekers_sou
Checklist for Job Seekers:
http://www.mla.org/jil_jobseekers_che
Planning a Career after Graduate School
http://www.mla.org/job_planning
Developing a Nonacademic Career
http://www.mla.org/job_nonacademic
When and Where to Look for an Academic Job
http://www.mla.org/job_whenwhere

Outline

1:00-1:20
Welcome, Introductions--Cheryll

Overview of the Academic Job Placement Workshop Series--Cheryll
A. Structure and purpose of the series
1. what the series is: a structured aid to the job search process
2. collaborative, to offer varying points of view (field, generational, individual)

B. Who should attend, and when?
Those on the job market, those expecting to be on the job market, those considering the job market. Especially those students in their penultimate year of graduate program.

C. Upcoming workshops (1:00-3:00, FH 107)
Sept. 27th--written materials (CV, statement of purpose, writing sample, dossier)
Nov. 15th--telephone and MLA interviews
Mock interviews and campus visit preparation--individually tailored and scheduled.

Today's focus . . .
--Overview of Academic Job Market
--Timeline for your job search.
--Readiness and Psychology: When is it time for you to go on the market? And what's it like?

117

--Procedure: How do you apply?
--Resources: Where do you find information and advice?
--Planning: How do you stay organized?
--Discussion of job seeking, by field
--Next week

The Academic Job Market--Overview--Cheryll, supplemented by Ashley and Mark
--Hiring department determines its needs and makes position requests to the dean (or college administration).
--Dean approves the search(es).
--Department posts position announcements and specifies how and when to apply for them.
    --The MLA Job Information List is one place jobs are posted, but there are many others, which we'll review later in this session.
--Applicants apply for a range of jobs for which they are eligible.
--Department search committee vets applications, eliminating applicants who do not meet minimum qualifications and choosing a pool of strong applicants from whom they may request additional materials.
--Search committee narrows field to semi-finalists, with whom they schedule an initial interview (often at MLA convention, but also by telephone)
--Search committee invites finalists (2-4 generally) for campus visits.
--Guided by the search committee, the hiring department ranks finalists and makes an offer to top choice, with contingency plans should choice #1 decline.

Timing of this process
Standard timing (from which there are *many* variations):
--Positions announced in Fall, beginning in September. (Sept. 13 first MLA JIL is available online.)
--Telephone interviews in November/December and/or MLA interview in early January.
--Campus visits in February and March.
--Offers made in February/March.
--Job starts in fall.

Reiterate: There are *many* departures from this "standard" calendar. New jobs continue to be posted into spring and all the way through summer.

Questions?

1:20-1:40
What we've discussed is how the process looks from the perspective of the hiring department and search committees.

Now let's shift our attention to the perspective of the job seeker. . .

Timetable for Job Seeking (Ashley for TT, Mark for postdoc; Cheryll supplementing with Jane's handout)

Questions?

1:40-2:00

Readiness and Psychology: How do you know if you are ready to go on the market? What can you expect the experience to be like? How can you prepare yourself emotionally? (Ashley and Mark)

Procedure: When you are ready to go on the market, how do you do it? (Ashley and Mark)

--Where jobs are advertised

        A. The MLA Job Information List (JIL)

            Faculty and graduate students in our department have access to the online MLA Job Information List through the department's membership in the Association of Departments of English. This is the primary source for academic job listings in English. This year's JIL will become available starting September 13; it will be updated weekly into July.

            To log on to the list, you must go to the ADE website: http://www.ade.org

            Click on Job Information List' and then on 'Search the Job Information List.' Use the department's login information.

            The department's ADE ID is 5373; the JIL search password is 89557.

            You will then be requested to create a personal login.

B. Other sources of job ads: *Chronicle* (http://chronicle.com/jobs/), AWP job list (http://www.awpwriter.org/careers/joblist.htm), University Jobs (http://www.universityjobs.com/), NCTE CCCC (http://www.ncte.org/cccc/), HigherEdJobs (http://www.higheredjobs.com/), LinguistList (www.linguistlist.org), Linguistic Society of America (http://www.lsadc.org/info/jobs-index.cfm)

--What materials are typically requested. (We'll discuss these documents next week at the 9/28 workshop.)

--Planning and requesting letters of recommendation. Timing, strategy, prepping your recommenders, protocol.

--Setting up a dossier with Interfolio.

A. You will need to provide references to mail directly to job committees or you will need to use the services of Interfolio (www.interfolio.com), an internet company that provides dossier services for a fee. Many universities, in addition to UNR, are now recommending Interfolio.

B. Notes on Interfolio researched and kindly provided by Sarah Perrault:

Letters of recommendation — How long before they are available?

- If a letter writer uploads the letter to Interfolio, it is available immediately.

- If a letter writer mails a paper copy to Interfolio, it will be available within 3 days of its arrival at their office.

Letters of recommendation and other materials — How long before Interfolio sends them after being requested to do so?

- If the receiving institution will accept it electronically, the letter goes out the same day (if the request is made before 11:00 a.m. our time zone) or the next day.

- If the receiving institution wants paper copies, they go out in the mail on the next business day. How quickly they go depends on how much the applicant wants to spend; for a small fortune, materials can be delivered as soon as the day after the request is sent.

Questions?

2:00-2:15

The Role of Advising/ Other Helpful Resources / Tips on Staying Organized (Ashley and Mark)

--Resources: Where do you find information and advice?
--Planning: How do you stay organized?

Questions?

2:15-2:45 (approx. 10 minutes each)

View of the Job Process within Fields (Cheryll, Ashley, Mark)
--types of jobs, and signals within the job ad of what type of job it is (Please emphasize that there are a wide variety of jobs and that all have pros and cons. Last year we put undue emphasis on the desirability of R1 jobs, which few of our students will actually get.)

--perhaps each discuss how to read (decode) a sample job ad? show and "decode" actual ads
Cheryll: teaching-heavy TT
Ashley: research-heavy TT
Mark: postdoc, lectureship

2:50-3:00
Open Q&A

Preview of next workshop--Cheryll
9/27, 1:00-3:00--written materials (CV, statement of purpose, writing sample, dossier)
Coordinator/Moderator: James Mardock
Panelist: Katherine Fusco
Panelist: Carrie Walker
Panelist: Jim Webber

Department of English
Academic Job Placement Workshop #2
Fall 2012

Friday, September 28, 1:00-3:00, FH 219

Ann Keniston, Katherine Fusco, Anupama Mohan, Jim Webber, Cheryll Glotfelty

Topics: issues in crafting letters of application, polishing and adjusting CVs, choosing and revising writing samples, soliciting letters of recommendation, building a dossier of recommendation letters

I. Analyzing the Job Ad
    A. What jobs are you qualified for?
    B. What should you emphasize in your letter?
    C. Reading between the lines

II. The Application Letter
    A. The main elements
        1. introduction (What job are you applying for? How do your qualifications match the advertised position? What is your status?)
        2. dissertation (Title? Focus? Importance? Relationship to other work?)
        3. other research interests (Next project? Related interests? Secondary area?)
        4. teaching (Fields? Ambitions? Experiences? Interests? Awards?)
        5. other (Service? Awards? Interdisciplinary experience? Advertised subfields? Etc.)
        6. close (clarify MLA availability and timing of contact info near holidays)
    B. Main issues for consideration
        1. length
        2. tone
        3. the letter as writing sample
        4. customizing in terms of the job ad
            --customizing by job
            --customizing by individual school

III. The CV
    A. Drafting
        examine other models (by colleagues, and in supporting materials)
    B. Organizational and Design Matters
        1. the importance of good visual design
        2. the importance of structure/ logic/ readability
        3. the question of developing multiple versions of the CV

IV. The Dossier/ Requesting Letters of Recommendation

A. Establishing and Using the Dossier
      1. establish a dossier at www.interfolio.com
      2. contents of the dossier; how many letters to include
      3. creating a balanced dossier: letters on teaching/dissertation/coursework/other
B. Requesting Letters of Recommendation
      1. do so well in advance of deadlines
      2. provide recommenders clear info re. logistics (where, when, how) & your contact info
      3. provide additional documents to support and inform the letter
      4. discuss with the recommender the role of their letter in the balanced dossier
      5. ask advisor to request and read the dossier

V. The Writing Sample(s)
A. When and how to send it
B. The length of the writing sample
C. The question of whether to send more than one sample

VI. Other Documents in the Process
A. Dissertation abstract
B. Statement of teaching philosophy
D. Course evaluations
E. Other?

VII. Questions and Discussion

Academic Job Placement Workshop: Phone and Conference Interviews
Friday, November 18, 2011

Preparing for the Conference Interview

Step I. Research the Three Ps: Position, People, Place

1. U of Central Missouri
English & Philos, 336 Martin, Warrensburg, MO 64093 http://https://jobs.ucmo.edu
Instructor of English [16363]
The University of Central Missouri invites applications for two one- year renewable non-tenure track Instructor positions starting August 1, 2012. Teach 4 composition courses per semester. M.A. in English or TESL with two years experience teaching composition required. Experience working in a computer-assisted classroom and serving on department committees desirable. Applicants must complete an online faculty profile at https://jobs.ucmo.edu. Apply to position #998142 and #998603 (apply for both). Attach to the profile a letter of application, CV, three letters of recommendation, and black & white scanned transcripts. Screening will begin November 15, 2011, and will continue until the positions are filled. For questions about the online application process contact Human Resources at jobs@ucmo.edu or (660) 543 4255. The University of Centrral Missouri is a AA/EEO/ADA employer. **[R]**
Expires from JIL database 23 Dec 2011

2. Hilbert C
Arts & Sciences Div, 5200 S Park Av, Hamburg, NY 14075 http://www.hilbert.edu
Assistant Professor of English [16291]
Job Summary: Hilbert College anticipates an opening in Fall of 2012 for an Assistant Professor of English. The Division of Arts and Sciences is currently seeking qualified candidates for this full-time position with expertise in both European (including but not limited to modern/contemporary British literature) and World literature. Successful candidates must demonstrate a willingness to teach courses beyond their area of expertise, including cross-discipline courses, general education courses, and lower level composition and introduction to literature courses. Faculty appointments are for a ten-month contract period and the normal teaching load is twelve credit hours per semester. Student advisement and participation on college committees are required. Salary is commensurate with experience.

Appointment/Start Date: August 1, 2012

Requirements/Qualifications: A Ph.D. in English is required. Candidates who will have their Ph.D. in hand by August 2012 will be considered. Hilbert is a teaching-oriented institution, and candidates should have experience in teaching and course development.

_____

Application review will begin December 1, 2011. Interested candidates should submit a

letter of interest, curriculum vitae, and contact information for three professional references to:

Maura A. Flynn
Director of Human Resources
jobs@hilbert.edu

Hilbert College is an Equal Opportunity Employer **[R]**
Expires from JIL database 16 Dec 2011

3. Rutgers U
Amer Studies, 131 George St, New Brunswick, NJ 08901
Assistant Professor, West/Southwest Asian American Culture [16368]
The Departments of Women's and Gender Studies and American Studies at Rutgers University, New Brunswick invite applications for a tenure track Assistant Professor in feminist cultural studies of West (Middle East) and Southwest Asian America within a transnational framework. The committee will consider innovative research in literature and culture after 9/11; religion and religious cultures; and/or Asians in the Americas, including the Caribbean and Latin America.

Teaching load is 2/2. Successful candidate must hold Ph.D. in relevant field by time of appointment and demonstrate strong commitment to teaching a diverse student body. For fullest consideration, applications should be submitted by December 2, 2011. Send letter of interest, curriculum vita, three (3) letters of recommendation, and writing sample (max 25pp) to Asian American Search c/o Prof. Nicole Fleetwood, Department of American Studies, 131 George Street, Ruth Adams Building, New Brunswick, NJ 08901. Rutgers University is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity employer. **[R]**
Expires from JIL database 23 Dec 2011

Step II: Anticipate Questions

Research Questions: the dissertation, future work, secondary areas of interest
- Tell us a bit of the genealogy of your interest in your dissertation project and perhaps document one of the surprises you encountered in the process of completing the dissertation.
- How would you explain your research to a non-expert?
- What is the purpose of your field?
- What theorists inform your work? Or which theorists have you found particularly helpful in framing your book project?
- In what critical conversations do you see your work participating in, and how?
- Where do you see your research going in the next few years? What next project(s) do you have in mind?
- What is your next article? What approximate date do you expect to publish your next article?

Teaching Questions: specialty areas, range of teaching ability, how you would teach certain courses, imagining future courses

- Tell us about a dream course you would want to teach.
- We offer course X. Please tell us how you would teach it.
- What texts would you use for course X and why?
- Tell us about a problem or disaster that you have experienced in your teaching and explain how you handled it.
- What areas of your teaching need improvement? How do you plan on improving them?
- What theories inform your teaching?
- Why is your teaching area of expertise relevant to our students?
- What part of a first-year writing class do you think is most difficult for students?
- How do you see yourself adjusting to the larger teaching loads (4/4) of a full-time position, while maintaining your research agenda?
- How do you feel about not having graduate students to mentor?
- Can you talk a bit about how you would mentor graduate students?
- Given your interests, what might be a graduate seminar you would like to teach, and what sorts of texts or approaches would the course include?

Service/Community/Collegiality Questions

- Tell us about any service work you have done in your graduate studies.
- How have you become involved in your local community while earning your degrees?

"Have You Done Your Homework" Questions:

- Why did you apply for this position?
- Why did you apply to this university?
- Why do you want to move to this state?
- You have been educated and trained in a large Research I institution. What interests you in teaching at a small liberal arts school?

Questions You Can Ask

- What are the enrollment stats from last year and this year?
- Where do your students come from?
- What type of diversity do you have among the student population and among the faculty population?
- What research funding is available to faculty?
- How does your department/university mentor junior faculty?
- What types of interdepartmental forums are there at your university?

Final Academic Job Placement Workshop

Navigating the last stages of the process
- negotiating offers
- reasonable expectations
- hiring
- role statements

Wednesday, Dec. 4, noon-1:00 (brown-bag lunch), FH 109

Everyone is welcome to attend.

RSVP to Cheryll Glotfelty (glotfelt@unr.edu) by December 3.

APPENDIX H

Graduate Assessment Reports, 2012-2014

UNR English Graduate Program Assessment Report 2012
Cheryll Glotfelty, Director of Graduate Studies

2010
In fall 2010 (Don Hardy, DGS) the Graduate Committee collected and evaluated MA Comprehensive Exams.
General problem #1 found: Students do not apply theory appropriately.   There is no fit between theory and close reading and analysis.
Proposed solution: Graduate faculty will supply helpful models of the application of theory in close reading and analysis.

General problem #2 found: The genre and format of the MA Literature course plan option interferes with student learning assessment.
Solution: The English Department eliminated the course-plan option for the MA Literature degree, requiring a written exam for all students in the emphasis.

2011-2012
In fall 2011 the Graduate Committee planned to collect and evaluate MA professional papers and portfolios collected in spring 2011 and summer 2011. However, although nine MA students took the comprehensive exam in this period, only one portfolio was submitted, which was not a large enough sample size to assess.

The DGS collected assessment data via individual exit interviews from graduating students, a focus group, and an anonymous 10-question survey (administered via SurveyMonkey), to which there were 22 responses. The findings from these survey instruments were similar and are summarized below:

What we are doing well:
- Mentoring
- Rigor of seminars and quality of professors
- Professionalization
- Community

Areas for improvement:
- Scheduling of seminars--do not schedule seminars in a given emphasis area back to back; do not create schedule conflicts between advanced linguistics courses and Rhet/Comp seminars.
- Variety of seminars--students want a wider choice of seminars, more seminars in their particular field, and more seminars on less-specialized topics and on canonical literature.
- The quality of mentoring varies depending on which faculty member is the mentor.

- Gateway courses, 711 and 730 are taught differently by different instructors. Clarify the goals of these courses.
- Would like a course on writing articles (and revising work) for publication.
- L&E emphasis and Rhet/Comp emphasis seem to have better community and mentoring than the Literature emphasis.
- Would like clearer availability of information on deadlines and program requirements.

Steps taken and plans for improvement:
- Strong effort in 2012 on recruitment. More students = more seminar offerings.
- Revised the English Department's and graduate program's website to be a more effective recruitment tool, provide a calendar of events, and make degree requirements and due dates more readily available.
- DGS holds an orientation meeting with each incoming student and his/her assigned faculty mentor to review degree requirements. This meeting trains faculty as well as students.
- The Graduate Committee studied the syllabi of English 711, collected from four faculty members who have taught the course in the last ten years. In general 711 is being taught consistently, so the plan is for the student learning outcomes to be made more explicit for the benefit of new instructors.
- The Graduate Committee reviewed syllabi for English 730, collected from three faculty who have taught the course in the last six or seven years. The course seems to vary depending on who teaches it, and it is unclear whether this required course serves MA Writing students and PhD Rhet/Comp students equally well. The plan is for the department's Writing Committee to clarify/standardize student learning outcomes for this course, re-evaluate the constituency (should it be required? for whom?), clarify the articulation of 730 and 731 (research methods, required of PhD students in Rhet/Comp), and discuss the consequences of offering 730 every two years rather than every year.
- Scheduling problems: The Graduate committee is undergoing a study about the pros and cons of converting 4-credit seminars to 3-credit seminars. Doing so may allow us to address some of the scheduling issues that survey results indicate have been a problem.
- The graduate committee is undergoing a study of developing a Professional Development or Professional Studies course that would be required for PhD students and optional for MA students. The course would help students revise articles for publication; perfect professional documents such as a CV, writing sample, cover letter, and sample syllabi; practice interviewing and job talk skills; and consider practical issues in academia such as work-life balance, time management, tenure and promotion process, grant seeking, conferencing, and short- and long-term goal setting.

Assessment plan for 2013
- Surveys, exit interviews, and focus groups will continue, although the set of questions may be adjusted.

The Graduate Committee surveyed the assessment plans of graduate programs in English at a dozen peer institutions and found that the University of Arizona's plan has much to recommend it. We do not plan to adopt the U of AZ plan wholesale, but we will consider collecting graduate

student CVs and/or a self-evaluation essay, or a report similar to the Part 1 evaluation that faculty produce for UNR's annual evaluation process.

UNR English Graduate Program Assessment Report 2013
Cheryll Glotfelty, Director of Graduate Studies

711 and 730
The graduate committee's assessment focus for academic year 2013-2014, based on student feedback (via an anonymous program evaluation administered on SurveyMonkey) and faculty recommendations, was to evaluate the department's two "gateway" courses—English 711 Introduction to Graduate Study, and English 730 The Craft of Writing.

711 is a required course for the following emphasis areas: MA Literature, MA Language, and PhD Literature.

730 is a required course for the following emphasis areas: MA Writing and PhD in Rhetoric & Composition.

These courses are offered every year, and faculty rotate in teaching them. To date individual instructors have created their own Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for their course. The Graduate Committee felt that these required, gateway courses should have SLOs that remain consistent from year to year. An agreed-upon set of SLOs would help new instructors prepare their syllabus and would ensure that these courses do indeed prepare students for graduate study in their fields.

In fall, via the Literature Committee, Writing Committee, and Graduate Committee, we developed SLOs for both courses (see attachments) and discussed ways of assessing them. Final papers/portfolios will be collected from 711 and 730 at the end of fall term. In spring, aided by Professor Bill Macauley, the department's assessment coordinator, the Graduate Committee will read the student work in light of the SLOs as step one in assessing these courses. It may be that we will need to follow up with additional data collection and/or revise the SLOs.

Scheduling
In 2013 we addressed some concerns and recommendations that emerged from the 2012 program evaluation (SurveyMonkey findings), focus group, and exit interviews:

- We no longer schedule seminars in a given emphasis area back to back; we do our best to avoid creating schedule conflicts between advanced linguistics courses and Rhet/Comp seminars.

- We put extra effort into recruitment, which has boosted enrollment in our program by 16%, allowing us to offer a greater range of courses. (Students reported that course offerings last year were too limited.)

- The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) held orientation meetings with each incoming student and his/her assigned faculty mentor to review degree requirements. This meeting trains faculty as well as students, creating consistency in student advisement.

The department will administer another anonymous graduate program evaluation this coming spring as a way to keep apprised of students' experience and benefit from their ideas.

UNR English Graduate Program Assessment Report 2014-15
Valerie Fridland, Director of Graduate Studies

The graduate committee's assessment focus for academic year 2014-2015, based on the mandate to have SLOs for all courses by Spring 16, was to come up with general programmatic SLOs and specific course SLOs. While most of this work is still ongoing, this report provides a summary of our progress so far.

In fall, the Graduate Committee discussed and developed SLOs that could serve as general programmatic SLOs. In addition, we developed and, in some cases, solicited sample SLOs for specific seminar courses from faculty who often teach particular seminars to use as models for other similar field seminars. The shift in faculty who cover broad seminar topics (e.g. Problems in Language as our main Linguistics seminar, taught by various faculty in different sub-fields) makes developing generic SLOs a bit more difficult. For example, just in literature, we offer 29 seminars, which will obviously have key areas of difference and overlap. While we have previously had individual faculty develop SLOs for their syllabi, we felt it would help to provide some overarching SLO models under which a variety of seminars within the same field (but not on the same topic) could utilize. Finally, since all of our 600 level courses are taught in concert with 400 level courses, the graduate committee requested that these courses have SLOs and supplemental syllabus entries put into curriculog at the same time as the undergraduate courses are updated.

The remainder of this report provides the SLOS, both programmatic and specific, that we have so far developed for the graduate program.

Generic Student Learning Objectives for the graduate program

Students taking English graduate seminars will:

1) analyze texts in their historical, cultural and/or professional contexts.
2) engage with critical and theoretical debates, both recent and historical, regarding the field's primary texts.

3) produce writing of a professional quality that makes a contribution to the critical conversation.

Student Learning Objectives developed for specific seminars within the disciplines

ENG 761: Problems in the Early Renaissance

Catalog description: "Intensive study of selected topics in non-dramatic Renaissance literature prior to 1603."

Student Learning Objectives:

Students taking ENG 761 will:

1) analyze non-dramatic English literary texts from 1500-1603 in their historical and cultural contexts.
2) engage with critical and theoretical debates, both recent and historical, regarding the course's primary texts.
3) produce critical writing of a professional quality that makes an original contribution to the critical conversation.

ENG 743: Problems in Later American Literature
Catalog description: "Selected subjects in early American literature."

Students will:
1. Analyze post-Civil War American literature in relation to its historical and cultural contexts.
2. Evaluate and assess scholarly arguments about American literature, demonstrating an understanding of the beliefs and perspectives which underpin such arguments.
3. Write a critical analysis of American literature that demonstrates both familiarity with ongoing conversations in the field and the ability to produced nuanced readings of literary texts.

English 743: The End(s) of American Studies

Students will:

- Become familiar with a range of critical traditions that comprise the discipline of American Studies, including the Frankfurt School, the Birmingham School, post-structuralism, feminism, and diaspora studies.
- Apply contemporary theory and criticism to literary and popular texts in order to produce conference-length and article-length papers.
- Become familiar with the concepts of culture, race, gender, sexuality, class, space,

and performance in critical analysis.

- Write lucid, well-constructed arguments analyzing and interpreting texts that engage relevant conversations in the field of American studies.
- Analyze literary, critical, and cultural texts in their historical contexts.
- Articulate the premises and assumptions of different critical approaches and master their literary-critical vocabulary effectively.
- Read carefully, discuss thoughtfully, write analytically, think creatively, and participate actively.

English 743: African American Cultural Traditions and the Literary Marketplace

- Students will:
-
  - Engage a number of nineteenth- and twentieth-century African American literary and cultural traditions.
  - Master a wide variety of theoretical and critical frameworks and learn to apply these frameworks to literary texts.
  - Consider how gender, class, race, nationality, ethnicity, and sexuality influence American literature and culture.
  - Produce written work that engages literary and cultural scholars in the field over questions of literary genre, the politics of publishing, and the state of academic criticism.

English 722 Problems in Literary Theory
Catalog Description: "Problems in criticism and critical theory."

Students in 722 will:

- Enhance their critical thinking and writing skills through careful reading of difficult theoretical texts, rigorous class discussion, and writing papers of the quality expected at the 700 level
- Acquire an understanding of major issues and debates in theory in their critical and historical contexts and their significance for English studies.
- Demonstrate their critical engagement with key concepts in theory by producing a substantial, original scholarly paper on a topic in theory.

English 788 Problems in Modern Comparative Literature
Catalog Description: "Modern literature studied with emphasis upon international movements."

Students in 788 will:

- Analyze a variety of primarily literary texts from the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries in their cultural and geopolitical contexts.
- Acquire an understanding of the major critical debates regarding those primary texts and the literary and cultural developments of the period studied.
- Demonstrate their critical acumen by producing a substantial, original scholarly paper dealing with primary texts of the period studied.

Long-range planning:
Our goal this semester is to have all the seminar SLOs developed and approved through the graduate committee. The graduate committee is planning to have these uploaded into curriculog in Fall 2015.