SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
EDWARDSVILLE

Program Review
Cover Page

Academic Unit/Department: English Language and Literature

Undergraduate or Graduate: Undergraduate

Department Chair: Larry LaFond

Program Director: Valerie Vogrin

Person(s) Responsible for Preparing the Self Study: Larry LaFond

Response Date: August 7, 2009

Department of English Language and Literature
Undergraduate Program Review Self-Study

A. Table of Contents

B. Response to the Recommendations from Previous Review

Six recommendations were offered after the last program review. The recommendations are given here in italics, together with the department's responses:

1. *"By Fall ... 2002, the English Department should establish the Senior Assignment course ([ENG497A]) and document how the Senior Assignment (SRA) that emerges from the course meets the baccalaureate goals of the department and the university.... "*

Response:

The recommended course, ENG497A, was established, culminating in a lengthy research paper that was reviewed by the instructor of record and the department chair. While this course has become a magnificent capstone course for the undergraduate major, it has shortcomings as a tool for program assessment. A single paper does not permit measurement of how well students achieve all of the departmental and university goals. Therefore, the department is implementing a portfolio review of student work. Four papers written in four different courses will be reviewed, using a new rubric designed to accurately gauge student success in meeting departmental and university goals. These papers will be assessed by a committee consisting of members from all of the academic "strands" of the department (literature, writing, and linguistics), to be chaired by the Director of Undergraduate Studies. Findings will be disseminated to the department on an annual basis, and curricular modifications will ensue based on those findings. ENG497A remains a vital part of the portfolio process, as final papers come from that course, and oral presentations will be pegged to that course.

2. *"Establish a dedicated undergraduate advising position for the B. A. English majors or give a faculty member in the department release time to assume this position.... Faculty advisors would still be responsible for career and graduate school advising. "*

The department previously had a Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUS), but in response to this recommendation the duties of that Director were further extended and included reassigned time each year. The DUS is now responsible for overseeing faculty advisors, running graduation checks, co-chairing the Curriculum Committee, advising undergraduate majors and literature minors, facilitating registration, publicizing the program, and coordinating with the Registrar's office regarding Banner and other advising-related technologies. Faculty volunteers continue to advise students on major requirements, course selection, and career plans. As CAS phases in professional advising, the roles of the DUS and faculty advisors will evolve.

3. *"Carolyn Handa and the Ad Hoc English 101 Committee should continue to systematically examine and revise the goals of English 101 and revise the course as necessary to meet the goals.... As part of this process, the training of the graduate assistants who teach the course needs to be examined.... [and] the effectiveness of the common final needs to be examined to determine if it is assessing what the students are supposed to have learned.... "*

Carolyn Handa is no longer a faculty member at SIUE and the Ad Hoc English 101 Committee has completed its work; nevertheless the current Director of Expository Writing, together with the Expository Writing/Teaching of Writing Committee, engage in ongoing and systematic review and revision of the goals of English 101. The goals of English 101 are made available as a common resource to all teachers of 101 via a department website (http://www. siue. edu/ENGLISH/TOW/FYW). Graduate assistants take a dedicated course, ENG 554, to prepare them to teach ENG101 and ENG102, and they are reviewed several times in their first year. The common final has been replaced with portfolio assessment of all 101 students and involves all teachers of 101.

4. *"Improve the coordination between the English Department and the School of Education in the placing of student teachers. "*

This recommendation was based on an erroneous assumption upon the part of the review team, which Alice Farley, the chair at the time, addressed in her response to the initial review. Regardless, the placement of student teachers is solely coordinated through the Office of Clinical Experiences Certification and Advisement (OCECA) in the School of Education. The English Department does not play a role in this placement, with the occasional exception that the department may recommend or suggest qualified cooperating teachers or alert OCECA to potential problems with cooperating teachers. There have been no incidents or problems with OCECA's management of this process since the last review.

5. *"Examine area identification and rank divisions within the department to determine if the undergraduate curriculum is being adversely impacted. "*

This concern appears to relate to an earlier era in the department's life. While some of the more veteran members of the department report tensions in the past concerning area identification (for example, between literature and composition) and pedagogical and ideological disagreements, such battles are rare in the current departmental culture.

The major requirements have undergone a significant revision in the last year, one that re-establishes an upper-level writing course as part of English major. The Curriculum Committee continues to examine the kind of writing required in literature classes. In other words, the various areas of the department seem not to be divided in their specializations but united in the belief that all of these areas are necessary to produce well-rounded English majors.

Concerns about rank divisions were largely related to call staff. The department attempted to address these concerns through the establishment of Instructor positions and the full integration of Instructors into the life of the department. This strategy was quite successful, but has more recently faced new challenges in light of the Instructors' Collective Bargaining Agreement with SIUE, adopted in 2007. An unfortunate byproduct of the new relationship between Instructors and SIUE has been disenfranchisement of instructors within the department. The department, however, remains committed to empowering instructors and to recognizing the important work instructors do; most

instructors still voluntarily contribute to or on committees associated with the writing program; instructors remain vital to the continued success of students and the department.

6. *"Examine the faculty's perception that they must focus on getting good student evaluations and that this focus decreases the rigor of course offerings. "*

While this is always a danger in a top-down climate that still emphasizes the importance of student evaluation as a central tool in assessing teaching, the department has worked hard to minimize faculty perceptions that student evaluations are the primary measure of good teaching practices. Faculty are consistently invited to contextualize student evaluations in their annual conferences with the department chair, and annual evaluations of teaching by the department chair are focused less on "good" student evaluations and more on ensuring the integrity of instructors and a pedagogical practice of self-reflection. The department is most interested on what useful information student evaluations reveal about practices, and how those practices may be modified to yield greater excellence. Research has not established direct links between decreased rigor and better evaluations, and the department would be more concerned about teachers who reduce the rigor of their courses to get better evaluations than it would about negative evaluations per se. Since the last program review, the department has developed new, voluntary faculty cadres to peer review teaching practices, and has established regular meetings to discuss larger pedagogical issues that surface. When candidates are considered for tenure and promotion, the tenured members of the department meet to discuss and assess candidates' files and development of teaching excellence, a discussion that goes well beyond a single-focus evaluative tool such as student evaluations. These procedures, most of them new since the last evaluative period, encourage faculty to adopt reflective pedagogical practices and to use both reflection and academic rigor.

C. Program Information

This section discusses enrollment data, observed trends, demographic data, alumni survey data, and an analysis of program demand.[1] The last year for which there is complete enrollment and demographic data is 2007, so this discussion is based on the eight-year period from 1998-99 to 2006-07.

a. Enrollment Data and Trends

During the latter part of the eight-year period from 1999 to 2007, the Department of English Language and Literature experienced a substantial increase in its enrollment of both full-time and part-time major students. As Table 1 shows, the growth was greatest among full time English majors, up 69% from 1999. Part-time student enrollment rose by 43% over the same period, for a combined growth of 63%, or 82 more total majors in 2007 than in 1999.

Table 1: Full-time versus Part-time English Majors 1999-2007

	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07
Full-time	101	80	90	88	94	129	131	171
Part-time	30	43	36	30	28	27	37	42
Total	131	123	126	118	122	156	168	213

Alongside this growth in the number of majors, during this same period the Department of English Language and Literature experienced a shift in the distribution of student credit hours. Table 2 reveals that while the department saw rapid growth in its number of student credit hours delivered to majors, from 1841 to 3383 (88% increase), student credit hours delivered to non-majors declined from 20,482 to 19,352 (6% loss). The increase in delivery of SCHs to majors did more than offset the decline in non-major SCHs, and overall this resulted in a modest increase in total student credit hour production, with the final year of the period showing 2% higher production than the initial year.

Table 2: English Undergraduate Student Credit Hours from 1999-2007

	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07
Total for Majors	1841	1850	1784	1943	2338	2697	3154	3383
Total for Non-Majors	20482	20712	20698	20727	20990	19774	19273	19352
Total SCHs	22323	22561	22482	22670	23329	22471	22428	22735
% Majors	.08	.08	.08	.9	.10	.12	.14	.15
% Non-Majors	.92	.92	.92	.91	.90	.88	.86	.85

---

[1] A general description of each program in English is found in the next section (D).

It should be noted that the general trend observed within the department is in keeping with broader trends within the University's College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). As Table 3 shows, during this period CAS also experienced an overall shift in terms of the balance of credit hours delivered to majors and non-majors. The CAS percentage of SCHs delivered to majors was 5.62% higher in AY06-07 compared to AY 95-96, while the percentage of SCHs delivered to non-majors declined.

Table 3: Percentage of SCHs for Majors/Non-majors in CAS from 1999-2007

	99-00	01-02	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07
Majors	19.88	19.64	21.16	21.49	23.33	25.46
Non-majors	80.12	80.36	78.84	78.51	76.67	74.54

b. Demographic Data

Demographic data reported here—gathered from SIUE's Office of Institutional Research and surveys of graduates—includes information on full- or part-time status, gender, ethnicity, and age.

The percentage of full-time undergraduate students that pursue an English degree at this institution rose slightly in this eight-year reporting period. An average of 72% of the students were full time during the first four years of the period; during the last four years of the period, that percentage had risen to nearly 80% (Table 4).

Table 4: Percentage of Full-time Versus Part-time English Majors 1999-2007

	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07
% Full time	77	65	71	75	77	83	78	80
% Part time	23	35	29	25	23	17	22	20

Table 5 reports the gender breakdown of English majors for each fall semester from 2000-2007. Female students accounted for 68% of the total undergraduate student population in English during this period, a percentage that averages somewhat higher than that of the College of Arts and Sciences during the same period.

Table 5: Female and Male English Majors During Fall Terms, 2000-2007

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Female	91	89	86	84	110	131	136	139
Male	32	37	32	38	46	68	77	85

About 9-10% of the undergraduate students in the Department of English Language and Literature report ethnicity other than White. This percentage has remained relatively constant throughout the period from 2000-2007. As the number of English majors has grown during this period, the number of students reporting ethnicity other

than White has also grown, although this does not translate into growth in diversity as a percentage of the total English student population. As Table 6 shows, the greatest increase during this period came from students who were not African American.

Table 6: # of English Majors During Fall Terms, 2000-2007, by Ethnicity

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Black	9	8	9	6	8	13	9	9
Other	3	5	8	7	6	6	11	11

At the time of graduation, the average age of undergraduate English students during this period was 23.71. The last year of the reporting period, 2007, is slightly higher than all previous years in the period, showing a graduation age of 25.1

Table 7: Median Age at Graduation

2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
23.0	24.4	24.0	23.3	---	22.9	23.3	25.1

Another way of considering this is that the typical demographic profile of an English student in this department, at the time of the granting of a baccalaureate degree, would be the following: a 24-year old white, female, full-time student.

c. Alumni Survey Data

Alumni data available for this review period is from all graduates for the years 2006, 2005, 2003 and 2002 and responses for these same years for survey respondents who had been out for one year. Demographic data was discussed above, so this discussion will focus on employment information, satisfaction with the program, education practices, effectiveness and quality.

One (expected) finding from the alumni data regarding employment is that looking back over the four-years from 2006 to 2002, the employment situation of alumni improves over several years out of school. Those who have been out a few years are more likely to have obtained a job in a field closely related to English, have a higher annual income, and have job satisfaction. A relatively small percentage (14%) of recent graduates report that their bachelor's degree inadequately or poorly prepared them for the job market, but even this small percentage decreases as a few years pass. 100% of the 2002 graduates state that their bachelor's degree prepared them for the job market either very well, well, or adequately. The most common industry employing students is educational services, including secondary school teaching. Within a few years, around 80% of alumni pursue additional degrees, and 90-100% of those students report that their bachelor degree did a good job of preparing them for that additional work.

Satisfaction levels among alumni are high, both in regards to the university in general, but particularly their major. As with general job satisfaction, satisfaction with the degree program increases after being out a few years. About 87% of those who were recently finished (2006) reported positive attitudes towards their major. Looking back to 2002, the percentage rises to 100%.

In general, alumni seem pleased with the educational practices, effectiveness and quality of the program. Regardless of year, a strong majority (75-95%) report that faculty were accessible outside of class, encouraged them to challenge ideas, used appropriate teaching activities, had high expectations for quality, provided timely feedback, encouraged questions and discussion, and spent the necessary time and energy to come to class prepared. Alumni also report high satisfaction with the quality of the faculty, the availability of the courses, and grading standards.

Many questions posed to alumni were focused on educational effectiveness. Again, responses in this area were predominately positive. Students reported that their university experience helped them understand people with different backgrounds, develop reasoning skills, view problems from different perspectives and solve them, and develop better skills in writing and communication. Most believe their SIUE education is of higher quality than what their friends at other schools received.

In short, the alumni survey presents a very positive picture of the effectiveness of SIUE, in general, and the Department of English Language and Literature, in particular.

d. Program Demand

It was shown above that a general shift in SIUE's College of Arts and Sciences, realized also in the Department of English Language and Literature, has been towards an increasing percentage of majors. This has required an increasing number of student credit hours in the service of these major students, and the department has successfully responded to that growing need.

There are very likely multiple reasons for the energetic growth in the number of majors in the English Department during this period. Foremost it should be noted that the Department of English Language and Literature has taken important steps to attract and retain majors. Some of these steps have involved curricular changes that are described in detail in the next section in the eight-year status report, but it should be mentioned here that the creation of a gateway course, a mid-major theory course, and a culminating senior experience have contributed significantly toward giving students a stronger sense of what it means to be an English major. English has maintained a high profile within the university during this period, in part because of a very active English student organization (ELLA), consistent high quality in teaching, and innovative programs that have resulted in a surge in both majors and minors who are attracted to this department. New faculty hires during this period, which now account for 72% of total tenured and tenure-track faculty, have brought fresh, cutting

edge knowledge of their fields, and this also has attracted new students to the major. The department has become a center not only for literature, but for English Studies broadly conceived, including composition / rhetoric, creative writing, English as a second language, linguistics, and English education. The creation of the position of Director of Undergraduate Studies, mentioned in the response to the previous review, has enhanced student success within the department's programs.

There are, undoubtedly, other external contributing factors to the growth within the department. During this reporting period, SIUE has been undergoing a transformation in its student body. In the last decade, SIUE has built numerous new residential halls and has made steady advances towards moving from a largely commuter campus to a campus that now services mostly residential students. At the same time, average ACT scores have been rising and the national prominence of the institution is also on the rise. The change in the type of students SIUE is attracting may be a major contributing factor for the growing number of English students, since it appears that many of these residential students are more traditional high achievers, who see the value in a liberal education beyond vocational training.

The department has also been the recipient of a significant number of majors who previously were Bachelor of Liberal Studies majors. That major underwent certain changes several years ago that made entrance into that degree more rigorous. This has made it less of a "default" degree in the curriculum. The result has been that the Liberal Studies degree went from 150 majors down to 15 majors during this period, as students were forced to be more intentional about their course of studies. English, along with other departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, has benefited from this change.

Whatever the case may be for undergraduate growth, the department's outstanding faculty is the primary reason for the success of students who declare English as a major. From initial recruitment to the culminating senior experience, the department has done an exceptional job of making the English major a viable, attractive degree.

D. Eight-Year Status Report

This section describes the program, its courses, its advising procedures, the culminating senior experience, standards of excellence, and program achievements.

a. Program Description

The Department of English Language and Literature is one of the largest academic units in the University, with 27 tenured or tenure-track professors (7 full professors, 9 associate professors, and 11 assistant professors), 9 full-time instructors, and a variable number of lecturers and graduate teaching assistants that fill out a teaching staff of about 70 persons.

The department is a place of great intellectual vitality, realized in part through the outstanding grant and publication record of its faculty and the array of professional journals housed in the department: *Sou'wester*, a literary magazine of fiction and poetry established in 1960, published two times a year, and *PLL: Papers on Language and Literature*, an internationally recognized scholarly journal of criticism, founded in 1965, which is published quarterly. The department also sponsors *River Bluff Review*, an annual of student poetry and fiction, and supports the Eugene B. Redmond Writers Club and the Black Literary Guild. These journals, edited by members of the English faculty, provide opportunities for English majors and others to gain first-hand experience in scholarly and literary editing. To further encourage writers at the undergraduate and graduate level, the department sponsors several contests that offer small monetary awards for winners as well as recognition at the spring Honors ceremony.

Until recently, the department also was home to *Drumvoices Revue*, a multicultural journal of literary and visual arts, published twice yearly with occasional special issues and anthologies. This journal completed its run with the retirement of its editor, Eugene B. Redmond, but is being replaced in 2009 with the launch of a new cross-disciplinary, peer-reviewed scholarly journal, *Postmedieval: A Journal of Medieval Cultural Studies*, supported by the department, edited by a departmental faculty member, Dr. Eileen Joy, and published by Palgrave MacMillan. The journal's primary focus is on presentist-minded medieval studies that use contemporary events, issues, ideas, objects, and texts as "triggers" for critical investigations of the historical past; thus, *postmedieval* will bring the medieval and modern into productive critical dialogue.

During the last review period, the department offered a B.A. in English, a B.S. in English Education in conjunction with the School of Education, and three English minors: English, creative writing, and linguistics; however, in recent years the faculty have been reevaluating several pieces of the undergraduate curriculum. In the coming academic year the department will launch a major revision to the English B.A. and a replacement of the B.S. in English Education. The department currently offers 99 undergraduate courses, although this number will be significantly reduced in the future due to these recently approved revisions in the program.

Since these changes represent important shifts in the English program, a detailed description of the revised programs and a discussion of the rationale for these changes follow:

The B.A. in English

Throughout the last review period, the B.A. program in English had the following shape:

- three (3) required courses:
  - 200: Introduction to Literary Study
  - 208: Survey of British Literature: Beginnings to 1789
  - 497a: Senior Seminar
- six (6) required distribution courses:
  - two (2) additional Survey courses from:
    - 209: Survey of British Literature: 1789 to the Present
    - 211: Survey of American Literature: Colonial Times to the Civil War
    - 212: Survey of American Literature: Civil War to Modern Times
  - one (1) Major Authors course from:
    - 307: Introduction to Shakespeare
    - 404: Chaucer: Canterbury Tales
    - 413: Spenser
    - 471a: Shakespeare: Comedies and Histories
    - 471b: Shakespeare: Tragedies and Non-dramatic Works
    - 473: Milton
  - one (1) 400-level course in American literature
  - one (1) course in literary theory from:
    - 301: Introduction to Literary Theory
    - 495: History of Critical Theory
  - one course in Language Systems from:
    - 369: Grammatical Analysis
    - 400: Principles of Linguistics
    - 403: History of the English Language
- three (3) required electives to be chosen from English courses numbered 200 or higher, with no more than fifteen (15) hours total allowed at the 200-level and at least fifteen (15) hours total required at the 400-level in the overall degree program.

Through several years of productive discussion, departmental faculty have completed the first large-scale revision of the English department's course offerings in literature in over twenty-five years, driven largely by a desire to bring the B.A. degree in English more closely in line with current thinking in the field of English studies. Important changes had already been made to the curriculum in recent years by way of keeping up with some of these developments in the discipline, most significantly the addition of a Gateway course (200: Introduction to Literary Studies) and a Capstone course (497a: Senior Seminar), which, together with an existing requirement of a course in Literary Theory (either 301: Introduction to Literary Theory and Criticism or 495: History of Critical Theory) gave

English majors, at key points in their development, the rare experience of being in several courses that have only other English majors in it. The point has been to allow one course on each level that allows English majors to work with other English majors, given that the majority of their classes will continue to be Gen Ed/Eng Major courses.

This year, the department has broadened the curricular renovation, with additional changes to the requirements for the B.A. in English. The changes are in a certain sense altogether modest: that is, the revision takes place within the categories of current curriculum, making small but significant tweaks to catalog offerings in order to open up new and more culturally diverse possibilities for students' selection of courses, and with the hope of giving a broader sense of what a degree in English means today in the contemporary university. The department believes this modification makes the department more current and will also make the degree a more attractive one for students, a more coherent and vigorous experience for all concerned (including faculty), while being flexible enough in design to accommodate potential future developments.

In short, the revised program does the following:

- decreases the number of required courses from three (3) to two (2): 200 and 497a
- increases the number of required distribution courses from six (6) to eight (8):
    1-3. three (3) Survey courses at the 200 level (students' choice, whereas before 208 was compulsory)
    4-5. two (2) Major Authors courses (whereas before only one was required)
    6. one (1) course in Literary Theory (from 301 and 495, as before)
    7. one (1) course in Language Systems (from 369, 400, and 403, as before)
    8. one (1) course in Writing Approaches (from 201: Intermediate Composition, 290: Introduction to Creative Writing, 334: Scientific Writing, 489: Style and Intentionality, 490: Advanced Composition, and 491: Technical and Business Writing; this represents a new required distribution).
- decreases elective requirements from three (3) to two (2) courses.

The prior stipulation that one 400-level course in American Literature must be completed was replaced by the additional Major Authors course. The stipulations that no more than five (5) 200-level courses will count toward the major, and that at least five (5) 400-level courses must be completed to satisfy the major requirements, remain the same.

This program revision represented more than just a reshuffling of the distribution of requirements. The change in requirements was proposed concurrently with proposals to modify existing Survey and Major Authors courses, and to also create new Major Authors and other 400-level courses. The primary purposes were:

- to add more variety of critical and thematic approaches as well as global literatures to the building block Survey courses

- to create better opportunities, at the Survey, Major Authors, and 400-level, for students to gain rigorous in-depth knowledge of particular authors, genres, and historical movements and periods (depth over breadth approach)
- to make 400-level offerings more inclusive of more authors, more genres, and more historical movements and periods (as well as more focused on demonstrating inter-relations between all of those)
- to highlight, by way of new courses such as 479: Major Authors: Crossing Boundaries, cross-historical and cross-cultural contact between authors situated in different periods and different cultural traditions (which will not necessarily be *only* British and/or American)
- to address, through the new required distribution in Writing Approaches, the need to improve the overall level of academic and professional writing skills of majors, especially with regard to improving their success in upper-level courses and in applying to graduate school

The existing British and American Literature survey courses (208, 209, 211, and 212) were retooled to focus on themes or topics (i.e., 208 and 209 would become Topics in Early British Literature and Topics in Modern British Literature, respectively), and are being individually designed by instructors along the lines of their particular research and background interests (thus helping to pave a better path toward the teacher-scholar model of pedagogy). The existing World Literature survey courses (303: Literary Masterpieces: Ancient to Medieval and 304: Literary Masterpieces: Renaissance to Modern) is being retooled as 214: Topics in World Literature: Ancient to Medieval and 215: Topics in World Literature: Renaissance to Modern. These will all be available as courses through which students can partially fulfill their Survey course requirements, and thereby enable them to craft a schedule of Surveys that will reflect either a preferred concentration in periods (early or late), in certain national literatures (American and/or British), and/or in a more globally diverse literary studies. In either case, their choices have been widened, and the content of all of the Survey options has been diversified. Just as with 303 and 304 currently, 214 and 215 will still be available as general education electives designated as "Dist. FAH."

One of the reasons for the previous requirement that students take at least one course at the 400-level in American Literature was that existing Major Authors courses (307: Introduction to Shakespeare, 404: Chaucer: Canterbury Tales, 413: Spenser, 471a: Shakespeare: Comedies and Histories, 471b: Shakespeare: Tragedies and Non-Dramatic Works, and 473: Milton) only covered authors in early British periods. Under the new program, a new course focusing specifically on the oeuvre of contemporary African-American author Toni Morrison (477: Morrison) will be available as a selection under required Major Authors courses. Moreover, two other new courses, 479: Major Authors: Shared Traditions and 480: Major Authors: Crossing Boundaries, will be available as selections under required Major Authors courses. Because 479 and 480 stipulate a focus on two to four authors (who either share a similar historical period or share some kind of affiliation across different periods, respectively, and who can come from any national culture), students who select these courses now have an opportunity to broaden their knowledge of the work of significant authors beyond the period and provenance of early

British literature. Finally, 471a and 471b are being conflated into 471: Shakespeare, which is being designed along a variety of critical and thematic lines in different semesters. In this way, the works of Shakespeare still retain an important place within the Major Authors course offerings, but can be reconceived along lines that are not confined by genre only. 307, 404, and 473 will still be available as options under the Major Authors requirement, whereas 413 (Spenser) will be eliminated. The modified and new courses (471, 477, 479, and 480) will also be available as general education electives designated as "Dist. FAH."

The return to a requirement for a course in Writing Approaches fulfills the department's desire for students to have more expertise in discipline-specific writing and to be better prepared to undertake the more extensive research writing projects typically assigned in upper-division courses. As with the new Survey and Major Authors courses described above, a key component of this change is to also expand the range of choices students have in designing their menu of courses. A range of types of writing are now available for students, so that they can choose genres that suit their current interests as well as their future plans, from creative to scientific to technical and business writing (290, 334, and 491, respectively). They also now have the option to develop more intensively a variety of different modes of academic composition (201: Intermediate Composition and 490: Advanced Composition) or different aesthetics of writing (489: Style and Intentionality).

In addition to the proposed new offerings under Major Authors, the department has eliminated many courses taught under the rubrics of strictly historical periods and/or narrowly defined literary genres, which were typically conceptualized only within the confines of British and American national literatures:

- 421: Poetry and Prose of the Medieval Period
- 422: Poetry and Prose of the Renaissance
- 423: Poetry and Prose of the 17th Century
- 424: Poetry and Prose of the Restoration and 18th Century
- 426: Poetry and Prose of the Romantic Period
- 427: Poetry and Prose of the Victorian Era,
- 428: British Poetry and Prose of the Modern Era
- 431: Major American Writers of the 19th Century
- 432: Major American Writers of the 20th Century
- 434: American Poetry to 1900
- 435: American Poetry from 1900 to 1950
- 437: American Drama
- 439: American Novel to Early 20th Century
- 440: American Novels from Early 20th Century to 1950
- 441a: Contemporary American Literature: Poetry
- 441b: Contemporary American Literature: Fiction
- 454: 18th-Century Novel
- 455: Victorian Novel
- 456: 20th-Century British Novel

- 460: Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama
- 461: Restoration and 18th-Century Drama
- 462: Modern British and Continental Drama

These are being replaced with the more capaciously contoured 463: Topics in Literary Periods and 464: Topics in Forms and Genres, and 465: Special Topics (with this last course representing a modification of 458: Topics in English Language and Literature), the content of each of which will vary according to the faculty teaching that course in any given semester. Ultimately, these three new courses are designed to allow for maximum flexibility in designing courses that will meet, on a continual basis, the always changing needs and objectives of students, while still giving room to offer courses designed along more traditional lines. They will also allow faculty to diversify course offerings in accordance with new directions in their research and scholarship, which will keep student learning in line with current thinking and practice in the field.

Survey Courses

The previous array of Surveys—courses that examined literature in the context of some historical sweep—included two British and two American literature courses, all at the 200-level (208, 209 and 211, 212), and two Literary Masterpieces courses at the 300-level (303 and 304), which covered world literatures (such as ancient Greek or medieval Italian texts in translation). B.A. majors were required to take three of the four 200-level surveys (with 208: British Literature: Beginnings to 1789 stipulated as a required choice), but none of the 300-level Literary Masterpieces surveys (which counted, however, as electives). However, fruitful and important links can be drawn between English literature and literature of different cultural traditions in translation. These survey courses have been equalized by placing them all on the 200-level (renumbering 303 and 304 to 214 and 215), and the department recognizes that, in intention and design, each of these surveys serves the same, foundation-setting purpose. Students are now required to take any three (3) of the six (6) survey courses, and 208 will no longer be an absolute requirement in order not to privilege early British literature over other early and later American and world literatures.

The department is renaming and redesigning all of the survey courses to provide a more useful and hopefully more attractive thematic information to students, as well as a more pointedly in-depth experience in the class. Currently the titles are generic and presented solely in terms of historical range: Survey of British Literature: Beginnings to 1789, or 1789 to Present, for the British courses (208 and 209), and Survey of American Literature: Colonial Times to the Civil War, or from the Civil War to Modern Times, on the American side (211 and 212). The world literature courses are called Literary Masterpieces: Ancient and Medieval, or Renaissance to Modern (303 and 304). These courses will now be called:

- 208: Topics in Early British Literature
- 209: Topics in Modern British Literature
- 211: Topics in Early American Literature

- 212: Topics in Modern American Literature
- 214: Topics in World Literature: Ancient to Medieval
- 215: Topics in World Literature: Renaissance to Modern

The Topics approach will allow faculty to focus these historical survey courses more sharply and along lines that will be more conducive to faculty's backgrounds, current research interests, and scholarship (thereby creating a more productive space within which a teacher-scholar model can have full range). The special emphasis of each offering of these classes (for example, 211: Topics in Early American Literature: Nature and Religion, or 209: Topics in Modern British Literature: War, or 215: Topics in World Literature: Renaissance to Modern: Love and Death) will allow students to select courses of particular interest to them, structured more on an in-depth exploration of certain works of literature in relation to the topic and less on acquiring, at a fairly fast clip, a large number of works within a long period of historical time.

Major Authors

The re-conception of the Major Authors requirement will have great impact on the program in terms of course development. This requirement previously consisted of taking one course on either Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, or Milton—a relatively narrow definition of the term "major author," one that does not extend beyond the parameters of medieval to seventeenth-century British literature. Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Milton have an obvious stature in English literature (they need no first names), but Spenser is clearly not quite a star of that magnitude—a major author certainly but of a less pervasive influence and enduring readership. There are many more writers of this ilk—figures who loom large within the various canons of world literatures but who have not attained the elemental status of Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Milton—and the department wishes to include more of them alongside these three, and not be limited to British writers only. The faculty believe it is imperative that the program's definition of who constitutes a "major author" include American and World writers as well, in keeping with the broadest and strongest trends of the past forty years in the field of literary studies.

There have not traditionally been courses in the catalog devoted to figures as diverse and culturally important as Homer, Sophocles, Dante, William Wordsworth, Herman Melville, Charles Dickens, Jane Austen, Mark Twain, Edith Wharton, James Joyce, Richard Wright, or Salman Rushdie, just to cite a few examples, who only sometimes briefly appear in the context of more broadly defined "period" or "genre" courses. The aim is to correct this disability in the program, and to create broader opportunities for the intensive study of more historically significant authors across a fuller cultural spectrum. In addition to adopting this broader definition of "major author," the reform is intended to make a place in the curriculum—because it has been observed that students need such places—to consider such writers in close comparison to one another, to integrate their various readings of singular works. Therefore, two new courses, *479: Major Authors: Shared Traditions*, and *480: Major Authors: Crossing Boundaries*, have been designed for close scrutiny of significant writers, culled from a broad variety of times and cultures, in relation to one another. More specifically, 479 includes two to four major authors

within a particular period, drawn from American, British, or World literature (or some combination thereof), and 480 includes two to four major writers from *different* periods, again from any provenance, with an emphasis on highlighting connections between them related to style, genre, themes, etc. Both courses will vary in authors, as well as in topic and/or theme, according to which faculty are teaching them in any given semester, thereby providing students with a broad variety of "major author" choices while also affording them the opportunity to further contextualize the literary texts they are studying. These two courses will allow the program enormous flexibility when it comes to Major Authors offerings, and hold rich potential for illuminating questions of historical context, intertextuality, and canon formation—all critical issues at present in the discipline.

A third new course, *477: Morrison*, is aimed at the same objectives, but with a particular emphasis on the diversification of the traditional canon of literature. This course is dedicated to one of the most culturally significant writers of our time (a Nobel Prize winner), who is also an African-American woman, thus establishing race and gender, as well as nationality and historicity, as important considerations of the Major Authors requirement, and signaling new openings of inquiry into literary canon formation more sharply than do 479 and 480. With the addition of this course, as well as 479 and 480, it is no longer necessary to require that major students take at least one 400-level course in American Literature for two reasons: 1) there are now Major Authors courses that do not feature British writers only, and 2) British and/or American literature in no longer privileged at the expense of other cultural traditions. This may help students see how different traditions and voices are importantly related to and mutually dependent upon each other, such that, in a course like 480 (Major Authors: Crossing Boundaries) Shakespeare's sonnets may be taught alongside the sonnets of Pablo Neruda, or Milton's epic poem *Paradise Lost* may be taught alongside Albert Camus's *The Plague*. And in 479 (Major Authors: Shared Traditions), the novels of Toni Morrison and William Faulkner, or the poetry of Dante and Boccaccio, may be taught together.

Two other minor changes have been adopted in the category of the Major Authors requirement. 471a and 471b (Shakespeare: Comedies and Histories and Shakespeare: Tragedies and Non-Dramatic Works, respectively) are to be collapsed into one course, 471: Shakespeare. The focus of each offering will be determined by the instructor, to allow for a wider range of approaches than the traditional generic divisions do. For example, previously one could not consider in a single class, 471a or 471b, how Shakespeare's tragedies and comedies compare to one another with regard to some common theme (death, or monarchy, or marriage, let's say); under the new B.A. such offerings would become possible. Finally, Spenser has been dropped from the catalog as a major author, though he can easily be taught either in connection with one of the new Major Authors courses (479 or 480), or under the heading of another proposed new elective course at the 400 level, 465: Special Topics.

The category of Major Authors now includes:

- 307: Introduction to Shakespeare

- 404: Chaucer: Canterbury Tales
- 471: Shakespeare
- 473: Milton
- 477: Morrison
- 479: Major Authors: Shared Traditions
- 480: Major Authors: Crossing Boundaries

Unlike the existing program requirements which stipulate that students take one (1) Major Authors course, students are now required to take any two (2) of these courses, thus having more opportunities for intensive study of key figures with an emphasis on relations and distinctions between them, while also still allowing for students to freely choose courses that would concentrate on an in-depth study of a single, traditional author, such as Shakespeare or Chaucer. Previously, students in the B.A. degree program took one Major Authors class, and were also required to take a 400-level American literature class; this latter requirement has been dropped in favor of a second Major Authors course. 471, 479, and 480 may now be repeated (once each) for credit, as long as the course content between the two separate offerings of the course is markedly different, with the approval of a departmental major advisor.

Writing Approaches

At one point in time, the B.A. in English included a requirement in writing (one course), which was dropped in order to institute the requirements in Literary Theory (one course from 301 or 495) and a Capstone course (497a). It was agreed at the time that the loss of the writing course would be addressed by other means: the faculty would make a concerted effort to assign more writing in upper-level courses. In short, it is the department's collective wisdom at this point in time (wisdom partly gained through the process of examining the type of student writing undertaken in the 497a: Senior Seminar course) that students need to spend a more concerted effort in at least one course (beyond 101 and 102) on discipline-specific writing. The department believes that a required course in Writing Approaches will increase the quality of the research and writing in the Senior Seminar (497a), will enhance the ability of students to successfully pursue admission to graduate school, and will also give students an opportunity to explore the discursive practices of other disciplines, such as Biology or Business, which could also broaden their employment opportunities after they graduate. Consequently, students are now required to take one (1) course in Writing Approaches from the following:

- ENG201: Intermediate Composition
- ENG290: Introduction to Creative Writing
- ENG334: Scientific Writing
- ENG489: Style and Intentionality
- ENG490: Advanced Composition
- ENG491: Technical and Business Writing

It is the firm belief of the faculty that a required course in Writing Approaches will benefit majors, especially as regards their success with their future plans after graduation

(whether their intention is to teach public school, teach English as a second language, apply to graduate school, or work in another professional field). It will also give faculty an invaluable tool for assessing primary learning outcomes relative to the teaching of academic writing.

Electives

With regard to the electives available to English B.A. students, this revision, a) provides more flexibility for teachers and students, and b) radically streamlines the catalog. Courses at the 400-level that were either too narrowly defined or rarely offered have been removed, and are now collapsed into two (2) new courses and one (1) modified course that are capacious enough to accommodate all possible literature offerings, either now or in the future:

- 463: Literary Periods (new)
- 464: Forms and Genres (new)
- 465: Special Topics (modified; formerly 458: Topics in English Language and Literature)

Previous 400-level Courses	Current Courses
421: Poetry and Prose of Medieval Period	463: Topics in Literary Periods
422: Poetry and Prose of the Renaissance	464: Topics in Forms and Genres
423: Poetry and Prose of the 17th Century	465: Special Topics
424: Poetry and Prose of the Restoration and 18th Century	*all three of these courses will be available as general education electives designated as "Dist. FAH"
426: Poetry and Prose of the Romantic Period	
427: Poetry and Prose of the Victorian Era	
428: British Poetry and Prose of the Modern Era	
431: Major American Writers of the 19th Century	
432: Major American Writers of the 20th Century	
434: American Poetry to 1900	
435: American Poetry from 1900 to 1950	
439: American Novel to Early 20th Century	
440: American Novels from Early 20th Century to 1950	
441b: Contemporary American Literature: Fiction	
454: 18th-Century Novel	
455: Victorian Novel	
456: 20th-Century British Novel	
460: Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama	

461: Restoration and 18th-Century Drama	
462: Modern British and Continental Drama	

463, 464, and 465, allow faculty to offer every one of the previous courses under new headings (for example, 463 Literary Periods: English Renaissance, or 464 Forms and Genres: Victorian Novel), but they will also allow new conceptions not possible under current configurations, such as 463 Literary Periods: Romanticism and Modernism (or, The Middle Ages and Modernity), or 464 Forms and Genres: The Short Story (or, the Epic or the Graphic Novel or Film Noir, or even 20th-Century British and American Poetry considered together in the same course). At the same time, 465: Special Topics now makes possible courses that have never fit comfortably within certain traditional period and genre parameters, or that did not fall within conventional British and American literary traditions, such as the literature of the Beat generation (Jack Kerouac et al.) or the Russian novel or medieval Italian poetry in translation or post-colonial world literature. Faculty who teach within the department's writing, linguistics, and creative writing units are now also able to utilize the 464 and 465 course designations to craft new courses that would further strengthen their elective offerings at the 400-level. And students now have a catalog of offerings that both better captures the subjects of the contemporary discipline of English studies and more accurately reflects the research and scholarship of the department's faculty.

All other courses in the catalog not mentioned above remain as they are, from the 100-through the 400-level. For the most part these courses address the other areas of the department's curriculum: Composition, Creative Writing, TESL/Linguistics, and English Education. The remainder are either Major Authors courses at the 300- and 400-level that are untouched by this revision, are cross-listed with other departments or minor studies programs, or are courses at the 300-level designed for both General Education and English B.A. students, and which do not readily fit in to either the "Literary Periods" or "Forms and Genres" rubrics of 463 and 464.

B.A. in English Education plus Secondary English Language Arts Teacher Certification

Another important change within the program has been a newly approved revision replacing the BS in English Education with a Bachelor of Arts plus Secondary English Language Arts Teacher Certification (BA+TCERT). A description and rationale for this change follows:

In the College of Arts and Sciences, the secondary English education program operates in conjunction with the English major curriculum in the Department of English Language and Literature. In addition to SIUE's general education requirements (42-44 hours), students seeking Illinois secondary teaching certification in English Language Arts (grades 9-12) complete the English major (39 hours) and a required speech communication education minor (21 hours). English education students also work with

the School of Education to complete a series of six professional education courses (16 hours) and a semester of full-time student teaching (12 hours). The English major is designed to offer students various academic experiences in literature, language, and composition through coursework in literary study, literature surveys, major authors, writing approaches, language systems, and a senior seminar. In addition, English majors working toward ELA certification take two courses in methods of teaching secondary English, one focusing on literature and culture and another emphasizing language and composition. English education majors also have an additional language systems requirement.

When the English Department revised its Bachelor of Arts major last year, it also updated the secondary English education major by eliminating the Bachelor of Science degree and laying out a new BA program in English education that closely corresponds to the non-certification English major. As of Fall 2009 the department is in the process of transitioning recently declared majors into the new BA program (Bachelor of Arts plus secondary English Language Arts teacher certification [BA+TCERT]). Previously declared BS English majors are being allowed to complete the old English education program.

Aligning the secondary English education program with the BA in English includes English education students in the study of critical theory (301 or 495), which more fully prepares them for 497a (Senior Seminar) and for graduate study in English. In fact, simply changing the degree from BS to BA increases students' potential for graduate study in English because BA degrees are vastly more common in the humanities and correspond more closely to admissions requirements for MA and MA/PhD programs in English.

SIUE's general education program for the Bachelor of Arts degree requires that students study a foreign language and culture (101/102), and this new addition will assist English education majors in teaching language systems (in particular, grammar) while bolstering their knowledge and understanding of multicultural perspectives—important elements of the Illinois secondary English Language Arts standards. In fact, the Illinois Association of Deans of Public Colleges of Education held a conference in April 2007 on this very point. The population of English language learners is growing steadily in the Metro-East area and across the nation, and students preparing to teach in public school systems must be equipped to teach ELL students. Instruction in foreign language can prepare students to communicate with English language learners and serves as a foundation for students studying linguistics and language acquisition.

The BA+TCERT program also increases students' opportunities for choice, giving them options where there had only been requirements. For example, under the new program, English education majors select three of six offered literature surveys and two of seven major authors courses, where previously English education majors were required to take four specific surveys and one major authors course. Similarly, the old BS English degree required six hours of language systems in the form of two specific courses: 369 (Grammatical Analysis) and 400 (Principles of Linguistics). The BA+TCERT curriculum

continues to require 369 and allows students to select a second course from among several options: 400, 403 (History of the English Language), 416 (Language and Society), or 470 (Methods for K-12 ESL Teaching). Broadening the choices within the literature and language systems categories allows students to pursue their own interests while meeting the practical needs of ELA certification.

The transition to the new English education program serves to normalize the preparation of all majors in the discipline itself and offers additional (and strengthened) qualification toward certification requirements for those English majors who plan to teach secondary English Language Arts. In addition to meeting the certification requirements and professional ELA standards of Illinois and Missouri, the BA+TCERT degree improves the secondary English Education program's alignment with the accreditation standards of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

The total minimum number of hours to complete the secondary English Education program (BA+TCERT) is 132. Students who take advantage of a one-course overlap between the speech minor and the general education distribution requirement in the fine arts and humanities category (DFAH) can reduce their total hours to 129.

Old Program:

English with Secondary English Lang. Arts Teaching Certification (B.S.) - 130 Hrs.

[NOTE: This program is in effect only for students who declared secondary English Education before Fall 2009. New students complete the *Bachelor of Arts plus Secondary English Language Arts Teacher Certification* program (BA + TCERT program; effective Fall 2009).]

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BACHELOR OF SCIENCE MAJOR IN ENGLISH - 39 hours

GPA for English courses (3.0/4.0 required): _____

_____ Number of 200-level courses (no more than 6, as noted below, will apply to major)
_____ Number of British literature courses (3 required: 2 surveys, 1 major author)
_____ Number of American literature courses (2 required: 2 surveys)
_____ Number of 400-level English courses (5 required, excluding 499)

Literary Study: One required course

( ) ENG 200— Introduction to Literary Study

Writing: Two courses (one required, one selected)

( ) ENG 490 — Advanced Composition (REQUIRED)*
      *NOTE: ENG 201—Intermediate Composition
        Consider adding ENG 201 to your schedule if you would like additional instruction in the conventions of formal writing (+3 hours)

( ) ENG 290 — Introduction to Creative Writing
( ) ENG 491 — Technical Writing
( ) ENG 392 — Fiction Writing*
( ) ENG 393 — Poetry Writing*
( ) ENG 492 — Advanced Fiction Writing*

( ) ENG 493 — Advanced Poetry Writing*
        *NOTE: ENG 290 prerequisite

Surveys: Four required courses

( ) ENG 208 — Topics in Early British Literature
( ) ENG 209 — Topics in Modern British Literature
( ) ENG 211 — Topics in Early American Literature
( ) ENG 212 — Topics in Modern American Literature

Major Authors: One selected course

( ) ENG 307 — Introduction to Shakespeare
( ) ENG 404 — Chaucer
( ) ENG 471 — Shakespeare
( ) ENG 473 — Milton

Language Systems: Two courses (one required, one selected)

( ) ENG 369 — Grammatical Analysis (REQUIRED)

( ) ENG 400 — Principles of Linguistics
( ) ENG 403 — History of the English Language
( ) ENG 416 — Language and Society
( ) ENG 470 — Methods for K-12 ESL Teaching

English Education: Two required courses

( ) ENG 475 — Methods of Teaching Secondary English:
                Literature and Culture

( ) ENG 485 — Methods of Teaching Secondary English:
                Composition and Language

Senior Seminar: One required course

( ) ENG 497a— Senior Seminar in English

Additional English Courses:
( ) ENG 101 — English Composition I
( ) ENG 102 — English Composition II

GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (BACHLOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE) - 42 hours

SPEECH COMMUNICATION EDUCATION MINOR - 21 hours

GPA for Speech courses (3.0/4.0 required): _____

        ( ) SPC 103 — Interpersonal Communication
        ( ) SPC 104 — Oral Argumentation Skills
        ( ) SPC 105 — Public Speaking
        ( ) SPC 201 — Small Group Communication
        ( ) SPC 261 — Oral Interpretation of Literature
        ( ) SPC 305 — Listening
        ( ) SPC 461 — Strategies for Teaching Speech Communication

PROFESSION EDUCATION COURSES - 28 hours [6 courses + student teaching]

COURSEWORK

( ) CI 200 — Introduction to Education (2 hours)
( ) EPFR 315 — Educational Psychology (3 hours)
( ) EPFR 320 — Foundations of Education in a Multicultural Society (3 hours)
( ) SPE 400 — The Exceptional Child (3 hours)
( ) CI 440 — Teaching Reading in the Secondary Schools (3 hours)

( ) CI 315a —Secondary School Methods (2 hours)
        Students must pass through STUDENT TEACHER SCREENING before enrolling in CI
    315a
        (see below for more information)

FULL-TIME STUDENT TEACHING (ONE SEMESTER): CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT IN CI 315b / CI 352f
( ) CI 315b — Secondary School Methods (2 hours)
( ) CI 352f— Secondary Student Teaching in English (10 hours)

ADDITIONAL MIDDLE SCHOOL ENDORSEMENT (OPTIONAL)
( ) EPFR 415 — The Middle School Learner (+3 hours)
( ) CI 407 — The Middle and Junior High School (+3 hours)

New Program:

Bachelor of Arts plus Secondary English Language Arts Teacher Certification

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BA+ TCERT MAJOR IN ENGLISH . . . . 39 HOURS (TOTAL)

Only courses in which students receive a C or better will be accepted for credit toward the English major.
Complete program can include no more than 15 hours at the 200 level, and must include at least 15 hours at
the 400 level.

_____ Number of 200 level courses (no more than five will apply)

_____ Total number of 400-level English Department courses (five required, excluding 499)

_____ GPA/English (B [3.0/4.0] required for student teacher screening and for program completion)

_____ GPA/Speech (B [3.0/4.0] required for student teacher screening and for program completion)

Surveys: three courses required
( )   ENG 208—Topics in Early British Lit.
( )   ENG 209—Topics in Modern British Lit.
( )   ENG 211—Topics in Early American Lit.
( )   ENG 212—Topics in Modern American Lit.
( )   ENG 214—Topics in World Literature:
           Ancient to Medieval
( )   ENG 215—Topics in World Literature:
           Renaissance to Modern

Major Authors: two courses required
( )   ENG 307—Introduction to Shakespeare
( )   ENG 404—Chaucer
( )   ENG 471—Shakespeare

( )   ENG 473—Milton

( )   ENG 477—Morrison

( )   ENG 479—Major Authors: Shared Traditions

( )   ENG 480—Major Authors: Crossing Boundaries

Literary Study: one course required

( )   ENG 200—Introduction to Literary Study

Literary Theory: one course required

( )   ENG 301—Introduction to Literary Theory
              and Criticism

( )   ENG 495—History of Critical Theory

Language Systems: two courses required

( )   ENG 369—Grammatical Analysis (REQUIRED)

( )   ENG 400—Principles of Linguistics

( )   ENG 403—History of the English Language

( )   ENG 416—Language and Society

( )   ENG 470—Methods for K-12 ESL Teaching

Writing Approaches: one course required

( )   ENG 490—Advanced Composition

( )   ENG 491—Technical and Business Writing

Senior Seminar: one course required

( )   ENG 497a—Senior Seminar in English

Secondary English Education: two courses required

( )   ENG 475—Methods of Teaching Secondary English Language Arts: Literature and Culture

( )   ENG 485—Methods of Teaching Secondary English Language Arts: Composition and Language

FOREIGN LANGUAGE . . . . 8 HOURS
          One year required (8 credits in one foreign language). The SIUE general
          education OPTION B requirements for BA majors already include eight credits of
          foreign language.

BACHELOR OF ARTS GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS . . . . 44 HOURS
          BA includes eight hours in one foreign language (B [3.0/4.0] required). SIUE
          requires 44 hours of general education coursework for BA students (SKILLS
          OPTION B). Reduce that total to 41 hours by using one speech communication
          education course to meet the Fine Arts and Humanities distribution
          requirement [Dist. FAH].

SPEECH COMMUNICATION EDUCATION MINOR . . . . .21 HOURS

( )   SPC 103—Interpersonal Communication

( ) SPC 104—Oral Argumentation Skills

( ) SPC 105—Public Speaking

( ) SPC 201—Small Group Communication [Dist. FAH]

( ) SPC 261—Oral Interpretation of Literature [Dist. FAH]

( ) SPC 305—Listening [Dist. FAH]

( ) SPC 461—Strategies for Teaching Speech Communication

ENGLISH STUDENT TEACHER SCREENING

The English department's English Education Committee screens all prospective student teachers of English before enrollment in CI 315a and **one year prior** to the semester in which they plan to student teach (i.e., CI 315b and 352f). This process includes a writing portfolio and interview. Contact the English Education Coordinator for more information.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION COURSES AND STATE OF ILLINOIS TESTS ....28 HOURS

Contact an advisor in the Office of Clinical Experiences, Certification, and Advisement to register for all education courses beyond CI 200 (OCECA, 1110 Founders Hall, x3940). See the Illinois Certification Testing System (ICTS) website for information about the Illinois Basic Skills Test, the English Language Arts Content-Area Test, and the Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) Test. Take the Basic Skills Test immediately (students must pass the skills test to take courses beyond CI 200). Take the ELA content test before student teaching (students must pass the content test before taking CI 315B/352F). Take the APT test before/during student teaching (students must pass the APT test to become certified).

( ) CI 200—Introduction to Education (2 hours)

( ) EPFR 315—Educational Psychology (3 hours)

( ) EPFR 320—Foundations of Education in a Multicultural Society (3 hours)

( ) SPE 400—The Exceptional Child (3 hours)

( ) CI 440—Teaching Reading in the Secondary Schools (3 hours)

( ) CI 315a—Secondary School Methods (2 hours)*

*NOTE: students must pass through student teacher screening before enrolling in CI 315a

( ) CI 315b—Secondary School Methods (2 hours)*   }
( ) CI 352f—Secondary Student Teaching in English (10 hours)*   }
    *NOTE: concurrent enrollment in CI 315b and CI 352f   }

( ) EPFR 415—The Middle School Learner (+3 hours)*

( ) CI 407—The Middle and Junior High School (+3 hours)*

*NOTE: add these courses for optional middle school endorsement

TOTAL CREDIT HOURS FOR DEGREE (INCLUDING CERTIFICATION) ....132 HOURS

b. Catalog Description & Course Descriptions

[These descriptions reflect newly approved changes to the program]

Program Description

The study of literature and of the English language encourages appreciation of the significant ideas of the past and present, provides training in effective writing, and offers practical experience in logical and aesthetic analysis. These skills are of particular value in a world in which specific technical capabilities may be threatened by obsolescence. Students prepared in English language and literature are equipped to acquire essential technical skills and to assimilate knowledge crucial to technological and computer-based capabilities.

Career Opportunities

English majors are well prepared for graduate and professional studies in business, law, and library science. In addition, they may find career opportunities in public relations, journalism, teaching, consulting and editing, particularly when an English major is combined with a minor or significant course work in art and design, journalism, mass communications, or speech communication. Advertising agencies, book publishers, and institutions such as universities, hospitals, major corporations, and federal agencies that have organizational publications employ creative and technical writers, researchers, and editors. Articles by free-lance writers are published in many local and national magazines and newspapers. Although job opportunities in these areas are highly competitive, students who can express themselves clearly and document their ideas through careful research will receive thoughtful consideration from potential employers.

Degree Programs:

Bachelor of Arts, English
Bachelor of Arts, English plus Secondary English Language Arts Teacher Certification
Linguistics Minor
English Minor
Creative Writing Minor

Program Overview/General Department Information

Admission
To be admitted to the program of study for a Bachelor of Arts, English, students must:
- Complete all Academic Development courses required by the University.
- Complete any courses required to address high school deficiencies.
- Attain a cumulative grade point average of at least 2.0 (on a 4.0 scale).

Retention
- Maintain a cumulative grade point average of 2.0.
- Maintain a term grade point average above 1.0 in any term.

Students failing to meet above standards may be conditionally retained. Failure to meet the conditions established by the department will result in termination from the major and ineligibility to enroll in upper division School of Engineering courses without writer

departmental permission. After one year, students are eligible to reapply for admission to the major. Students dropped from the major may direct a written appeal to the department's academic standards committee.

Transfer
A student wishing to get credit for English major or minor requirements for courses taken at other institutions should consult the Assistant Chair, Dr. Sharon James McGee. Only courses above the 100 or freshman level can count. No transfer credit will be given for a course not in the SIUE catalog; the Assistant Chair must ascertain the content of a course to be transferred to see if credit can be given for a similar course at SIUE. Grades lower than "C" will not be transferred.

Gen Ed Requirements for the Major

University general education requirements are outlined in the General Education section of this catalog and included in the sample curriculum outline. While fulfilling University general education requirements all English majors are required to complete the following:

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE B.A. MAJOR IN ENGLISH 36 HOURS (TOTAL)

Only courses in which students receive a C or better will be accepted for credit toward the English major. Complete program can include no more than 15 hours at the 200 level, and must include at least 15 hours at the 400 level.

_____ Number of 200 level courses (no more than five will apply)

_____ Total number of 400-level English Department courses (five required, excluding 499)

Surveys: Three courses required:

( ) ENG 208 — Topics in Early British Lit.

( ) ENG 209 — Topics in Modern British Lit.

( ) ENG 211 — Topics in Early American Lit.

( ) ENG 212 — Topics in Modern American Lit.

( ) ENG 214 — Topics in World Lit.: Ancient to Medieval

( ) ENG 215 — Topics in World Lit.: Renaissance to Modern

Major Authors: Two courses required:

( ) ENG 307 — Introduction to Shakespeare

( ) ENG 404 — Chaucer

( ) ENG 471 — Shakespeare

( ) ENG 473 — Milton

( ) ENG 477 — Morrison

( ) ENG 479 — Major Authors: Shared Traditions

( ) ENG 480 — Major Authors: Crossing Boundaries

<u>Literary Study</u>: One course required:

(   ) ENG 200 — Introduction to Literary Study

<u>Literary Theory</u>: One course required:

(   ) ENG 301 — Introduction to Literary Theory and Criticism

(   ) ENG 495 — History of Critical Theory

<u>Language Systems</u>: One course required:

(   ) ENG 369 — Grammatical Analysis

(   ) ENG 400 — Principles of Linguistics

(   ) ENG 403 — History of the English Language

<u>Writing Approaches</u>: One course required:

(   ) ENG 201 — Intermediate Composition

(   ) ENG 290 — Introduction to Creative Writing

(   ) ENG 334 — Scientific Writing

(   ) ENG 489 — Style and Intentionality

(   ) ENG 490 — Advanced Composition

(   ) ENG 491 — Technical and Business Writing

<u>Senior Seminar</u>: One course required:

(   ) ENG 497a — Senior Seminar in English

<u>English Electives</u>: Two electives required: Choose any English course numbered 200 or higher.

BACHELOR OF ARTS MINOR COURSES . . . . .18 – 21 HOURS
Select six or seven courses (dependant upon minor department's requirements).

BACHELOR OF ARTS GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS . . . . 44 HOURS
BA includes eight hours in one foreign language.

ADDITIONAL ELECTIVES . . . . 23 – 26 HOURS

TOTAL FOR DEGREE . . . . 124 HOURS

An Example Schedule for a major in English:

YEAR	FALL		SPRING	
1	ENG 101 English Composition I	3	ENG 102 English Composition II	3
	PHIL 106, MATH 106, STAT 107,		ENG 200 Introduction to Literary	3
	or CMIS 108	3	Study #	3
	Intro Fine Art & Humanities	3	Dist Fine Arts & Humanities	3
	Intro Natural Science & Math	3	Intro GENERAL EDUCATION	3
	Intro Social Science	3	Intro GENERAL EDUCATION	
		15		15
2	ENG Survey	3	ENG Survey	3
	ENG Survey	3	ENG Writing Approaches	3
	FOREIGN LANGUAGE 101	4	FOREIGN LANGUAGE 102 (IC)	4
	Dist Natural Sciences & Math	3	Minor	3
	Intergroup Relations (IGR)	3	ELECTIVE	3
		16		16
3	ENG ELECTIVE (200 or higher)	3	ENG Literary Theory	3
	ENG Language Systems	3	ENG Major Authors	3
	Interdisciplinary Studies (IS)	3	Minor	3
	Minor	3	Minor	3
	ELECTIVE	3	ELECTIVE	3
		15		15
4	ENG Major Authors	3	ENG 497a Senior Seminar	3
	Minor	3	ENG Elective	3
	Minor	3	Dist Social Sciences	3
	ELECTIVE	3	ELECTIVE/Minor	3
	ELECTIVE	4	ELECTIVE	4
		16		16

Of the 36 hours in English courses, at least 15 must be at the 400-level, and no more than 15 may be at the 200-level. English 499 may not count towards the 400-level course requirements. Only courses in which the student receives a "C" or better will be accepted for credit toward the English major. Students must pass a year's worth of a single foreign language.

B.A. in English plus Secondary English Language Arts Teacher Certification

English majors seeking certification to teach secondary English Language Arts in Illinois must meet all requirements for the BA in English and must take 9 hours in specific courses in English rather than the 6 hours of electives in English required for the non-certification BA English degree. In addition, English majors seeking certification must complete the Department of Speech Communication's speech communication education

minor and a series of professional education courses in the School of Education, including a semester of student teaching. English majors seeking certification must maintain a cumulative 3.0 GPA in English courses and, independently, in speech courses as well as an overall cumulative 2.5 GPA. English majors seeking certification must be advised within the secondary English Education program in the Department of English Language and Literature.

One calendar year before the semester in which they plan to begin student teaching, students must apply for approval from the English Education Committee of the Department of English Language and Literature. Application is made through the department's Student Teacher Screening Process, described in detail in the English Department's Undergraduate Handbook for Majors and Minors.

The Bachelor of Arts plus Secondary English Language Arts Teacher Certification major in English fulfills Illinois and Missouri state certification requirements. Anyone interested in an endorsement to teach English as a second language should contact the ESL endorsement advisor.

General Education Requirements 44
    (For a Bachelor of Arts degree in English, students must
    select Option B in the general education skills area.)
Required English Courses.. 6
    ENG 200 Introduction to Literary Study 3
    ENG 497a Senior Seminar.. 3
Required English Distributions... 27
    Three survey courses
        from 208, 209, 211, 212, 214, 215............................. 9
    Two major authors courses
        from 307, 404, 471, 473, 477, 479, 480..................... 6
    One course in literary theory from 301, 495..................... 3
    Two courses in language systems
        from 369 (required), 400, 403, 416, 470..................... 6
    One course in writing approaches from 490, 491 3
Required Secondary English Teaching Methods....................................... 6
    ENG 475 Literature and Culture....................................... 3
    ENG 485 Composition and Language 3
Required Speech Communication Education Minor 21
Foreign Languages.. [8]
    (all hours in the same language; credits included
    in the option B general education requirements)
Professional Education Courses... 28
Total...132

Complete major in English can include no more than 15 hours at the 200 level and must include at least 15 hours at the 400 level. English 499 may not count toward the 400-level course requirements. Only courses in which students receive a C or better will be

accepted for credit toward the English major. English Education majors must also maintain a cumulative 3.0 GPA in English courses and, independently, in speech courses as well as an overall cumulative 2.5 GPA. GPAs will be calculated based on all college courses taken at all institutions.

Example Schedule for B.A. in English plus Secondary English Language Arts Teacher Certification:

YEAR	FALL		SPRING	
1	ENG 101 English Composition I	3	ENG 102 English Composition II	3
	SPC 103 Interpersonal Comm Skills (IGR)	3	SPC 105 Public Speaking	3
	STAT 107 Concepts of Statistics	3	Intro Fine Arts and Humanities (e.g., THEA 111 or MUS 111)	3
	(or any other Option B skills choice)	4	Any Foreign Language 102 (IC)	4
	Any Foreign Language 101	3	Intro Social Sciences (e.g., PSYCH 111)	3
	Intro Social Sciences (e.g., HIST 111A/B)			
		16		16
2	ENG 200 Introduction to Literary Study	3	ENG Survey (e.g., ENG 214 or 215)	3
	ENG Survey (e.g., ENG 208 or 209)	3	ENG Major Authors: Shakespeare (e.g., ENG 307 or 471)	3
	ENG Survey (e.g., ENG 211 or 212)	3	ENG 369 Grammatical Analysis	3
	Intro Fine Arts and Humanities (e.g., ART 111)	3	SPC 104/204 Oral Argumentation Skills	3
		3	SPC 201 Small Group Comm (Dist FAH)	3
	Intro Natural Sciences and Mathematics (e.g., ESCI 111 or MATH 111)	2	Dist Natural Sciences and Mathematics (e.g., SCI 241 or GEO 210)	3
	CI 200 Intro to Education			
	ICTS Basic Skills Test (must pass skills test to take education courses beyond CI 200)	17	*Contact OCECA secondary education advisor to be admitted to teacher certification program.*	18
3	ENG Major Authors (e.g., ENG 404, 473, 477, 479, 480)	3	ENG Language Systems (e.g., ENG 400, 403, 416, 470)	3
	ENG 475 Methods: Literature and Culture	3	ENG 485 Methods: Composition and Language	3
		3		3
	ENG 490 Advanced Composition (or ENG 491 Tech and Business Writing)	3	ENG Literary Theory (e.g., ENG 305 or 495)	3
		3	SPC 305 Listening	3
	SPC 261 Oral Interpretation of Literature	3	IS Course: Interdisciplinary Studies	3
	Dist Social Sciences (e.g., HIST 200/201)		EPFR 320 Foundations of Education in a Multicultural Society	
	EPFR 315 Educational Psychology			
	See the English Education coordinator to sign up for student teacher screening. Students who fail to do so by the end of this semester will delay student teaching by one semester.	18	*Student Teacher Screening* Student teacher screening portfolios due at the end of the first week of the semester.	18
4	ENG 497A Senior Seminar	3	CI 315B Secondary School Methods	2
	SPC 461 Strategies for Teaching Speech	3	CI 352F Secondary Student Teaching: English	10
	SPE 400 The Exceptional Child	3		
	CI 440 Adolescent Literacy	3		

CI 315A Secondary School Methods	2	Student Teaching Semester (full-time student teaching experience)	
ICTS English Language Arts Content-Area Test (must pass ELA content test before student teaching semester begins)	14	*ICTS Assessment of Professional Teaching Test (must pass APT to become certified)*	12

Linguistics Minor Requirements

The linguistics minor requires a minimum of 6 courses (18 hours).

Students are required to take an introduction to the field of linguistics (English 400), and one course in each of the following major areas of linguistic study: semantics and pragmatics (English 405), phonetics and phonology (English 408), and syntax (English 409). Students must also select two electives from the following courses: English 370, 403, 416, 468 and 474. Students who are considering the Linguistics Minor are encouraged to take English 207 as part of their General Education coursework. A minor in Linguistics may be combined with a major in English. English majors who satisfy the Linguistics Minor requirements may substitute any English elective for the three-hour Language Systems requirement.

Four required courses:

ENG 400 - Principles of Linguistics
ENG 405 - Semantics and Pragmatics
ENG 408 - Phonetics and Phonology
ENG 409 - Syntactic Analysis

Electives (choose two):

ENG 370 - Morphological Analysis
ENG 403 - History of the English Language
ENG 416 - Language and Society
ENG 468 - Second Language Acquisition
ENG 474 - Bilingualism and Bilingual Education

Literature Minor Requirements

To complete a literature minor requires a minimum of 18 hours of English courses numbered 200 or above, with a grade of C or higher in each course is required. English 200 should be taken at the first possible opportunity; 6 of the 15 hours must be taken in English courses numbered 400 or higher. Appropriate courses in creative writing, expository writing, and linguistics may be included as supplements to the literature courses. All courses should be selected with the approval of the English Department's undergraduate adviser. The literature minor may not be combined with an English major.

Creative Writing Minor Requirements

The minor in creative writing requires a minimum of 18 hours. (Students must complete the freshman composition sequence before taking courses in creative writing.) Students must choose either of the following programs from the primary sequence: fiction (English 290, 392, 492, 498) or poetry (290, 393, 493, 498). To fulfill the two elective courses within the minor, students are strongly recommended to choose from: English 490, 494, 441a and 441b. Students may also elect to take 498 a second time; any 392, 393, 492, or 493 course that is outside the student's primary sequence; and one 400-level literature course (besides 441a and 441b). A course from the Mass Communications Department, Writing for the Media (202), also may be counted toward the creative writing minor. A more complete description of the creative writing minor is found in the Undergraduate Handbook for Majors and Minors, which can be obtained from the Department of English, or from the Creative Writing Adviser.

Graduation Requirements

- Complete all general education and specific program requirements.
- Complete all minor requirements.
- Complete a year's worth of a single foreign language
- File an Application for Graduation by the first day of the term in which you plan to graduate.

Department of English Language and Literature Course Descriptions

[The descriptions list of courses and descriptions found on the following pages are taken from the English web site. These are being reproduced from this site because, although the program and all courses have received final approval, not all have yet found their way into the current course catalog.]

100 LEVEL COURSES

100 - WRITING LAB
Self-instructional materials for improvement of writing skills; tutorial assistance in composing papers, reports, or theses. Word processors available. Not for English major or minor credit. (1 credit hour)

101 - ENGLISH COMPOSITION
Instruction and practice in analyzing and composing the academic expository essay. Pre-requisite: ACT English score of 21 or higher; or placement score; and/or completion of AD 090a/b or AD 092 or equivalent with a grade of C or better.

101n - ENGLISH COMPOSITION: NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS
Instruction and practice in expository writing, including the paragraph and short essay. Course is a general education skills course. Prerequisite: Consent of advisor.

102 - ENGLISH COMPOSITION
Builds upon the analytical and writing skills developed in 101 with emphasis on argumentation and critical synthesis of information based on research. Prerequisite: 101.

102n - ENGLISH COMPOSITION: NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS
Instruction and practice in expository writing, including the essay and research paper. Course is a general education skills course. Prerequisite: Consent of advisor.

111 - INTRODUCTION TO LITERATURE
Representative works in world drama, fiction, and poetry. Development of appreciation of literature by understanding themes, purposes, techniques, history. Prerequisite: 101.

300 LEVEL COURSES

301 - INTRODUCTION TO LITERARY THEORY AND CRITICISM
Selected literary theories, types of criticism, and theorists. Practice in interpreting and writing about literature, and in application of research methods. Prerequisite: Open Only To English Majors.

306 - INTRODUCTION TO THE BIBLE
Reading and discussion of selected books from the Old and New Testaments and Apocrypha in translation, with attention to their literary, historical, and theological contexts.

307 - INTRODUCTION TO SHAKESPEARE
Shakespeare's life, the Elizabethan theater, and representative plays and poems.

308 - DETECTIVE FICTION
Development of detective short story and novel from nineteenth-century beginnings to the present.

309 - POPULAR LITERATURE
Analysis of literature which has influenced and been influenced by popular culture. May be repeated up to 6 hours provided no topic is repeated.

310 - CLASSICAL MYTHOLOGY AND ITS INFLUENCE
Major Greek and Roman myths: origin, nature, interpretations, and use in the modern world.

315 - AMERICAN NATURE WRITING
Works by Audubon, Thoreau, Muir, Austin, Leopold, Abbey, McPhee, Berry, Momaday, Dillard, Silko, and other writers focusing on relations of Americans to American landscapes.

334 - SCIENTIFIC WRITING
Offers students experience in researching, writing, structuring and revising scientific documents. Designed for science and English majors or minors.

340 - LITERATURE OF THE THIRD WORLD
Third World literature from antiquity to present; social, political, historical, and philosophical problems reflected in literature.

341 - AFRICAN AMERICAN WOMEN'S WRITING
(Same as Women's Studies 341) Poems, novels, short stories, essays, dramas, autobiography, and other texts by African American women writers during various periods from Colonial to Contemporary times.

342 - MOVEMENTS IN AFRICAN AMERICAN LITERATURE
Fiction, poetry, drama, essays, speeches, and autobiography with emphasis on different literary time periods, creative trends, and political movements specific to African American literature.

343 - TOPICS IN AFRICAN AMERICAN RHETORIC AND ORATORY
This course introduces students to essays, oratory, slave narratives, speeches, and theories relative to abolitionism, captivity, religion, and civil-rights focused movements, in African American texts. May be repeated up to 6 hours provided no topic is repeated.

344 TOPICS IN ETHNIC LITERATURE.
This course will examine ethnic literatures from a socio-economic, political, and historical context. Students will investigate issues of diaspora, class, gender, and resistance in literatures often marginalized. May be repeated up to 6 hours provided no topic is repeated.

345 TOPICS IN AFRICAN AMERICAN POETRY AND FOLKLORE.
Examinations of parallel themes, forms, missions and theories of African American poetry/folklore from ancient origins to Langston Hughes, Gwendolyn Brooks, Rita Dove, blues, rap. May be repeated up to 6 hours provided no topic is repeated.

369 - GRAMMATICAL ANALYSIS
Analysis of formal spoken and written English sentences; encourages critical thinking about conceptions of grammar and greater awareness of our (mostly unconscious) knowledge of language.

370 - MORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS
An introduction to the analysis of the internal structure of words, and the processes of inflection, derivation, and word formation found in human languages.

392 - FICTION WRITING
Short story writing, with special emphasis on plot, point of view, description, dialogue, and other elements in the rhetoric of fiction. Workshop format.

393 - POETRY WRITING
Writing of poetry and study of poetic fundamentals, including form, imagery, figurative language, and speaker. Workshop setting for critiques of student work.

394 - PLAYWRITING
Provides a close acquaintance with a range of theatrical strategies explored by playwrites, and a workshop forum for the development of student's own writing.

400 LEVEL COURSES

400 - PRINCIPLES OF LINGUISTICS
Principles and techniques of linguistic analysis illustrated through survey of major structural components of language. Recommended for anthropology students, linguistics students, and those preparing to teach English.

403 - HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE
Historical survey of major phonological and grammatical changes in English language from its Indo-European antecedents to the present.

404 - CHAUCER: CANTERBURY TALES
The Canterbury Tales read in Middle English.

405 - PRAGMATICS
Study of principles controlling how implicit levels of meaning are expressed in language and how context influences the interpretation of meaning.

406 - OLD ENGLISH LANGUAGE
Sounds, grammar, and vocabulary of the Old English language, including readings in Old English poetry and prose.

408 - PHONOLOGICAL ANALYSIS
Principles of linguistic analysis and interpretation as applied to sound systems of language. ENG 400 recommended.

409 - SYNTACTIC ANALYSIS
Principles of syntactic analysis and interpretation as applied to clause and sentence level structures.

416 - LANGUAGE AND SOCIETY
Relationships among language, society, and culture, and their implications for education and intercultural communication. Topics include language variation, socialization, and ethnography of communication.

443 - PROSODY
Students will both study and write metrical poetry. All aspects of versification will be considered. For both literature majors and creative writing minors.

446 - STUDIES IN AFRICAN AMERICAN LITERATURE
This course will examine the fiction, poetry, short stories, and essays of African American writers within the context of scholarship and criticism dedicated to the study of black diasporic cultures. May be repeated up to 6 hours.

457 - TOPICS IN POSTCOLONIAL LITERATURE AND CRITICISM
Examination of Postcolonial texts-novels, poems, plays, memoirs, speeches, and critical essays with focus on scholarship and theory in postcolonial studies. May be repeated to a maximum of 6 hours provided no topic is repeated.

458 - TOPICS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.
Topics in language and literature. May be repeated once for a maximum of six hours provided no topic is repeated.

463 - TOPICS IN LITERARY PERIODS
Reading and analysis of works drawn from one or more specific literary periods; authors and periods vary. May be repeated to a maximum of 9 hours as long as no topic is repeated.

464 - TOPICS IN FORMS AND GENRES
Reading and analysis of works drawn from one or more specific literary forms and genres; authors, forms, and genres vary. May be repeated to a maximum of 9 hours as long as no topic is repeated.

468 - SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION
Examination of issues and theories applicable to understanding process of second language development.

470 - METHODS AND MATERIALS FOR K-12 ESL TEACHING
Examination of techniques and materials for teaching English as a Second Language in K-12 settings.

471 - SHAKESPEARE
The in-depth study of the works of Renaissance author William Shakespeare. Topic varies; may be repeated to a maximum of 6 hours so long as topic is not repeated.

472 - ASSESSMENT AND TESTING IN ESL
Examination of issues and methods for assessing oral and written proficiency in English as a Second Language.

473 - MILTON
Paradise Lost and other works such as *Samson Agonistes, Paradise Regained, Lycidas, Comus*, and selected prose.

474 - BILINGUALISM AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION
An introduction to cognitive, linguistic, and social perspectives on bilingualism, and the history and politics of bilingual education in the US.

475 – METHODS OF TEACHING SECONDARY ENGLISH: LITERATURE AND CULTURE
Approaches to and issues in teaching literature and culture at the secondary level. Must be seeking secondary ELA certification.

476 - PRACTICUM IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE
This course is designed for students who need to gain supervised experience teaching ESL for the purposes of the state ESL enrollment.

477 - MORRISON
Reading and analysis of the works of major contemporary American author Toni Morrison.

478 - STUDIES IN WOMEN, LANGUAGE, AND LITERATURE
Relationships among society, gender, language, and literature: ways women are affected by and depicted in language and literature: literature written by women; feminist criticism. Topic varies; may be repeated to a maximum of 6 hours so long as topic is not repeated.

479 - MAJOR AUTHORS: SHARED TRADITIONS
Reading and analysis of the works of two to four major authors who share an historical period; authors and topic vary. May be repeated up to a maximum of 6 hours as long as authors and topic are not repeated.

482 - TECHNOLOGY AND LITERATURE
Analysis of digital theory and digital literature: short fiction, poetry, and novels created for new media such as CD-ROMs and hypertext.

485 - METHODS OF TEACHING SECONDARY ENGLISH: COMPOSITION AND LANGUAGE
Approaches to and issues in teaching composition and language usage at the secondary level. Must be seeking secondary ELA certification.

486 - TEACHING CREATIVE WRITING
Seminar on the teaching of creative writing, with an emphasis on poetry and/or fiction.

487 - POLITICS OF COMPOSITION PEDAGOGY
Pedagogical politics of the writing classroom, teacher-student power relations, relations between educational institutions and social order, and development of alternative perspectives in pedagogical politics.

488 - HISTORY OF RHETORIC
Major figures, texts, and definitions of rhetoric, beginning with Classical origins and continuing into Modern era. Designed for students interested in composition, literature, and criticism.

489 - STYLE AND INTENTIONALITY
A writing course on the study of style. The aim: to study stylistic conventions and innovations. The course is both theoretical and practical.

490 - ADVANCED COMPOSITION
Writing sophisticated expository prose. Review of grammatical matters as needed; emphasis on clarity, organization, effectiveness, and flexibility. May be repeated once for a max of 6 hours with permission.

491 - TECHNICAL AND BUSINESS WRITING
Technical communication, professional correspondence, reports, proposals, descriptions, and evaluations; word processing and graphics software. For students in English, business, engineering, nursing, the sciences, and the social sciences.

492 - ADVANCED FICTION WRITING
Advanced seminar in short story writing. Includes readings in fiction and a study of the psychology of creativity, fiction markets, experimental fiction. Workshop format.

493 - ADVANCED POETRY WRITING
Advanced workshop in writing poetry. Examination of poetic expression.

494 - LITERARY EDITING
Principles of literary editing, primarily of fiction and poetry.

495 - HISTORY OF CRITICAL THEORY
Major critical theories from Plato to the present, including practice in writing criticism.

496 - SCHOLARLY AND CRITICAL EDITING
Editorial preparation of copy for scholarly and critical journals in English language and literature.

497A - SENIOR SEMINAR
Required of majors. A variable topics course providing intensive study of a specialized topic. Includes a substantial research paper. Not for Graduate Students.

498 - TUTORIAL IN CREATIVE WRITING
Independent study designed primarily for creative writing minors. May be repeated once for credit. Not for graduate credit.

499 - READINGS IN ENGLISH
Independent study in specific area of interest. Extensive reading. For English students only; may be repeated to a maximum of 6 hours. Prerequisite: Approval of department chair and instructor.

c. Advising/Mentoring

Advising in the Department of English Language and Literature underwent major revisions during this review period, in part as a response to the previous review. As mentioned above, a new position—Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUS)—was created to ensure the quality of the advising experience of students by having one person to troubleshoot problem situations, provide training to advisors, and oversee the department's advising process. This DUS works together with nine faculty advisors who meet regularly with students to monitor their progress and suggest an academic course of action that will move them efficiently towards graduation. The DUS performs a number of other duties that assist the overall undergraduate program, namely he/she co-chairs the Curriculum Committee, publicizes the undergraduate program, and coordinates advising issues with registrar's office. The DUS also performs all graduation checks.

Working in conjunction with the DUS, the Coordinator of Secondary English Education works extensively with English majors who are also interested in secondary teaching certification. The Coordinator serves on various departmental committees (including the executive committee), publicizes the undergraduate English+TCERT program, fields program inquiries, works with students seeking post-baccalaureate certification, and coordinates advising issues with the registrar's office. He/she advises all of the undergraduate English+TCERT majors and performs all of their graduation checks (32 majors graduated with secondary ELA teaching certificates in 2008-2009; 24 are slated for graduation in 2009-2010). It is important to note that the undergraduate English+TCERT advising duties are usually divided between two English education specialists and that the department is in the process of filling one vacant position. In addition, the Coordinator of Secondary English Education collaborates with the School of Education's Office of Clinical Experiences, Certification, and Advisement (OCECA) and the Joint Committee on Teacher Preparation (JCTP) to ensure that the English content-area program in the College of Arts and Sciences aligns effectively with the professional education requirements English majors must complete within the School of Education.

The College of Arts and Sciences is currently in the process of hiring professional advisors and as this program is phased in, it is expected that the roles of the DUS and present faculty advisors will evolve. At present, the department distributes students alphabetically to nine advisers. These advisers provide quality one-on-one contact with the students, with the DUS supervising the process. A similar structure will be maintained even after CAS phases in professional advisors, but the role of current advisors will shift from one that involves a significant amount of administrative work to one which focuses on what the advisers do best, discuss the role of English for students' career plans. The department welcomes this new "mentoring" role, because the faculty are much better at mentoring than they are at doing general education checks, handing out pin numbers, using the University's information management system, and filling out forms.

d. Culminating Senior Experience

Designed to be the final course for the bachelor's degree, English 497A Senior Seminar is required of all majors and is a variable topics course providing intensive study of a

specialized theme. The senior assignment, included within this capstone course, integrates the knowledge and skills in the general education and English major programs by specifically asking students to complete a series of culminating experiences, including intensive reading, scholarly research, academic writing, and professional presentation. The department is in the process of adding a new component to the English senior assignment. Beginning Fall 2009, in addition to the seminar paper and presentation, students will also create portfolios of their work. While compiling their portfolios, students will write reflective self-assessments about the skills they have developed over the course of their academic careers as English majors at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville. The process of creating capstone learning portfolios will encourage students to include documents and materials that collectively suggest the scope and quality of their performance as learners and to inquire into and represent their practices related to learning and development, thus allowing students to consider their strengths and accomplishments as English professionals and to determine skill areas they may want to continue to develop after they graduate. See section G (Student Learning Outcomes) for a detailed description of the revised senior assignment and assessment practices.

e. Applications of Knowledge

It is certainly the goal of the undergraduate program to provide students with opportunities to apply their knowledge and skills. This has been one of the guiding rationales behind recent revisions in the BA and the BA+ programs described above. Those revisions included specific improvements with respect to application of knowledge and skills. Nevertheless, throughout the reporting period, there have been numerous other ways that the department has helped students apply the knowledge they've learned about literature and language, and apply their writing, speaking, thinking, and information-eliciting skills. For example, it is undergraduate students who serve as the editorial staff of the department's *River Bluff Review*, a magazine of student writing. In addition to the *River Bluff Review*, the department serves as the home of three active professional journals that provide English majors and minors great opportunities to gain first-hand experience in scholarly and literary editing. The department promotes participation of undergraduate students in numerous readings of original works in open mic nights on campus. The senior culminating experience involves undergraduate students in conference-like public presentations of their projects, the most recent of which has been a Senior Conference with the title of "Freedom as Paradox—American Captivity Narratives from the 17th Century to 2009." Undergraduate English education students participate in student teaching to practice and apply the learning they have gained in the program. Undergraduate linguistic minors engage in projects that directly involve the application of their skills in practical research (e.g., two undergraduate linguistic projects during this period involved the documentation of dialectal variation in rural regions of southern Illinois.) Opportunities to engage undergraduate students in direct, part-time employment (e.g., as copy editors or ESL tutors) are promoted through student listservs maintained by various department units. Numerous other examples could be cited, but undergraduate students are given ample opportunities for the application of the skills they develop, and current revisions within the department have been designed to further enhance and increase opportunities for these applications.

f. Standards of Excellence

Departmental faculty have built a wide-ranging and demanding curriculum that involves a great deal of rigor. This includes a variety of teaching methods for the daily classroom experiences, paper assignments, class projects, and exams that allow students to investigate complex, significant issues, and require high levels of performance from their students. In some cases, this rigor has been codified in course portfolios that serve not only to inform students regarding what to expect, but also to guide faculty, call staff, and graduate teaching assistants in the creation of a pedagogical experience that meets the standards of excellence that the department expects. For example, the department has directed efforts at the creation of an ENG 101/102 information and pedagogy database (which may be found at http://www.siue.edu/ENGLISH/TOW/FYW/) that not only offers a lot of information about the first-year writing sequence but also provides syllabi, assignment sheets, and classroom activity sheets that exemplify the kind of teaching excellence expected of faculty. Student excellence is, of course, a separate issue, and this is discussed in greater detail in section G (Student Learning Outcomes).

g. Outstanding Program Achievements

The Department of English Language and Literature has achieved a great deal during the last review period—more than can be adequately summarized here—but the following provides representative examples of achievements that have directly, or indirectly, affected the undergraduate program in significant ways.

(1) Growth in the Number of Majors

This important achievement was discussed previously in section C, under *Program Demand.*

(2) Major Curricular Developments

The successful completion of revisions to the undergraduate major in English and the BA the addition of a specialization in Secondary English Language Arts Teacher Certification (to replace the B.S. in English) were discussed in the description of the program earlier in this section, but there have been several additional important curricular changes that should be mentioned:

During the past decade a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in TESL, resulting in a need to create coherence between these programs and the linguistic minor. Since courses taken for the undergraduate minor may not be used by students who then wish to pursue a post-baccalaureate certificate in TESL, or remain at SIUE for English MA specializing in TESL, it was necessary for to consider how the minor might be revised in a way that allows it to function as a feeder program for post-baccalaureate studies at SIUE, without hampering student's continuance at the university due to lack of coherent differentiation between programs. This revision was conducted during this last review period, and did

more to focus the minor on courses specifically related to core areas of linguistic study. Several courses that were less directly related to a linguistic core of study were removed as electives, though a course on bilingualism, ENG 474, was included to serve as a bridge between linguistic study and the post-baccalaureate work the department offers. The result has been a cogent undergraduate minor, focused on core learning in linguistics, that better serves students wishing to extend their minor field of study into later academic work.

During the last review period the creative writing minor curriculum was significantly revised to create an introductory course (290) and then establish a required sequence of four core courses through the program (290 to 392/393 to 492/493 and then 498). This revision has resulted in a far more cohesive group of creative writing students and also a significant increase in the number of students that choose this minor. The creative writing unit within the English Department has become one of its most vital programs, with students actively engaged in campus and community readings, a strong an vibrant writing community, and faculty who are garnering national recognition for the quality of their work.

The department has seen expansion of its post-baccalaureate programs and created a new creative writing specialization during this period. While these important programs are not specifically for undergraduates, they have provided additional courses and new options for undergraduates who choose to continue academic work at SIUE after graduation.

(3) The Formation of the English Language and Literature Association (ELLA)

With faculty encouragement and advisement, a student-based organization arose during this period with the purpose of fostering professional development among students, creating new expressions of learning through reading groups or creative circles, and establishing connections between students of differing areas within the department. The most visible and exciting outgrowth of this organization was an ELLA Speaker Series that took place from 2004-2007. ELLA, through the extraordinary energy and efforts of one key student, Janella Moy, succeeded in bringing numerous noted academics and speakers to the SIUE campus. Many of the speakers also attended class sessions and to deepen discussions following readings and/or presentations. The Speaker Series proved educational and invigorating for both students and faculty. The following list gives a sense of the scope and depth of the speaker series:

Allison Joseph—poetry
Janice Lauer—rhetoric and composition
Sonia Sanchez—poetry
Nichelle Tramble—fiction
Paula Bennett—literature/Emily Dickinson
Walt Wolfram—linguistics/sociolinguistics
Brad Land—non-fiction
Kathleen Finneran—memoir
Amiri Baraka—poetry

Tyhimba Jess—poetry
Ellen Cushman—rhetoric and composition
Salikoko Mufwene—linguistics, world Englishes
Linda Wagner-Martin—American literature
Karen Kovacik—poetry
Agnes Wilcox—Shakespeare theater
Silvina Montrul—linguistics, second language acquisition
Julie Otsuka—novelist
Bruce McComisky—rhetoric and composition
The "Arts League Players"—reading from James Joyce's "Ulysses"
Andrew Scheil—Jewish and Medieval studies
Brad Watson—fiction
Betsy Sholl—Poet Laureate of Maine

(4) Internationalization

An important achievement during this period was a deepending of the internationalization of the department, evident in increasing connections with other institutions abroad, increased travel abroad by students and faculty, and revision of the curriculum that has broadened it with the goal of expansion in a way that makes greater space for a consideration of other cultures and traditions. Since just 2006, English students have engaged in study abroad experiences in Germany, Spain, Czech Republic, Korea, Mexico, Wales, England, Italy, and Austria. Faculty in the department have also led or directed international experiences for undergraduates (e.g., in Mexico, Spain, Turkey, Greece, Egypt) and significant connections between the department and other universities abroad have also developed.

From 2001-2004, a the College and University Affiliations grant brought several faculty from the department into contact with faculty at the University of Ibadan, Nigeria through reciprocal visits with that institution. A Fulbright Alumni Initiative Award funded exchanges of eight faculty between the department and the University of Lleida, Spain from 2004-2006, a connection that further developed into semester-long student exchanges for six students, ongoing collaborations between faculty and videoconferenced presentations by faculty and students from both sides.

(5) Faculty Development in Online Education

Over the last review period, many faculty members from the department have been exploring ways of extending teaching in online and distance education formats. The department has supported the participation of several faculty members at the Illinois' Interinstitutional Faculty Summer Institute on Learning Technologies. These members have explored best practices for integrating technology into courses and academic programs, and brought their insights back to curricular discussion within the department. Other faculty members have received grants for the development of learning technologies related to the teaching of English and have exercised leadership in their disciplines

through courses they have taught and scholarly reflection on emerging modes of learning. Two new faculty were recruited whose major research areas involve emerging technologies and composition/rhetoric. While this department is not attempting to shift a major portion of its curriculum to online media, it recognizes the important role that strategic deployment of online courses may play, particularly in the summer program, and is attempting to ensure that best practices for online teaching are followed and new initiatives in technology are employed with excellence.

E. Program Resources

Faculty

At the time of the previous review, the Department of English Language and Literature had 27 faculty members. Despite the large increase in number of majors over the last five years of the review period (from 118 in 2002 to 213 in 2007), the department currently still has 27 faculty members. The increase has been handled by increasing the instructor ranks from 6 to 9, and by deploying more lecturers and graduate teaching assistants. The end result has been that faculty members teach more courses at the upper level and fewer sections in the first-year writing sequence. This is especially true for faculty in areas such as TESL/Linguistics, Teaching of Writing, and English Education where the existing faculty are sufficient only to meet the needs of majors and graduate students. The current number of faculty members requires the use of around 40 non-tenure track instructors, lecturers and GAs each year, and while this is not necessarily a problem, it does represent a shift in the course distribution over the last period, with a diminished role for tenure-track faculty in the teaching of composition. This does not lessen the department's commitment to teaching writing skills to freshman students, but it has increasingly required the use of part-time faculty to meet that commitment. It is worth considering whether this shift is ultimately in the best interests of the institution. Without additional faculty, the potential for future growth of the department is limited, as is the availability of faculty for teaching freshman seminars or interdisciplinary studies.

Space

Office space also remains a concern, especially given the shift towards more lecturers. It is common to have four or five lecturers and TAs in one space, each of whom are teaching three classes in a semester. This kind of crowding makes it difficult to effectively conduct writing conferences or office hours. Full-time instructors, who currently teach four courses a semester, have also been required to share space. All of the English journals, an active and nationally recognized feature of the department's program, have been forced this year for the first time to work in a single space. While the department strives to deploy resources effectively and to maximum advantage, crowding has an erosive effect on faculty morale.

Classroom space is also an issue for the department, although this is an issue that is broader than the department. The department's programs would make greater use of smart classrooms if more were available. Classroom scheduling has become increasingly difficult and has required that more courses be offered during evenings, weekends, or online.

F. Summarized Survey Results

a. Undergraduate Student Questionnaire

A 55-question survey was administered to 140 undergraduate students during a class period in one of their English classes. A complete listing of the questions and the percentage of responses to each question is provided in the appendices. Two items should be noted: (1) total percentages exceed 100% for those items where students had the option of selecting all responses that they felt applicable, and (2) while almost all of the students answered all the questions, there were some questions (especially near the end of the survey) that were left unanswered by some students. The percentages reported for these questions are based on the students who answered the survey, not the total number of students.

Students were asked questions regarding the program/courses, their participation and involvement, the kinds of activities they encountered in their classes and the extent to which their classes accomplished a number of goals. Students were also asked to reflect on all the English courses they had taken in the department, not just the one in which they were taking the survey.

These students identified themselves as the following:

A. English BA majors	44.29%
B. English BS majors	23.57
C. Creative Writing minors	12.14
D. Linguistics minors	4.29
E. Literature minors	5.71
F. None of the above	20.71

The results of the survey revealed a generally positive level of satisfaction with the administration of the program. 91.43% of the students responded they "Always" or "Frequently" are able to register for the courses they *need*. Only 5% are dissatisfied with the size of their classes, and even fewer (2.86%) are dissatisfied with the quality of instruction. 96% report that the stated objectives of the course are "Always" or "Frequently" met and 85.71% find their courses "Always" or "Frequently" challenging. Only 10% report being dissatisfied with the availability of their adviser, the same percentage that report dissatisfaction with the feedback on academic progress received from English professors. 87.14% are "Satisfied" or "Highly Satisfied" with the accessibility of their professors through office hours and email, and only 6.43% are dissatisfied with the concern that their English professors show for them as students.

Some administrative challenges remain--21.43% reported dissatisfaction with the availability of English courses they need to graduate, and only about 25.18% report

satisfaction with the summer course offerings. These are areas that the department may need to address.

In terms of participation and involvement, most students (71.94%) reported spending 11-20 hours a week in preparation for all their courses, with 78.57% stating that 2-5 hours of that time was spent on each English course they took, with much of that time devoted to drafting and/or revising written assignments. While almost 39.29% do not have an off-campus job (and 88.57% do not have an on-campus job) or spend 5 or less hours a week at such a job, 41.43% state that they spend 16-20+ hours a week at an off-campus job.

Students engage in a diverse array of activities for their program/major. At the time of the survey, students had been engaged in the following activities:

A. Formal presentations	74.10
B. Exams	85.61
C. Research papers (i.e. papers requiring the use of outside sources)	84.29
D. Student journals or self-reflective papers	76.98
E. Student course portfolios (paper or web-based)	64.03
F. Responses on Blackboard, wiki, blog, or other on-line medium	84.17
G. Group projects	74.10
H. Senior Assignment	19.42
I. Literary analysis or other single-source paper	72.66
J. Creative writing	59.71

Nearly half the survey addressed the extent to which the program helped students gain particular skills or grow in certain areas. Examples:

To what extent has this program/class directly helped you grow in the critical thinking within the discipline?

A. Excellent	26.43%
B. Good	55.71
C. Fair	14.29
D. Poor	2.86
E. Don't Know	0.71

To what extent has this program/class directly helped you grow in the creative thinking within the discipline?

A. Excellent	31.43%
B. Good	49.29
C. Fair	12.14
D. Poor	2.86
E. Don't Know	4.29

As the responses above illustrate, the most common answer to many of these areas of growth was "Good," followed by a somewhat lower percentage choosing a rating of "Excellent." This pattern was true also for questions concerning growth in respect for diversity of culture and ideas, growth in preparation for a future career, growth in reading, analysis, and basic knowledge within the discipline. A similar pattern emerged regarding questions directed at their assessment of their professors. Examples:

In the classes in my major, faculty create an environment that reflects mutual respect:

A. Strongly Agree	43.07%
B. Agree	48.91
C. Disagree	5.11
D. Strongly Disagree	2.19
E. Does Not Apply	0.73

My English professors are role models for the profession:

A. Strongly Agree	42.45%
B. Agree	43.17
C. Disagree	8.63
D. Strongly Disagree	2.16
E. Don't Know	3.60

The above pattern was repeated for responses regarding the degree to which English professors motivate students to learn, help students succeed in the program, uphold "challenging-but-achievable" academic performance standards, create an environment where students feel comfortable asking questions, and create an environment where faculty and students work together to address issues posed.

There were four important areas in which English faculty received particularly high ratings. Students feel that professors in this program accept/encourage differences of opinion, create an environment where students feel safe and civility is expected, which also creates an environment where students are required to *think*. A civil, safe, and open place where students can critically engage each other, faculty, and ideas is really what a university education is at its best.

My English professors accept/encourage differences of opinion:

A. Strongly Agree	48.20%
B. Agree	38.85
C. Disagree	9.35
D. Strongly Disagree	2.88
E. Don't Know	0.72

In the classes in my major, faculty create an environment where civility is expected:

A. Strongly Agree   58.82%
B. Agree   36.76
C. Disagree   2.21
D. Strongly Disagree   0.74
E. Don't Know   1.47

In the classes in my major, faculty create an environment where I feel safe:

A. Strongly Agree   60.15%
B. Agree   36.09
C. Disagree   1.50
D. Strongly Disagree   0.75
E. Don't Know   1.50

In the classes in my major, faculty create an environment that requires me to think:

A. Strongly Agree   53.79%
B. Agree   43.94
C. Disagree   2.27
D. Strongly Disagree   0.00
E. Don't Know   0.00

b. Faculty Questionnaire

A 62-question survey was made available to all faculty. 26 of 27 faculty members completed this questionnaire. A complete listing of the questions and the percentage of responses to each question is provided in the appendices. As before with the undergraduate questionnaire, total percentages exceed 100% for those items where faculty had the option of selecting all responses that they felt applicable, and percentages reported for these questions are based on the faculty who answered each question, not the total number of faculty. Additionally, it should be noted that since this is a smaller number of respondents than for the undergraduate questionnaire, responses of 3-4% for an item may numerically translate into the response of a single faculty member; nevertheless, the high response rate of the faculty (96%) should mean that responses have a high level of validity for this group.

Faculty members were asked questions regarding the program morale/"working atmosphere," support/resources, policies and procedures, communication, program goals/outcomes/objectives, and the department's Senior Assignment. A number of questions were also asked that were related specifically to graduate programs; however, the results of this portion of the questionnaire are reported in the Graduate Program Review Self-Study document.

Despite the fact that this survey was administered in a difficult year for faculty (due to the general economic downturn in the economy, with the resulting effects of a college budget reduction exercise), morale in the department remained good. Most respondents view the level of collegiality among the faculty as "Excellent," feel morale is "Good" or "Excellent," feel their contributions are rewarded and that they are valued by their colleagues. Not a single faculty member rated the level at which "faculty work together to get the program 'work' done" as poor.

Faculty generally appear to be satisfied with the level of support for their scholarship and teaching. They are satisfied with the secretarial support, the processes by which teaching load is distributed and courses assigned. There is a bit less satisfaction with evaluation procedures for faculty merit and promotion, although 72% believe tenure procedures are "Effective" or "Very Effective." While 73% feel policies and procedures with respect to faculty diversity are "Effective" or "Very Effective," 19% disagreed.

Strongest levels of dissatisfaction regarding program resources were registered for the buildings, physical environment and facilities in which faculty teach (only one person was "Very Satisfied") and the *Banner* system for advising. Most faculty are satisfied with the *Blackboard* course management system, the "smart classrooms" on campus, computer lab accessibility, and web access from on and off campus.

Only one respondent felt the department chairperson is "Ineffective;" most ranked the chairperson "Very effective." None of the faculty felt the policies and procedures are ineffective with respect to faculty input, review or revision of program goals and objectives.

There were two questions posed about communication within the department. Responses for each are given here:

How does the department inform *YOU* of its program goals, objectives, expectations, and standards for faculty and student performance? (Mark all that apply)

A. Handbook (web or paper based)	80.77%
B. Handouts or Fact/Policy Sheets	26.92
C. Departmental faculty meetings	84.62
D. Informal discussions with colleagues	76.92
E. Individual discussion with chair	69.23
F. Email/list-serve discussions	53.85
G. Blackboard site	65.38
H. Other	3.85

How does the department gain information regarding the quality of *YOUR* teaching & its effectiveness? (Mark all that apply)

A. End-of-semester written evaluations by students	96.15%
B. Chairperson classroom visits and observations	3.85
C. Faculty colleague classroom visits and observations	50.00
D. External evaluators	3.85
E. Faculty teaching portfolios	19.23
F. Individual interviews	30.77
G. Annual Faculty Reports	61.54
H. Other	7.69

Literature faculty are more directly involved with the Senior Assignment (SRA) than those in other areas of the department; for this reason, quite a few faculty members responded that they are "Not Active" in the SRA or that certain questions were "Not Applicable" to them. Among those who did respond, most report good knowledge of the SRA, at least some participation in it, active participation in the evaluation and assessment of the SRA and in discussions of program changes based on SRA results.

G. Student Learning Outcomes

This section provides a description of the current benchmarks and student learning outcomes that the department is using to track student progress and evaluate the effectiveness of the program. The collection of data that may be analyzed for student learning has previously been a weakness for this program. During the last academic year and into the summer months, the department has been working to address this weakness and has now developed a comprehensive plan to assess its majors. Due to the newness of this plan, little relevant data is available, other than student questionnaire data (summarized in the previous section) and student grades. The department has now put structures in place to collect the kind of data needed for better program evaluation.

Undergraduate Assessment Program (2009)

The English department has revised the undergraduate assessment program with the goal of receiving a more holistic set of data about student development. The previous program primarily used student grades from the course, English 497A Senior Seminar, as the marker of students' success at meeting English Department program goals. The revised plan uses a rubric and digital portfolio system to assess how students develop throughout their time as English majors. The revised plan includes more faculty members in the assessment process, and it allows for a comparative analysis of a sampling of student work so that the department can determine how the faculty, as a body, interprets the learning outcomes of its students. These changes will allow the department to more effectively take student performance into account when considering curricular changes. Appendix D provides a copy of the Department of English Language and Literature's assessment rubric, which details benchmarks, performance indicators, and assessment guidelines.

Portfolio
One of the most important goals of the revised program is to integrate assessment into student life; consequently, the new portfolio system requires students to begin collecting materials on the professional portfolio website Epsilen when they complete the first English department class required of majors, English 200 Introduction to Literary Study. By beginning the process early, the new program encourages students to see the value in collecting their work and to become invested in their own academic growth. The completed portfolio will include one paper from the following required English courses: English 200 Introduction to Literary Study, English 301 Introduction to Literary Theory and Criticism, and English 497A Senior Seminar. Students are required to submit their papers to Epsilen in order to receive a passing grade in these courses (see Appendix E: Learning Portfolios, distributed to students in English 200 and 301). Students will also include an additional paper of their choosing that best exemplifies their abilities and interests. Upon completion of English 497A, students will write a self-reflection about their development and future goals as English majors, using the department's assessment rubric and prompts as guides (see Appendix F: Senior Portfolio Instructions, distributed to students in English 497A). The department has chosen Epsilen as a site for portfolio

development and storage with the hope that students will continue to use it to display their accomplishments to prospective employers.

Senior Assignment Department-Wide Conferences

Public presentations of students' senior assignment projects are included in the revised assessment program. This both allows the department to assess the oral communication skills of its students and helps to foster a stronger learning community among students and faculty. At the end of each semester, the English Department will hold a conference that showcases senior assignment projects. Students may invite their friends and family to the event, as well. Students will be arranged in panels of three to four according to their topics. Each student will give a short presentation of his/her work (10-minute maximum) and participate in a question and answer session. Three to four panels will run concurrently in two to three sessions, depending on the number of students. The entire faculty will be encouraged to attend and to complete short rubrics on the presentations (see Appendix G: Senior Conference Presentations, distributed to involved students and faculty). The rubrics will be collected and tallied for each student so that they can be taken into consideration for Benchmark #3 (displays good oral communication skills) on the departmental assessment rubric.

Assessment Process

In order to complete the task of assessment, the English Department is establishing a subcommittee of the curriculum committee with five rotating members from the faculty at large. The Director of Undergraduate Studies will be the committee chair and the one constant committee member.

During finals week, the Director of Undergraduate Studies will obtain students' portfolio links from English 497A instructors. English 497A has a cap of 15 students, and there are five sections of the course offered each academic year (two fall, two spring, one summer). Each year, this will result in approximately seventy-five student portfolios to assess. In order to complete the assessment report that includes data on all graduating students for the Office of Assessment, each committee member will be responsible for scoring approximately 15 portfolios. A Blackboard survey version of the assessment rubric will be housed on the English Department's Blackboard site where members of the subcommittee will enter their scores in order to maintain a consistent record of the data from each semester.

To ensure consistency in scoring, the subcommittee will meet for norming sessions in January before assessing the portfolios collected in the fall and in August before assessing the portfolios collected in the spring and summer. During these meetings the subcommittee will read sample portfolios that include below average, average, and above average work not included in the year's assessment (for the first norming session the department is using portfolios created during the pilot 497A class this summer). After the subcommittee scores these samples, they will discuss their scoring criteria with the other subcommittee members, eventually agreeing upon what does not meet, meets, or exceeds expectations as a group. At these norming sessions the Director of Undergraduate Studies will give each committee member his or her own list of student portfolio links to assess

along with the presentation rubrics completed for each of those students during the senior assignment conference.

In addition to the student-wide assessment required by the Office of Assessment, the department has chosen to also include a comparative analysis system into the revised assessment program to monitor the consistency of scoring and to elicit an ongoing faculty conversation about department goals and student progress. Every fall, the Director of Undergraduate Studies will download a random sampling of 20% of the previous year's student portfolios from Epsilen and upload them to the English Department's Blackboard site. Depending on class size, the sampling will include approximately 15 portfolios each year. The members of the assessment subcommittee will then assess all of the portfolios in the sample to discuss trends occurring in student work and how the data collected from assessment should guide future curricular changes.

H. Program Strengths

A number of the strengths of the Department of English Language and Literature were highlighted in part D, under the section *Outstanding Program Achievements*, namely the vibrant growth in the number of majors, the high level of engagement by students, increasing efforts at internationalization, and several outstanding curricular reforms. In addition to these achievements, it should be mentioned that a key strength of the department is that it is not narrowly focused in a single area, but is home to a truly integrated "English Studies" approach. English majors take courses in literature, linguistics, composition, literary theory, and they rub shoulders with students focused on English Education, Teaching English as Second Language, Teaching of Writing, Creative Writing, and Poetry. Furthermore, collegiality among faculty both within and across specializations in the department is excellent. There is increasing cross-fertilization between literature, creative writing, linguistics, and composition that enliven the intellectual life of the department and, unlike many departments that house such a broad set of specialties, the faculty and programs in this department work together harmoniously, with a noticeable absence of the kind of turf-battles that are unfortunately too common in English Departments.

The department has seen a great deal of faculty turnover in the past 5-10 years, which has led to an energetic, new faculty adept in recent advances in their areas of specialization. These faculty have played an important role in the development of a departmental pedagogical attitude overall that has shifted towards student learning and away from being solely teacher centered. Working together with veteran members of the department, the younger faculty has demonstrated a strong commitment to curricular reform and assessment. Several regular programs within the department now promote pedagogical discussion, discuss content and grading, and encourage peer-review.

The addition of a graduate specialization in Creative Writing has especially added a vibrant quality to the departmental community, with readings, speakers, and interesting students. Faculty in this area are some of the most productive writers and poets in the region, whose books have been selected for some of the highest national honors awarded in their areas.

The SIUE Department of English Language & Literature remains the editorial home to two active professional journals: *PLL: Papers on Language and Literature*, an internationally recognized scholarly journal of criticism, founded in 1965, which is published quarterly, and *Sou'wester*, a literary magazine of fiction and poetry established in 1960. In addition to these, the department is now providing additional support for a third journal: *Postmedieval: A Journal of Medieval Cultural Studies*, a cross-disciplinary, peer-reviewed journal in medieval studies published three times a year.

I.   Areas of Improvement

Overall, the Department of English Language and Literature is experiencing a good, positive time in its life. Faculty morale is good, collegiality is excellent, there is a lot of energy in the department, high-quality scholarship is being produced, new curricular changes are in place and student success is on the rise.

Nevertheless, there are still a number of things that the department can do to build upon the quality of its program.

For example, while the student-led organization (ELLA) was a great success during this period, a few students were primarily responsible for that success. Most students, undergraduate or graduate, spend little time in organized student events and even less time volunteering or engaging in activities that demonstrate a sense of "personal and collective responsibility for the social and natural environment" (from the CAS desired characteristics). There may be more that the department can do to instill greater participation in the local and global community.

While the department has made some strides in undergraduate advising, it is clear that not all issues related to advising and student success have been fully addressed. Since the college is moving towards a professional advising corps, the department will face the challenge of meeting mentoring needs without the institutionally-directed necessity for students and faculty to meet together regularly.

The changing student culture at SIUE may require continuing adaptation in program delivery methods and higher standards of rigor in some courses. Student needs for greater flexibility in scheduling and more summer offerings may require increased use of instructional technology to enhance web-assisted, online, or distance courses; however meeting student needs is a complex issue: The faculty questionnaire revealed that only 50% of the faculty feel the program is sufficiently rigorous, while at the same time only 34% believe that students come into courses with adequate background knowledge. The number of faculty members in the department has remained relatively constant, even though the department now teaches 2-3 times more majors than it first did with this number of faculty. That will continue to create scheduling and programming challenges.

While the program has a solid commitment to diversity, it still faces a continuing challenge to recruit and retain quality minority faculty in all areas, not just those related to African-American literature. The department should do all that it can to increase diversity in its student population and faculty alike.

J. Appendices

Appendix A. Faculty Survey Data

As part of our program review, our Department is currently collecting information from all our tenure-track faculty and instructors. Please take some time to complete this questionnaire and return it to Jean in the English Department office. Your feedback will be collected anonymously, compiled by the office of assessment, and reported in aggregate. Your candid answers are important to us so that we receive data that we may use to reflect upon what we do well and what we could do better.

Thanks for your time and attention to this matter,

Larry LaFond

Faculty Questionnaire for Undergraduate and Graduate Program Review

Program morale/atmosphere. Please provide feedback on the "working atmosphere" in the program.

1. Collegiality among faculty
A. Excellent   57.69%
B. Good   34.62
C. Fair   3.85
D. Poor   3.85

2. Morale in department
A. Excellent   26.92%
B. Good   53.85
C. Fair   15.38
D. Poor   3.85

3. Faculty work together to get the program "work" done
A. Excellent   34.62%
B. Good   50.00
C. Fair   15.38
D. Poor   0.00

4. Do you feel valued by your colleagues?
A. Excellent   50.00%
B. Good   34.62
C. Fair   11.54
D. Poor   3.85

5. Do you feel your contributions are rewarded?
A. Excellent   26.92%
B. Good   42.31
C. Fair   23.08
D. Poor   7.69

Support/resources. Please provide feedback on the support/resources you receive as they relate to your ability to provide a quality program.

6. "Basic" resources (office, computer)
A. Excellent	42.31%
B. Good	38.46
C. Fair	19.23
D. Poor	0.00

7. Support for your scholarship (i.e. travel funds, release time, research equipment, etc.)
A. Excellent	28.00%
B. Good	28.00
C. Fair	32.00
D. Poor	12.00

8. Support for your teaching
A. Excellent	46.15%
B. Good	46.15
C. Fair	3.85
D. Poor	3.85

9. Secretarial support
A. Excellent	50.00%
B. Good	46.15
C. Fair	3.85
D. Poor	0.00

10. How *satisfied* are you with the process by which the teaching load is distributed?
A. Very Satisfied	32.00%
B. Satisfied	60.00
C. Dissatisfied	8.00
D. Very Dissatisfied	0.00
E. Not Applicable	0.00

11. How *satisfied* are you with the process by which courses are assigned to faculty?
A. Very Satisfied	57.69%
B. Satisfied	30.77
C. Dissatisfied	11.54
D. Very Dissatisfied	0.00
E. Not Applicable	0.00

12. How *satisfied* are you with the process by which the effectiveness of teaching is evaluated?

A. Very Satisfied	23.08%
B. Satisfied	53.85
C. Dissatisfied	19.23
D. Very Dissatisfied	3.85
E. Not Applicable	0.00

13. How effective are the policies and procedures with respect to faculty merit?

A. Very Effective	26.92%
B. Effective	38.46
C. Ineffective	19.23
D. Very Ineffective	3.85
E. Not Applicable	11.54

14. How effective are the policies and procedures with respect to faculty promotion?

A. Very Effective	36.00%
B. Effective	28.00
C. Ineffective	16.00
D. Very Ineffective	0.00
E. Not Applicable	20.00

15. How effective are the policies and procedures with respect to faculty tenure?

A. Very Effective	36.00%
B. Effective	36.00
C. Ineffective	8.00
D. Very Ineffective	0.00
E. Not Applicable	20.00

16. How effective are the policies and procedures with respect to faculty diversity?

A. Very Effective	23.08%
B. Effective	50.00
C. Ineffective	11.54
D. Very Ineffective	7.69
E. Not Applicable	7.69

Policies and Procedures.

17. How effective are the policies and procedures with respect to chairperson?

A. Very Effective	50.00%
B. Effective	38.46
C. Ineffective	3.85
D. Very Ineffective	0.00
E. Don't Know	7.69

18. How effective are the policies and procedures with respect to advanced placement & proficiencies?

A. Very Effective   19.23%
B. Effective   30.77
C. Ineffective   3.85
D. Very Ineffective   0.00
E. Don't Know   46.15

19. How effective are the policies and procedures with respect to student admission, advisement, retention, and recruitment?

A. Very Effective   7.69%
B. Effective   42.31
C. Ineffective   15.38
D. Very Ineffective   0.00
E. Don't Know   34.62

20. How effective are the policies and procedures with respect to faculty input/process of review/revision of program goals/objectives?

A. Very Effective   30.77%
B. Effective   57.69
C. Ineffective   0.00
D. Very Ineffective   0.00
E. Don't Know   11.54

21. **Communication.** How does the department inform *YOU* of its program goals, objectives, expectations, and standards for faculty and student performance? (Mark all that apply)

A. Handbook (web or paper based)   80.77%
B. Handouts or Fact/Policy Sheets   26.92
C. Departmental faculty meetings   84.62
D. Informal discussions with colleagues   76.92
E. Individual discussion with chair   69.23
F. Email/list-serve discussions   53.85
G. Blackboard site   65.38
H. Other   3.85

22. How does the department gain information regarding the quality of *YOUR* teaching & their effectiveness? (Mark all that apply)

A. End-of-semester written evaluations by students   96.15%
B. Chairperson classroom visits and observations   3.85
C. Faculty colleague classroom visits and observations   50.00
D. External evaluators   3.85
E. Faculty teaching portfolios   19.23
F. Individual interviews   30.77
G. Annual Faculty Reports   61.54
H. Other   7.69

Program resources.

23. How satisfied are you with program resources such as the buildings, physical environment, and facilities in which you teach?
A. Very Satisfied   3.85%
B. Satisfied   42.31
C. Dissatisfied   42.31
D. Very Dissatisfied   11.54

24. How satisfied are you with program resources such as the equipment and supplies available?
A. Very Satisfied   15.38%
B. Satisfied   69.23
C. Dissatisfied   11.54
D. Very Dissatisfied   3.85

25. How satisfied are you with advising resources such as Banner?
A. Very Satisfied   3.85%
B. Satisfied   38.46
C. Dissatisfied   19.23
D. Very Dissatisfied   30.77
E. Not Applicable   7.69

26. How satisfied are you with technology teaching resources such as Blackboard?
A. Very Satisfied   19.23%
B. Satisfied   57.69
C. Dissatisfied   11.54
D. Very Dissatisfied   11.54
E. Not Applicable   0.00

27. How satisfied are you with program resources such as "smart classrooms" on campus?
A. Very Satisfied   15.38%
B. Satisfied   57.69
C. Dissatisfied   19.23
D. Very Dissatisfied   0.00
E. Not Applicable   7.69

28. How satisfied are you with program resources such as computer lab accessibility?
A. Very Satisfied   11.54%
B. Satisfied   42.31
C. Dissatisfied   19.23
D. Very Dissatisfied   0.00
E. Not Applicable   26.92

29. How satisfied are you with program resources such as web access from on-campus terminals?

A. Very Satisfied   42.31%
B. Satisfied   53.85
C. Dissatisfied   3.85
D. Very Dissatisfied   0.00

30. How satisfied are you with program resources such as web access from off campus computers?

A. Very Satisfied   30.77%
B. Satisfied   46.15
C. Dissatisfied   19.23
D. Very Dissatisfied   3.85

31. How satisfied are you with program resources such as technical assistance?

A. Very Satisfied   3.85%
B. Satisfied   50.00
C. Dissatisfied   34.62
D. Very Dissatisfied   11.54

32. How satisfied are you with program resources such as faculty development/learning workshops for technology?

A. Very Satisfied   4.00%
B. Satisfied   72.00
C. Dissatisfied   16.00
D. Very Dissatisfied   8.00

Program Goals/Outcomes/Objectives.

33. Given the goals & objectives of this undergraduate program, would you claim that: (Mark all that apply)

A. the program is timely/up to date   69.23%
B. the program is rigorous   50.00
C. the program utilizes professional standards   65.38
D. student grades accurately reflect student learning   46.15
E. students come to your courses w/adequate background knowledge 34.62
F. the program prepares students to pass external licensure   38.46
G. the program offers suitable foundation courses   84.62
H. the program offers suitable core courses   84.62
I. courses are appropriately sequenced   61.54

The Senior Assignment (SRA). Please provide feedback on your knowledge & participation with the senior assignment.

34. My knowledge of senior assignment is
A. Excellent   30.77%
B. Good   34.62
C. Fair   15.38
D. Poor   7.69
E. Not Applicable   11.54

35. My participation with the SRA
A. Very Active   19.23%
B. Active   11.54
C. Somewhat Active   23.08
D. Not Active   19.23
E. Not Applicable   26.92

36. My participation in the evaluation and assessment of the SRA
A. Very Active   15.38%
B. Active   15.38
C. Somewhat Active   11.54
D. Not Active   23.08
E. Not Applicable   34.62

37. My participation in faculty discussions of the overall SRA results
A. Very Active   7.69%
B. Active   19.23
C. Somewhat Active   19.23
D. Not Active   19.23
E. Not Applicable   34.62

38. My participation in discussions of program changes based on SRA results
A. Very Active   11.54%
B. Active   23.08
C. Somewhat Active   7.69
D. Not Active   19.23
E. Not Applicable   38.46

How adequate is this GRADUATE program for the preparation of your majors, in reference to:

39. Advanced knowledge and skills in the discipline
A. Excellent   32.00%
B. Good   40.00
C. Fair   16.00
D. Poor   0.00
E. Not Applicable   12.00

40. Career expectations
A. Excellent   28.00%
B. Good   36.00
C. Fair   16.00
D. Poor   8.00
E. Not Applicable   12.00

41. Future educational goals
A. Excellent   32.00%
B. Good   36.00
C. Fair   20.00
D. Poor   0.00
E. Not Applicable   12.00

To what extent are the GRADUATE students being taught the following?

42. The theoretical foundations of the discipline
A. Always   44.00%
B. Frequently   40.00
C. Occasionally   4.00
D. Never   0.00
E. Not Applicable   12.00

43. The major issues of the discipline
A. Always   40.00%
B. Frequently   40.00
C. Occasionally   8.00
D. Never   0.00
E. Not Applicable   12.00

44. The methods/techniques of the discipline
A. Always   48.00%
B. Frequently   36.00
C. Occasionally   4.00
D. Never   0.00
E. Not Applicable   12.00

45. How to communicate effectively the knowledge of the discipline
A. Always   20.00%
B. Frequently   56.00
C. Occasionally   12.00
D. Never   0.00
E. Not Applicable   12.00

46. How to think analytically
A. Always   40.00%
B. Frequently   40.00
C. Occasionally   8.00
D. Never   0.00
E. Not Applicable   12.00

47. How to apply the knowledge of the discipline
A. Always   24.00%
B. Frequently   52.00
C. Occasionally   12.00
D. Never   0.00
E. Not Applicable   12.00

48. The values/ethics/best practices of the discipline
A. Always   24.00%
B. Frequently   52.00
C. Occasionally   8.00
D. Never   0.00
E. Not Applicable   16.00

For each of the following, rate the GRADUATE program.

49. Admissions requirements
A. Excellent   8.00%
B. Good   36.00
C. Fair   28.00
D. Poor   4.00
E. Not Applicable   24.00

50. Degree requirements
A. Excellent   36.00%
B. Good   28.00
C. Fair   20.00
D. Poor   0.00
E. Not Applicable   16.00

51. Plan of Study Requirements (core curriculum)
A. Excellent   28.00%
B. Good   48.00
C. Fair   8.00
D. Poor   0.00
E. Not Applicable   16.00

52. Specializations/options
A. Excellent   40.00%
B. Good   36.00
C. Fair   8.00
D. Poor   0.00
E. Not Applicable   16.00

53. Specific course offerings
A. Excellent   16.67%
B. Good   66.67
C. Fair   4.17
D. Poor   0.00
E. Not Applicable   12.50

Indicate the strengths of your unit.

54. Quality of faculty
A. Excellent   65.38%
B. Good   30.77
C. Fair   3.85
D. Poor   0.00
E. Not Applicable   0.00

55. Quality of undergraduate curriculum
A. Excellent   34.62%
B. Good   61.54
C. Fair   3.85
D. Poor   0.00
E. Not Applicable   0.00

56. Quality of graduate curriculum
A. Excellent   30.77%
B. Good   46.15
C. Fair   15.38
D. Poor   0.00
E. Not Applicable   7.69

57. Quality of undergraduate students
A. Excellent   3.85%
B. Good   46.15
C. Fair   50.00
D. Poor   0.00
E. Not Applicable 0.00

58. Quality of graduate students
A. Excellent   3.85%
B. Good   57.69
C. Fair   23.08
D. Poor   0.00
E. Not Applicable 15.38

59. Research/creative activity
A. Excellent   30.77%
B. Good   50.00
C. Fair   11.54
D. Poor   0.00
E. Not Applicable 7.69

60. Public service
A. Excellent   16.00%
B. Good   32.00
C. Fair   32.00
D. Poor   0.00
E. Not Applicable 20.00

61. Physical facilities
A. Excellent   0.00%
B. Good   34.62
C. Fair   42.31
D. Poor   23.08
E. Not Applicable 0.00

62. Given the goals & objectives of your graduate specialization, would you claim that: (Mark all that apply)
A. the program is timely/up to date   69.57%
B. the program is rigorous   52.17
C. the program utilizes professional standards   95.65
D. student grades accurately reflect student learning   52.17
E. students come to your courses w/adequate background knowledge 30.43
F. the program prepares students to pass external licensure 39.13
G. the program offers suitable foundation courses   86.96
H. the program offers suitable core courses   78.26
I. courses are appropriately sequenced   52.17

Appendix B. Undergraduate Student Survey Data

As part of our program review, the Department of English Language and Literature is currently collecting information from students about our programs. We ask that you complete this questionnaire (**only once**) to provide feedback to us about your experience as a student. Your answers, which will be compiled in aggregate, will provide us with data that we will use to reflect upon what we do well and what we could do differently.

Thank you for your input.
Larry L. LaFond,
Chair, Department of English Language and Literature

Student Questionnaire for Undergraduate Program Review: Department of English Language and Literature

Please provide your feedback for the following areas of your program:

1. Which of the following track are you? (Select all that apply.)

A. English BA major	44.29%
B. English BS major	23.57
C. Creative Writing minor	12.14
D. Linguistics minor	4.29
E. Literature minor	5.71
F. None of the above	20.71

Program/Courses:

When answering the following questions, think about all your English courses, not just this one.

2. I register for and get enrolled in the English courses I need.

A. Always	47.14%
B. Frequently	44.29
C. Occasionally	7.14
D. Never	0.00
E. Don't Know	0.71

3. I achieve most of the stated objectives for my English courses.

A. Always	43.57%
B. Frequently	52.86
C. Occasionally	2.14
D. Never	0.00
E. Don't Know	1.43

4. My English courses have been appropriately challenging.

A. Always	47.14%
B. Frequently	38.57
C. Occasionally	13.57
D. Never	0.00
E. Don't Know	0.71

5. How satisfied are you with the **class sizes** of English courses:

A. Highly satisfied	26.43%
B. Satisfied	47.14
C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	20.71
D. Dissatisfied	5.00
E. Don't Know	0.71

6. How satisfied are you with the **quality of instruction** in English courses:

A. Highly satisfied	37.14%
B. Satisfied	48.57
C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	10.71
D. Dissatisfied	2.86
E. Don't Know	0.71

7. How satisfied are you with the **availability of your academic adviser(s):**

A. Highly satisfied	35.71%
B. Satisfied	30.71
C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	20.00
D. Dissatisfied	10.00
E. Don't Know	3.57

8. How satisfied are you with the **times at which English courses are offered:**

A. Highly satisfied	20.00%
B. Satisfied	45.71
C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	18.57
D. Dissatisfied	15.71
E. Don't Know	0.00

9. How satisfied are you with the **sequencing of the English courses offered:**

A. Highly satisfied	6.43%
B. Satisfied	50.00
C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	30.71
D. Dissatisfied	7.86
E. Don't Know	5.00

10. How satisfied are you with the **availability of English courses you need to graduate:**

A. Highly satisfied	14.29%
B. Satisfied	40.00
C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	19.29
D. Dissatisfied	21.43
E. Don't Know	5.00

11. How satisfied are you with the **total number of English courses scheduled per semester:**

A. Highly satisfied	11.43%
B. Satisfied	46.43
C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	26.43
D. Dissatisfied	12.86
E. Don't Know	2.86

12. How satisfied are you with the **daytime English course offerings:**

A. Highly satisfied	19.42%
B. Satisfied	53.24
C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	14.39
D. Dissatisfied	10.07
E. Don't Know	2.88

13. How satisfied are you with the **evening English course offerings:**

A. Highly satisfied	8.57%
B. Satisfied	34.29
C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	26.43
D. Dissatisfied	9.29
E. Don't Know	21.43

14. How satisfied are you with the **summer English course offerings:**

A. Highly satisfied	0.72%
B. Satisfied	24.46
C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	19.42
D. Dissatisfied	14.39
E. Don't Know	40.29

15. Overall, how satisfied are you with the **feedback from English professors about your academic progress in your courses:**

A. Highly satisfied	24.29%
B. Satisfied	48.57
C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	13.57
D. Dissatisfied	10.00
E. Don't Know	3.57

16. How satisfied are you with the **concern English professors show for you as a student:**

A. Highly satisfied	35.00%
B. Satisfied	39.29
C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	19.29
D. Dissatisfied	6.43
E. Don't Know	0.00

17. How satisfied are you with the **accessibility (e.g. during office hours and/or through email response) of English professors:**

A. Highly satisfied	38.57%
B. Satisfied	48.57
C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	10.00
D. Dissatisfied	1.43
E. Don't Know	1.43

Facilities and Services:

18. How satisfied are you with the **classrooms:**

A. Highly satisfied	6.43%
B. Satisfied	45.00
C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	30.71
D. Dissatisfied	17.86
E. Don't Know	0.00

19. How satisfied are you with the **Lovejoy Library resources relevant to English courses:**

A. Highly satisfied	25.00%
B. Satisfied	45.00
C. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	17.86
D. Dissatisfied	4.29
E. Don't Know	7.86

Student Participation/Involvement:

20. How many hours per week do you typically **spend in all courses:**

A. 0-5	8.63%
B. 6-10	16.55
C. 11-15	47.48
D. 16-20	24.46
E. 20+	2.88

21. How many hours per week do you typically **spend preparing/reading for each English course:**

A. 0-1	3.57%
B. 2-3	50.00
C. 4-5	28.57
D. 6-7	7.86
E. 7+	10.00

22. How many hours per week do you typically **spend drafting and/or revising written assignments each English course:**

A. 0-1	12.23%
B. 2-3	56.83
C. 4-5	22.30
D. 6-7	7.19
E. 7+	1.44

23. How many hours per week do you typically **spend employed at an off-campus job:**

A. 0-5	39.29%
B. 6-10	6.43
C. 11-15	12.86
D. 16-20	14.29
E. 20+	27.14

24. How many hours per week do you typically **spend employed at an on-campus job:**

A. 0-5	88.57%
B. 6-10	1.43
C. 11-15	2.14
D. 16-20	4.29
E. 20+	3.57

25. How many hours per week do you typically **spend in organized student activities:**

A. 0-5	85.00%
B. 6-10	10.71
C. 11-15	1.43
D. 16-20	0.71
E. 20+	2.14

26. How many hours per week do you typically **spend volunteering:**

A. 0-5	95.00%
B. 6-10	4.29
C. 11-15	0.71
D. 16-20	0.00
E. 20+	0.00

27. Which of the following activities have you completed for this program/major? (Select that apply)

A. Formal presentations	74.10%
B. Exams	85.61
C. Research papers (i.e. papers requiring the use of outside sources)	84.29
D. Student journals or self-reflective papers	76.98
E. Student course portfolios (paper or web-based)	64.03
F. Responses on Blackboard, wiki, blog, or other on-line medium	84.17
G. Group projects	74.10
H. Senior Assignment	19.42
I. Literary analysis or other single-source paper	72.66
J. Creative writing	59.71

28. To what extent has this program/class directly helped you grow in the **basic knowledge within the discipline:**

A. Excellent	29.29%
B. Good	56.43
C. Fair	13.57
D. Poor	0.71
E. Don't Know	0.00

29. To what extent has this program/class directly helped you grow in the **critical thinking within the discipline:**

A. Excellent   26.43%
B. Good   55.71
C. Fair   14.29
D. Poor   2.86
E. Don't Know   0.71

30. To what extent has this program/class directly helped you grow in the **creative thinking within the discipline:**

A. Excellent   31.43%
B. Good   49.29
C. Fair   12.14
D. Poor   2.86
E. Don't Know   4.29

31. To what extent has this program/class directly helped you grow in the **writing within the discipline:**

A. Excellent   31.43%
B. Good   53.57
C. Fair   11.43
D. Poor   0.71
E. Don't Know   2.86

32. To what extent has this program/class directly helped you grow in the **speaking within the discipline:**

A. Excellent   17.14%
B. Good   45.71
C. Fair   27.14
D. Poor   5.00
E. Don't Know   5.00

33. To what extent has this program/class directly helped you grow in the **sense of ethical research/citation practices within the discipline:**

A. Excellent   31.43%
B. Good   41.43
C. Fair   15.00
D. Poor   5.71
E. Don't Know   6.43

34. To what extent has this program/class directly helped you grow in the **respect for diversity of culture and ideas:**

A. Excellent	33.57%
B. Good	38.57
C. Fair	20.71
D. Poor	3.57
E. Don't Know	3.57

35. To what extent has this program/class directly helped you grow in **seeking opportunities for future education:**

A. Excellent	17.14%
B. Good	38.57
C. Fair	25.71
D. Poor	7.86
E. Don't Know	10.71

36. To what extent has this program/class directly helped you grow in the **preparation for a future career:**

A. Excellent	25.18%
B. Good	38.85
C. Fair	24.46
D. Poor	7.19
E. Does Not Apply	4.32

41. To what extent has this program/class directly helped you grow in the **foundation in the liberal arts and sciences:**

A. Excellent	11.51%
B. Good	59.71
C. Fair	15.83
D. Poor	2.88
E. Don't Know	10.07

42. To what extent has this program/class directly helped you grow in your **reading within discipline:**

A. Excellent	28.06%
B. Good	56.12
C. Fair	15.83
D. Poor	0.00
E. Don't Know	0.00

43. To what extent has this program/class directly helped you grow in your **analysis within discipline:**

A. Excellent	28.99%
B. Good	53.62
C. Fair	15.22
D. Poor	1.45
E. Don't Know	0.72

44. My English professors **motivate me to learn:**

A. Strongly Agree	35.97%
B. Agree	58.99
C. Disagree	3.60
D. Strongly Disagree	1.44
E. Don't Know	0.00

45. My English professors **help me to succeed in the program:**

A. Strongly Agree	32.37%
B. Agree	57.55
C. Disagree	7.19
D. Strongly Disagree	0.72
E. Don't Know	2.16

46. My English professors **are role models for the profession:**

A. Strongly Agree	42.45%
B. Agree	43.17
C. Disagree	8.63
D. Strongly Disagree	2.16
E. Don't Know	3.60

47. My English professors **accept/encourage differences of opinion:**

A. Strongly Agree	48.20%
B. Agree	38.85
C. Disagree	9.35
D. Strongly Disagree	2.88
E. Don't Know	0.72

48. My English professors **provide helpful feedback on assignments:**

A. Strongly Agree	38.69%
B. Agree	50.36
C. Disagree	8.76
D. Strongly Disagree	2.19
E. Don't Know	0.00

49. My English professors **uphold "challenging-but-achievable" academic performance standards:**

A. Strongly Agree	32.12%
B. Agree	57.66
C. Disagree	7.30
D. Strongly Disagree	1.46
E. Don't Know	1.46

50. In the classes in my major, faculty create an environment **that reflects mutual respect:**

A. Strongly Agree	43.07%
B. Agree	48.91
C. Disagree	5.11
D. Strongly Disagree	2.19
E. Does Not Apply	0.73

51. In the classes in my major, faculty create an environment **where I feel comfortable asking questions:**

A. Strongly Agree	34.31%
B. Agree	52.55
C. Disagree	10.95
D. Strongly Disagree	1.46
E. Don't Know	0.73

52. In the classes in my major, faculty create an environment **where civility is expected:**

A. Strongly Agree	58.82%
B. Agree	36.76
C. Disagree	2.21
D. Strongly Disagree	0.74
E. Don't Know	1.47

53. In the classes in my major, faculty create an environment **where I feel safe:**

A. Strongly Agree   60.15%
B. Agree   36.09
C. Disagree   1.50
D. Strongly Disagree   0.75
E. Don't Know   1.50

54. In the classes in my major, faculty create an environment **that requires me to think:**

A. Strongly Agree   53.79%
B. Agree   43.94
C. Disagree   2.27
D. Strongly Disagree   0.00
E. Don't Know   0.00

55. In the classes in my major, faculty create an environment **where we work together to address issues posed:**

A. Strongly Agree   31.06%
B. Agree   62.88
C. Disagree   3.03
D. Strongly Disagree   1.52
E. Don't Know   1.52

Appendix D:
Assessment Rubric:
Benchmarks, Performance Indicators, and Guidelines

Benchmark/ Outcome	Performance Indicators	Assessment Guidelines

#1 Reads critically and with comprehension	· Papers in portfolio
	· Letter of reflection
		· Exceeds
		  · Able to both frame analytical questions about reading and generate creative and productive answers.
		  · Expands the close reading of symbols or ideas to build an argument about student's own observations
		  · Demonstrates with examples how student's own reading ability has progressed
		· Meets
		  · Able to frame analytical questions about reading
		  · Close reads texts looking for symbols or ideas
		  · Recognizes a progression in student's own reading ability
		· Does Not Meet
		  · Unable to frame analytical questions about reading
		  · Cannot close read texts looking for symbols or ideas
		  · Does not recognize a progression in student's reading ability

#2 Writes coherently and effectively	· Papers in portfolio
	· Letter of reflection
		· Exceeds
		  · Clearly writes to audience
		  · Devises and controls a sophisticated, nuanced thesis
		  · Organizes thoughts logically throughout papers with careful attention to the content
		  · Recognizes and experiments with conventions of the discipline
		  · Uses sophisticated, fluid sentence structure
		· Meets
		  · Displays an awareness of audience
		  · Devises and controls a thesis
		  · Organizes thoughts logically throughout papers
		  · Recognizes and uses conventions of the discipline
		  · Uses appropriate, fluid sentence structure
		· Does Not Meet
		  · Does not display an awareness of audience
		  · Does not devise and control a thesis
		  · Does not adequately organize thoughts logically throughout papers
		  · Does not recognize and use conventions of the discipline
		  · Does not use appropriate, fluid sentence structure

#3 Displays good oral communication skills	· Oral presentation in 497A
	· Letter of reflection
		· Exceeds
		  · Clearly speaks to audience
		  · Presents and introduces new ideas in an organized, logical format

Benchmark/ Outcome	Performance Indicators	Assessment Guidelines
		· Engages and entertains audience despite anxiety · Participates actively and thoughtfully during class discussions · Displays a professional, inquisitive, civil attitude · Meets 　· Displays an awareness of audience 　· Presents ideas in an organized, logical format 　· Copes with performance anxiety 　· Participates often during class discussions 　· Displays a professional, civil attitude · Does Not Meet 　· Does not display an awareness of audience 　· Does not present ideas in an organized, logical format 　· Does not cope with performance anxiety 　· Does not participate often during class discussions 　· Does not display a professional, civil attitude
#4 Develops creative and critical thinking skills both independently and in groups	·Papers in portfolio ·Letter of reflection	· Exceeds 　· Able to generate original paper topics appropriate for the length and scope of an assignment 　· Articulates nuanced critical thinking in written and oral work 　· Actively listens to and creatively builds upon the ideas of group members · Meets 　· Able to generate paper topics appropriate for the length and scope of an assignment 　· Articulates critical thinking in both written and oral form 　· Listens to and builds upon the ideas of group members · Does Not Meet 　· Is not able to generate paper topics appropriate for the length and scope of an assignment 　· Does not articulate critical thinking in both written and oral form 　· Does not listen to others or participate in groups
#5 Has a knowledge of the formation of literary genres and movements	· Papers in portfolio · Letter of reflection	· Exceeds 　· Uses literary terminology inventively 　· Explicitly demonstrates understanding of basic generic conventions and how literature adapts and/or breaks from those conventions 　· Draws connections between texts and the wider literary movements and traditions of which they are a part · Meets 　· Uses literary terminology appropriately 　· Understands both basic generic conventions and how literature adapts and/or breaks from those conventions 　· Displays an awareness of the relationship between texts and the literary movements and traditions in which they participate · Does Not Meet

Benchmark/ Outcome	Performance Indicators	Assessment Guidelines
		· Does not use literary terminology appropriately · Does not understand basic generic conventions or how literature adapts and/or breaks from those conventions · Does not display an awareness of the relationship between texts and the wider literary movements and traditions of which they are a part

#6
Demonstrates a knowledge of at least one of the following bodies of theory: literary, rhetorical, and/or pedagogical
	· Papers in portfolio
	· Letter of reflection
		· Exceeds
		  · Demonstrates a critical understanding of a body of theory through its direct application
		· Meets
		  · Demonstrates a basic understanding of a body of theory through its direct application
		· Does Not Meet
		  · Does not demonstrate an understanding of a body of theory through its direct application

#7
Situates literary analysis within wider social, political, and/or historical contexts
	· Papers in portfolio
	· Letter of reflection
		· Exceeds
		  · Critically explores the relationship between texts and their social, political, and/or historical contexts
		· Meets
		  · Examines the relationship between texts and their social, political, and/or historical contexts
		· Does Not Meet
		  · Does not examine the relationship between texts and their social, political, and/or historical contexts

#8
Has gained awareness of English as a language system, including the development of its structures, functions, and uses
	· Papers in portfolio
	· Letter of reflection
		· Exceeds
		  · Articulately conveys the influence of linguistics course on development as an English major
		· Meets
		  · Conveys the influence of linguistics course on development as an English major
		· Does Not Meet
		  · Does not convey the influence of linguistics course on development as an English major

#9
Has experience in conducting scholarly research using a variety of search tools and media
	· Papers in portfolio
	· Letter of reflection
		· Exceeds
		  · Correctly adheres to a recognized professional citation style
		  · Uses a variety of scholarly methods to obtain sources
		  · Works with original sources such as primary documents and/or interviews
		  · Determines credibility of sources
		  · Covers a wide body of materials before choosing the most appropriate quotes for in-text citation
		  · Integrates sources in a way that acknowledges a wider critical discussion and student's place within it

Benchmark/ Outcome	Performance Indicators	Assessment Guidelines

		· Meets
		  · Attempts to adhere to a recognized professional citation style
		  · Uses appropriate methods to obtain sources
		  · Works with multiple sources
		  · Uses credible sources
		  · Considers several sources before choosing those most appropriate for use
		  · Attempts to integrate sources in a way that acknowledges a wider critical discussion
		· Does Not Meet
		  · Does not adhere to a recognized professional citation style
		  · Does not use appropriate methods to obtain sources
		  · Does not work with multiple sources
		  · Does not recognize credibility of sources
		  · Does not integrate sources in a way that acknowledges a wider critical discussion

Appendix E: Learning Portfolios

(information sheet for students in English 200, 301 and other major courses prior to 497A)

In your final semester at SIUE, you will be required to take a Senior Seminar, English 497A. One important component of that course will include creating a portfolio of writing from the courses in your major (ENG 200, 301, 497A, and one other class), which will be read by English Department faculty and be used to evaluate how well the Department meets its program goals. When you assemble the papers, you will also write a reflective letter to English Department faculty where you respond to prompts about the skills you developed at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville.

Although your Senior Seminar portfolio will not be graded, <u>completing one to the best of your ability is required to graduate</u>. You will not pass your Senior Seminar class without one. No exceptions.

What is a learning portfolio?

Have you ever finished a paper and thought, "That was great. I need to remember that next time..." or "I wish I hadn't done that..." only to forget about your breakthrough or discovery later? Starting and working periodically on your portfolio allows you to be an active agent in your learning and provides you a way of making sense of the skills you have developed in your studies. Although you may work on the portfolio in specific ways in specific English classes, in essence, your portfolio allows you as an individual to

- contain descriptions of your strengths and accomplishments as an English professional

- determine skill areas you may want to develop

- include documents and materials which collectively suggest the scope and quality of your performance as a learner

- inquire into and represent your practices related to learning and development.

Although it may be a long time until you complete the Senior Seminar, starting the process of collecting your essays and reflecting on your learning now gives you more power as a thinker, writer, and learner since you will be able to give concrete examples of your skills and development. Once you have started working on your portfolio, you will be able to chart your growth as a thinker, writer, and learner. Effectively, you will have a method to account for your development in the field of English Studies.

What goes into the portfolio?

A major paper from your ENG 200, 301, and 497A classes as well as a project you choose from another class will be included in the portfolio. (Pre-2009 Bachelor of Science English Education majors who did not take ENG 301 will substitute a pedagogy project from ENG 475, 485, or 490.) You will introduce the portfolio with a letter in which you reflect on your learning and skill development in classes and over your career at SIUE.

How do I get started on the portfolio?
There are three steps in starting and maintaining your portfolio: (1) create the portfolio, (2) select and upload documents, and (3) reflect on your experiences.

1. You will establish or update your Epsilen portfolio as a part of ENG 200, 301, and 497A. Go to Epsilen.com to establish your portfolio account. Detailed directions are available on the English Department website.[1]

2. You can upload papers as you write them or at the end of a class. When you choose papers for the portfolio, think about including those papers that you think are particularly well written, that indicate your growth as a writer or a thinker, or that show different and interesting facets of your skills.

3. Write reflections on your classes—i.e., what you have learned, what skills you have developed, and what you want to work on. You only complete the official reflection in ENG 497A when you are preparing to graduate. However, by starting it early, you can track your development and be more active in your learning.

How do I develop a reflection or reflection process?
Developing a reflective process involves asking and answering these fundamental questions:

- What do I do?

- How do I do it?

- What does this mean for both myself as a professional and for those with whom I study (other students and professors)?

Particularly in the early stages, your reflection can be as formal or informal as you like because you are writing for yourself. You can also reflect on arguments presented in course texts, articulate alternative conceptions from your perspective, develop lines of thought that the course texts raise, and position yourself in respect to texts. What are you thinking about when you read? How are you processing the scholarship and discussions? Reflecting in writing gives you the opportunity to pause, think, and articulate for yourself a coherent response. As you read and prepare for class discussions, you might keep a reader's journal or notebook. You can look back over those reflections and responses as you prepare for the more formal reflective response at the end of ENG 497A (these reading notes might also serve as a good resource for you later in your English career).

---

[1] As of this writing (13 July 2009), we have not posted the informational materials to the English Department's website. We plan to compile a number of materials under a new link, tentatively entitled "Required Portfolio Assessment for English Majors": (1.) a copy of this information sheet, also to be distributed in ENG 200 and 301; (2.) a link to Epsilen and instructions for creating a portfolio; (3.) the departmental benchmarks and prompts; (4.) the faculty assessment rubric with performance indicators and assessment guidelines.

Appendix F:
Senior Portfolio Instructions, distributed to students in English 497A

The Department's Senior Seminar (ENG 497A) and its required paper and presentation represent the culmination of your education in the English Department at SIUE. Many courses, however, have aided in your development as a reader, writer, and thinker. The Department has specific goals, or benchmarks, that we expect each of our students to meet before exiting the program. As part of the course requirements for English 497A, we ask that seniors (1.) create Epsilen portfolios of materials from their courses in the Department, (2.) present their senior seminar papers at a departmental conference, and (3.) write self-reflections about their growth and development during their time as students at SIUE.

The finished portfolio should include the following professional pieces:

- Self-Reflection (see included assessment prompts for guidance; pp. 4-6)
- English 200 Paper—Introduction to Literary Study (sophomore year)
- English 301 Paper—Introduction to Literary Theory and Criticism (junior year) [*Substitute a pedagogy project from ENG 475, 485, or 490 if you are a pre-2009 Bachelor of Science English Education major who did not take ENG 301.*]
- English 497A Senior Seminar Paper (substantial research project)
- Paper from any of your other English classes (a wildcard project of which you are particularly proud or that demonstrates another facet of your experience within the department)

Writing Your Capstone Self-Reflection

The process of writing a cumulative self-reflection asks you to be honest about your development as a student, to take the good with the bad, and to assess how far you have come and where you still need to go as a reader, writer, and thinker. Self-reflections aren't graded. This is your chance to tell us what you've learned and what you still want to know. Be honest, be critical, but also congratulate yourself on your accomplishments.

This packet includes a copy of a rubric that lists the English Department's benchmarks along with details of how the Department assesses whether an individual student has met each goal. In addition, we have included a table with prompts to guide you as you write your capstone self-reflection. You should address each of the benchmarks on the rubric. Note that the prompts are primarily there to help you generate ideas; you do not have to respond to all of them, and you can certainly expand beyond the suggestions we have provided.

Because many of the departmental goals are very specific, it could be a challenge determining how best to organize your ideas. For example, you might consider letting the items in the portfolio guide the organization of your self-reflection, or you could dedicate

a paragraph to each of the benchmarks. Determine your own organizational method, but do think carefully about how to best present your thoughts.

Remember that your self-reflection cannot stand independently of your portfolio. Part of its role is to explain what each item in your portfolio demonstrates about your learning. When you are trying to assess your own growth, refer to the items in the portfolio, relate specific classroom experiences, and feel free to tell stories about your time as a student.

Creating Your Portfolio

1. Go to Epsilen.com: http://www.epsilen.com/LandingSite/Home.aspx

2. Click CREATE YOUR ePORTFOLIO and register for an Epsilen account (SIUE email address; account identification; profile information). Keep everything fully public so that others can access your files.

3. Check your email for a message from Epsilen ePortfolio <mail@epsilen.net> and follow the link to activate your account (create password, etc.).

4. When the account is activated, you will land at a page that congratulates you and gives you your personal Epsilen ePortfolio address. For example, here is the URL generated for me: http://www.epsilen.com/jiander. At this point, you can login to your Epsilen account by clicking on your personal ePortfolio web address.

5. You need to login, of course, from your main page before you can do anything with your site. As Epsilen describes it, the "My Portal" page (where you arrive once you have logged in) is "the 'home,' information, and news center of your Epsilen account."

6. To update what you have posted on your welcome page:

   - go to your website—i.e., your ePortfolio address

   - login (see column on left)

   - When you login, you'll be at your "My Portal" page. From there you can customize your front page and anything else you want to add.

   - Click on "My ePortfolio" to open up the menu for adjusting the information you originally posted as you created your account. For example, click on "Welcome Notes" to adjust your front page. My initial information (from filling in the blanks as I established my Epsilen account) looked funny in terms of spacing and punctuation, so I made a number of adjustments.

7. Submit documents by uploading papers using the files/folders toolset:

   - go to your website (your ePortfolio address); login to your "My Portal" page

   - click on "Files / Folders" to open the file manager

   - create a new folder for senior assessment (keep it public!), or use the public folder that already exists

- follow the on-screen instructions to upload documents (MSWord documents [.doc or .docx] or portable document format [.pdf])

8. As indicated at the beginning of this document, you are required to include the following documents in your Epsilen portfolio to pass English 497A and to complete your English major:

   - Self-Reflection (see included assessment prompts for guidance; pp. 4-6)

   - English 200 Paper—Introduction to Literary Study (sophomore year)

   - English 301 Paper—Introduction to Literary Theory and Criticism (junior year) [Substitute a pedagogy project from ENG 475, 485, or 490 if you are a pre-2009 Bachelor of Science English Education major who did not take ENG 301.]

   - English 497A Senior Seminar Paper (substantial research project)

   - Paper from any of your other English classes (a wildcard project of which you are particularly proud or that demonstrates another facet of your experience within the department)

9. The work you are posting to your Epsilen account is for departmental assessment purposes only. You will not be graded on your self-reflection or re-graded on the posted papers, though these submissions are required to pass your senior seminar, to complete your English major, and to graduate from SIUE. Your seminar paper will be graded by your professor in English 497A.

As we explained on page 1, what follows is a copy of the English Department's benchmarks and prompts to guide you as you write your self-reflection. See the Department's website for a copy of the faculty assessment rubric, which aligns performance indicators and assessment guidelines with the benchmarks.[2] Address each of the benchmarks on the rubric. Note that the prompts are primarily there to help you generate ideas; you do not have to respond to all of them, and you can certainly expand beyond the suggestions we have provided.

---

[2] As of this writing (13 July 2009), we have not posted the informational materials to the English Department's website. We plan to compile a number of materials under a new link, tentatively entitled "Required Portfolio Assessment for English Majors": (1.) a copy of this information sheet, also to be distributed in ENG 200 and 301; (2.) a link to Epsilen and instructions for creating a portfolio; (3.) the departmental benchmarks and prompts; (4.) the faculty assessment rubric with performance indicators and assessment guidelines.

English Benchmarks
Including Prompts for Students' Self-Reflections

Benchmark/ Outcome	Prompt for Self-Reflection
#1 Reads critically and with comprehension	Consider discussing specific experiences you had while reading a text for one of your classes and discuss how your reading has developed during your time at SIUE. What strategies do you use to interact with a text? What does your reading process look like? Do you use different strategies for different genres? If so, explain. In what ways has your reading improved? What would you like to continue to work on as you develop as a reader
#2 Writes coherently and effectively	Directly address the papers in your portfolio and discuss how they demonstrate the development of your writing abilities during your time as SIUE. Explain who your audience was for each paper, and how that influenced your writing. Discuss the thesis, or argument for each paper. Are you happy with what you argued and how well you supported your argument throughout? What have you learned about the conventions of scholarly writing and writing about literature? How have you used or experimented with those conventions in your work? Reflect on your writing style, and how it has evolved. Do you think you craft sophisticated fluid sentences? In what ways has your writing improved? What would you like to continue to work on as you develop as a writer?
#3 Displays good oral communication skills	Reflect on presentations and your in-class participation during your time at SIUE. You will want to consider specific presentations, especially your formal presentation for 497A. How have you grown as a public speaker considering your first presentations to your last? What have you learned about how to engage an audience's attention? Discuss your class participation considering how active you are during large and small group discussions. Think about the depth of your comments, and your ability to articulate your thoughts to large and small groups. Imagine what your classmates and/or your professors would say about your contributions to class. Are you a valuable, active member? Do you demonstrate a desire to learn? Do you treat others with care and respect? In what ways have your oral communication skills improved?

Benchmark/ Outcome	Prompt for Self-Reflection
	What would you like to continue to work on as you develop your oral communication skills?
#4 Develops creative and critical thinking skills both independently and in groups	Reflect upon how your critical thinking has developed during your time at SIUE.

Using the papers in your portfolio as examples, explain how you generate paper topics. How has that process changed over time?

You might consider discussing a specific incident that demonstrates your use of critical thinking. Perhaps you worked through a problem that you were having when writing a paper, or you developed a series of questions about a reading.

For this category you will want to demonstrate that you can both develop thought on your own, and that you can work with others to generate ideas. You will want to also talk about a time that you developed a group project and what it was like to have both the restrictions and benefits of other people's ideas.

In what ways have your critical thinking skills improved?

What would you like to continue to work on as you develop your critical thinking skills? |
| #5 Has a knowledge of the formation of literary genres and movements | Using the papers in your portfolio as examples, reflect upon your understanding of literary movements and genres.

What literary terms do you use effectively or ineffectively in your papers?

What genres have you written about, and how have those texts' genres influenced your interpretation?

How have literary movements and their associated texts played a role in your literary interpretations? (Langston Hughes, for example, was a part of the Harlem Renaissance. In some ways his writings embrace that movement, but they also challenge it. How do issues like these arise in your analysis of texts?)

What have you learned about literary movements, terms, and genres during your time as a student as SIUE?

What would you still like to explore? |
| #6 Demonstrates a knowledge of at least one of the following bodies of theory: literary, rhetorical, and/or pedagogical | Your paper from 301 will probably most directly address a literary theory, but you may also use other papers as examples too. If you are a student in the English Education track, who has not taken 301, you can include a pedagogical study you wrote for 475 or 485 (papers or unit plans).

When describing you work in your letter of reflection, you should briefly discuss the challenges of applying theory practically to a text or in the classroom. In what ways did you struggle to understand the theory? How did you feel it limited or extended your reading of the text or pedagogical situation?

What have you learned about theory and its application during your time at SIUE? |

Benchmark/ Outcome	Prompt for Self-Reflection
	What would you still like to explore about literary theory?
#7 Situates literary analysis within wider social, political, and/or historical contexts	Using your papers as examples, discuss how you envision the relationship between texts and their social, political, and/or historical contexts. How has your reading of texts and their relationship to contexts changed during your time as a student as SIUE? What have you learned about texts and their contexts at SIUE? What would you still like to explore about texts and their contexts?
#8 Has gained awareness of English as a language system, including the development of its structures, functions, and uses	Thing about your language systems coursework (ENG 369, 400, 403). Also, be sure to briefly discuss how that course added to your development as an English major. How did that course or any others challenge your understanding of language, culture, and/or texts? What would you still like to learn about language systems?
#9 Has experience in conducting scholarly research using a variety of search tools and media	Discuss the development of your research methods during your time at SIUE, using your papers as examples. How do you go about finding sources? What processes do you use when determining what sources you will apply in your papers? In what ways have your research skills improved? What would you like to continue to work on as you develop your research skills?

Appendix G: Senior Conference Presentations

(information sheet for students in English 497A and faculty attendees)

Assignment

Create a presentation of the key ideas from your senior seminar paper. Prepare to speak for 5-10 minutes (five minimum; 10 maximum). In typical academic presentations, the speaker first introduces what text he or she is working on and then offers a clear statement of his or her thesis. The assumption is a highly educated audience—so, though you may choose to begin with a brief summary of your primary text, a good literary scholar does not belabor the plot (perhaps just a paragraph synopsis to remind your audience of a few key details). It is conventional to state your major claim and to explain how you have arrived at that idea. You could, for example, situate your ideas in terms of what other critics have said. You should give your audience some of your most interesting textual examples as well as offer a full explanation of your conclusions. Your unique thesis and your conclusions are what people care about, so don't get bogged down in minutiae.[3]

Conference Logistics

At the end of the semester, the English Department will hold a conference that showcases senior assignment projects. Students may invite their friends and family to the event. Students will be arranged into panels of three to four papers according to their topics. Each student will give a short presentation of his/her work (10-minute maximum) and participate in a question and answer session. Three to four panels will run concurrently in two to three sessions, depending on the number of students. The entire faculty will be encouraged to attend and to complete short rubrics on the presentations. In a typical fall or spring semester, we will have 30 students enrolled in two senior seminars. The panels, therefore, could be organized as follows on page 2 of this document.

---

[3] Jill Anderson wrote this brief assignment description for her Summer 2009 Senior Seminar. We assume that professors would customize their descriptions according to their own priorities and course contents.

Four-Panel Model
(four concurrent panels with two sessions; 8 faculty attendees)

Session One
6:00-7:00 p.m.
Panel #1: student 1, student 2, student 3, student 4   [Faculty 1, Faculty 2]
Panel #2: student 5, student 6, student 7, student 8   [Faculty 3, Faculty 4]
Panel #3: student 9, student 10, student 11, student 12   [Faculty 5, Faculty 6]
Panel #4: student 13, student 14, student 15   [Faculty 7, Faculty 8]

Session Two
7:15-8:15 p.m.
Panel #5: student 16, student 17, student 18,   [Faculty 1, Faculty 2]
Panel #6: student 19, student 20, student 21, student 22   [Faculty 3, Faculty 4]
Panel #7: student 23, student 24, student 25, student 26   [Faculty 5, Faculty 6]
Panel #8: student 27, student 28, student 29, student 30   [Faculty 7, Faculty 8]

Three-Panel Model
(three concurrent panels with three sessions; 6 faculty attendees)

Session One
5:00-5:50 p.m.
Panel #1: student 1, student 2, student 3, student 4   [Faculty 1, Faculty 2]
Panel #2: student 5, student 6, student 7   [Faculty 3, Faculty 4]
Panel #3: student 8, student 9, student 10   [Faculty 5, Faculty 6]

Session Two
6:00-6:50 p.m.
Panel #4: student 11, student 12, student 13   [Faculty 1, Faculty 2]
Panel #5: student 14, student 15, student 16, student 17   [Faculty 3, Faculty 4]
Panel #6: student 18, student 19, student 20   [Faculty 5, Faculty 6]

Session Three
7:00-7:50 p.m.
Panel #7: student 21, student 22, student 23,   [Faculty 1, Faculty 2]
Panel #8: student 24, student 25, student 26   [Faculty 3, Faculty 4]
Panel #9: student 27, student 28, student 29, student 30   [Faculty 5, Faculty 6]

If we imagine at minimum two faculty members at each panel, then the four-panel model requires eight faculty to attend one panel in both sessions, and the three-panel model requires six faculty to attend one panel for each of the three sessions.

Department of English Rubric for Senior Presentations

English Department Benchmark #3: Displays good oral communication skills		
Exceeds • Clearly speaks to audience • Presents and introduces new ideas in an organized, logical format • Engages and entertains audience despite anxiety • Participates actively and thoughtfully during class discussions • Displays a professional, inquisitive, civil attitude	Meets • Displays an awareness of audience • Presents ideas in an organized, logical format • Copes with performance anxiety • Participates often during class discussions • Displays a professional, civil attitude	Does Not Meet • Does not display an awareness of audience • Does not present ideas in an organized, logical format • Does not cope with performance anxiety • Does not participate often during class discussions • Does not display a professional, civil attitude

Check one →	Exceeds	Meets	Does Not Meet	Comments
Audience awareness				
Presentation of ideas				
Organization				
Performance				
Professionalism				