

English and Foreign Languages

Department of English and Foreign Languages

Introduction

The mission of the Department of English and Foreign Languages is to educate students successfully in understanding and communicating ideas through the medium of languages: English, French, German, Greek, Latin, and Spanish. The department also encourages active engagement in research, and its members help to serve the intellectual and cultural needs of the community. The department helps students acquire knowledge of content and discipline-specific skills, notably effective writing and speaking, that are useful for employers, other community members, and for the students themselves. The department provides students with a well-rounded knowledge of the history of the target language and literature, helps students explore values, encourages a perceptive approach to literature, and promotes critical thinking.

The department offers “successful education” for undergraduate and graduate students. This education and other services offered by the department serve the “community and employers.” The department stresses “in-depth disciplinary knowledge,” requires the demonstration of “discipline-specific skills,” and promotes “critical-thinking, effective communication, and independent learning.”

Performance Objective 1 Engage in collaborative ventures and campus and community activities that will enhance economic development and cultural growth.

1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 100% of tenure-track faculty members will engage in service to the University and/or community through participation in community activities, service to business or non-profit organizations, University committees, and/or departmental committees.

Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was 70% of tenure-track faculty members.

1.1 Data

Academic Year	Tenure-track faculty members that engaged in service to the university and/or community		Benchmark met?
	%	#	
2013-2014	100%		Yes
2014-2015	100%		Yes
2015-2016	100%		Yes
2016-2017	100%		Yes
2017-2018	100%	21/21	Yes

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Faculty members do an amazing amount of extra work both for the community and the university. The department is wonderfully diversified and talented in many areas. We had one faculty member teaching yoga, several offering help to the community with translating, some offering free readings or lectures to the community, many providing philanthropic help, such as working with food pantries, etc.

2017-2018:

Again faculty members do a fine job in serving the university and wider community. Faculty members make use of their academic talents by offering translation services, tutoring, offering in-services, and providing readings. Many faculty members also work with charities and churches in different roles.

Areas of improvement would be to see if we could get more faculty members involved with Banners and also to be sure that faculty list their non-university service on their merit pay reports.

If we acquired more faculty members, we could better serve the community and university. Some faculty members are already teaching overloads and/or courses with too many students.

2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: The department will sponsor or co-sponsor at least six cultural events for the campus and/or the broader community.

2.1 Data

2016-2017:

The department sponsored seven readings, and the Joe and Lydia Cash reading. It also helped co-sponsor a reading by Stella Nesanovich, a Law School information session, and a workshop on how to apply to graduate school. Students and faculty also took part in readings at a local coffee shop and the Womens Studies Brown Bag Luncheon Series.

2017-2018:

The department sponsored seven creative writing programs and co-sponsored the Joe and Lydia Cash lecture, featuring a former MFA student who just received his doctorate from Harvard. It also helped with the Southern Law School visit, the Women's Studies Brown Bag Luncheons, and a lecture sponsored by the Honors College (Michael Ward).

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

The department continues to do well in this area. In addition to our regular M.F.A readings and the Joe and Lydia Cash Lecture, we helped with several activities designed to enhance culture at the university and/or increase the potential of our students. We are looking at trying to bring more former students, many of whom have won awards and/or had impressive publications, back on campus for readings.

2017-2018:

This continues to be a strong area. We are already trying to secure readers and speakers for next year. It would be good to begin raising more funds with the Foundation so we can continue to pay for good readers. Currently the MFA program seems not to be able to pay the usual going rate for readers. This could eventually become a problem. It seems to work well to invite previous students to offer readings and lectures.

Performance Objective 2 Demonstrate excellence in teaching in order to enhance recruitment, retention, and graduation.

1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 60% or more of faculty will score at or above the University average on the SEI.

Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was 75% of faculty.

1.1 Data

Academic Year	Faculty that scored at or above the university average on SEI		Benchmark met?
	%	#	
2013-2014	54%		No
2014-2015	71%		No
2015-2016	75%		Yes
2016-2017	80%		Yes
2017-2018	62%	13/21	Yes

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

This seems to be about right as a score. Since the department teaches many general education courses, we would not expect figures to be higher, and in fact higher numbers might indicate too lenient grading. We will attempt to keep classes as small as we reasonably can, since this should help with teaching excellence. We also want to continue monitoring the SEIs grade distribution figures for graduate students and visiting lecturers and intervene if there are troubling numbers. We created a new evaluation system for non tenure-track faculty, which we are testing this coming year.

2017-2018:

The department seems roughly on track here. We do not want the scores too high, since we teach a large number of general education classes that are not always appreciated by students. In particular, students in on-line classes do not tend to give very good reviews (even though they will often beg to get in them!).

Most of the teachers who didn't reach the university average were close. One lower-scoring teacher has left the university. We are also reaching out to another faculty member who has some low scores; we think this individual's teaching can be improved.

There is no main area of weakness in the evaluations. Sometimes students feel that communication could be better or that feedback could be more helpful. The best goal seems to be to work with individual faculty members who are having problems. It would also help to lower class sizes, and perhaps decrease online offerings. Most of our teachers do an excellent job.

2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 60% or more of faculty will engage in some activity designed to promote recruitment, retention, and graduation.

2.1 Data

Academic Year	Faculty members		Benchmark met?
	%	#	
2016-2017	90%		Yes
2017-2018	100%	21/21	Yes

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Faculty members continue to do well in this area, with even instructors and adjuncts helping in this regard. The development of relationships with individual local teachers continues to be stressed, however, this can be difficult since there is so much turnover in the high schools. Sigma Tau Delta is very active. We need to work harder on recruiting with the foreign languages. We have set a date for a meeting to explore interest in restarting Phi Sigma Iota. We have added three new advisors, although we lost one undergraduate advisor to the graduate program.

2017-2018:

Again, the faculty does an admirable job in this area. Potential areas for improvement are to increase faculty presence on recruiting days and in Literary Rally. We tend to have the same faculty members volunteer, and it would be good to see a few more faces.

We are likely to have problems with advising this year. We are losing two advisors (one perhaps for only this year) and replacing them with a temporary position. We will have to spread out the students, but we are simply getting very low on full-time faculty.

We absolutely must increase our number of tenure-track faculty next year, or we will not do a good job of advising and retaining students.

Performance Objective 3 Demonstrate commitment to research and creative or scholarly activity.

1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 70% or more faculty members will engage in a creative or scholarly activity beyond preparation for class or personal reading.

1.1 Data

Academic Year	Faculty that engaged in a creative or scholarly activity beyond preparation for class or personal reading		Benchmark met?
	%	#	
2013-2014	75%	15/20	Yes
2014-2015	80%	16/20	Yes
2015-2016	85%	17/20	Yes
2016-2017	90%	19/21	Yes
2017-2018	95%	20/21	Yes

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

The department continues to do well in this area. Unfortunately the publication of *ECCB* is in a temporary hiatus, and this has been a good publication venue for faculty and even students. If *ECCB* does cease publication, we need to encourage a few faculty members to find other areas for publication.

2017-2018:

Faculty members do a good job in this area. *ECCB* still has not resumed publication, but faculty members are finding other venues. One faculty member has started extensive work on a poetry blog. Another, who does a lot of administrative work, is looking at different journals for book reviews.

2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 50% or more of faculty members will have some creative writing or research published during the year.

2.1 Data

Academic Year	Faculty with published creative writing or research		Benchmark met?
	%	#	
2013-2014	62%		Yes
2014-2015	75%		Yes
2015-2016	75%		Yes
2016-2017	65%		Yes
2017-2018	60%	12/21	Yes

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Again, this is a strong area for the department. Although our percentage is down a little this year, it is still relatively high. The department needs to continue to secure money for travel and released time, both of which generally contribute greatly to publication. Unfortunately released time has been difficult to acquire.

2017-2018:

The departmental faculty members have done a good job here, with even instructors contributing to scholarship. As noted above, the possible demise of *ECCB* will make things more difficult, but faculty members will find other venues. There are a few faculty members who have books in progress. Perhaps if merit pay returns faculty members will have more of an impetus to finish and submit.

Performance Objective 4 Utilize resources efficiently and effectively to support the university's mission.

1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Five or more members of the faculty will be granted sabbaticals or released time for administrative or research/creative duties.

1.1 Data

2016-2017:

Four individuals were granted released time for administrative purposes for the year. Two others received released time for one semester, but only one of these was for creative purposes (McNeese Review).

2017-2018:

Four individuals were granted released time for administrative purposes for the year. Two others received released time for one semester only. Only one of these was for creative purposes (McNeese Review), however.

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Gaining released time has proved difficult because of budget cuts. Although the university is being somewhat cooperative in this regard, we could use more help with released time in several areas. Disturbingly, the state seems no longer willing to consider giving sabbaticals. One faculty member with a book offer was willing to take a sabbatical at a greatly reduced salary but ended up having to take unpaid leave. We were told not even to try to ask for a sabbatical.

2017-2018:

For next year we intend to give one course each semester of released time for a foreign language teacher to facilitate in the language learning center, since it has no director. We also hope to add one course of released time for the director of fiction for the MFA program. This would enable him to write more. If we could add an additional course reduction for the assistant department head, that would be helpful, and it would be good to give one course each semester for the M.A. Director and the Editor of the *McNeese Review*.

Fortunately, the current administration essentially is leaving released time up to departments, provided that we cover our work. This is a good change, although given our limited number of faculty members, it doesn't help as much as it

might. Still, it is a move in the right direction.

We still need to hold on to the idea of granting released time for research. The last time a faculty member sought to apply for a sabbatical, we were told that the Board refused to follow their sabbatical policy. It would be good for a faculty member to apply for a research sabbatical so we could raise the issue again.

2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Two or more faculty members will be awarded grants, monetary prizes or endowed professorships.

2.1 Data

2016-2017:

Faculty members received seven endowed professorships, although two were dedicated to ex-officio to the Director of the Honors College and two to the Director of the MFA program. Two faculty members won awards for their books.

2017-2018:

Faculty members received eight endowed professorships, although two were dedicated ex officio to the Director of the Honors College and two to the Director of the MFA program. Still, the successful application for four professorships was a major accomplishment. Two faculty members won awards for their books.

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

The department is doing well, although as suggested above, if our budget remains at its current projection, faculty members will be greatly overworked and unlikely to be as energetic and successful in achieving awards.

2017-2018:

The department is doing very well in this area. It would always be nice to see more faculty apply for endowed professorships and for outside grants. One is interested in applying for a Fulbright. Again, it would be good to see someone apply for a research sabbatical.

3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Composition classes will have no more than 30 students, while lecture-type classes will be limited to no more than 35 students.

Numbers will be based on class limits or on actual number of students, whichever is higher. (Figures for the end of the semester do not include students who began the course and dropped it at some point.)

3.1 Data

Term	# of students for composition classes	# of students for lecture classes	Benchmark met?
Fall 2016	30-31	29-33	No
Spring 2017	22-26	28-30	Yes
Fall 2017	29-32	32-33	No
Spring 2018	20-25	27-29	Yes

3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Although numbers were too high in the fall, we made improvements in the spring, especially with online classes. Two caveats need to be made, though. We met our goals by using a lot of adjunct help, which cannot always be counted upon. Also, our goal is really too low, especially in the area of composition. We need to look at our goals again as a department. We intend to ask for an additional instructor or tenure-track faculty member if the university's enrollment remains steady.

2017-2018:

We continue to have problems in the fall semesters. In fall of 2017 we hit our target for most courses, but some ENGL 102 courses hit 32, which is far too high. We need to have lower limits just before late registration, so late registration doesn't bump them up too much. Still, this is very difficult. We often simply don't know the degree of need until it is too late to add courses. Moreover, it is often very difficult to find adjunct faculty.

ENGL	CMPL	2	0	0	2	4	0	1	1	0	3	5	3
	EGED	11	7	12	7	37	2	9	10	6	9	34	2
	FOLL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	LITR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	WRIT	3	5	1	7	16	1	3	4	2	7	16	3
	(blank)	11	3	7	10	31	2	4	5	4	11	24	4
	Total	27	15	20	26	88	5	17	20	12	30	79	12
FORL	FLED	2	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	0
	FREN	1	1	0	1	3	0	1	0	1	1	3	0
	LATN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SPAN	1	0	2	2	5	0	2	2	1	1	6	0
	(blank)	0	2	0	3	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
	Total	4	3	2	7	16	0	4	2	3	3	12	0
Grand Total	31	18	22	33	104	5	21	22	15	33	91	12	

2015-2016:

Major	Conc.	Fall						Spring					
		F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP
ENGL	CMPL	4	2	1	3	10	2	1	1	2	3	7	1
	EGED	12	11	6	7	36	1	15	11	8	7	41	3
	FOLL	2	1	2	1	6	0	1	2	2	2	7	0
	LITR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	WRIT	7	2	5	2	16	3	8	4	6	2	16	5
	(blank)	6	5	5	13	29	3	6	6	5	11	28	5
Total	31	21	19	26	97	9	31	24	23	25	99	14	

2016-2017:

Major	Conc.	Fall						Spring					
		F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP
ENGL	CMPL	1	1	2	2	6	0	1	1	1	2	5	0
	EGED	17	12	11	9	49	3	7	10	12	9	38	1
	FOLL	2	0	1	1	4	0	0	3	1	1	5	0
	LITR	1	4	2	1	8	1	2	5	4	4	15	1
	WRIT	11	4	4	8	27	3	4	6	3	9	22	4
	(blank)	3	1	4	5	13	0	2	2	3	0	7	0
Total	35	20	24	26	107	7	16	27	24	25	92	6	

2017-2018:

Major	Conc.	Fall						Spring					
		F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP
ENGL	CMPL	2	1	2	1	6	1	2	0	1	2	5	1
	EGED	12	13	8	10	43	0	7	14	8	12	41	3
	FOLL	2	1	2	3	8	1	2	1	3	3	9	0
	LITR	2	2	4	9	17	1	1	1	6	10	18	1

	WRIT	10	4	4	4	22	2	8	4	2	4	18	1
	(blank)	1	2	2	3	8	0	0	1	1	1	3	0
Total		29	23	23	30	104	5	20	21	21	32	94	6

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

The BA in Foreign Languages was eliminated prior to 2015-2016 academic year.

2016-2017:

BA English:

The program endeavors to maintain and increase its completers. Our numbers went up about 6% last year from the previous year. We had representatives and displays at both of the University's major recruiting days.

2017-2018:

It is somewhat difficult to analyze this data, since the B.A. in Foreign Languages was eliminated a few years ago and we not then have a B.A. in English with a concentration in foreign languages. It seems that we have lost some students interested in foreign languages, but we have gained some English majors in other concentrations.

In 2013-2014 we had an average of 14 BA in FL majors, and in 2017-2018 we have 8.5 English majors with a concentration in FL. Our total numbers of majors in the department has remained fairly constant, however. 103.5 in 2014-2015 to 99 in 2017-2018. Moreover, the number of majors with a BA in English has gone from 83.5 in 2014-2015 to 99 in 2017-2018. Thus we have lost a few students departmentally but have gained a few in the English BA. We are level with last year.

Overall, the numbers look pretty good, although continued efforts to recruit and retain are important. We continue to have a good presence at recruiting events, although that presence could be better. We are making student spaces more inviting, and we continue to support the *Arena* and Sigma Tau Delta.

2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Increase the enrollment of BA English students by 5% over a five-year period.

2.1 Data

2016-2017:

This is still a relatively new program objective (i.e., we have not been working on it for five years yet), so data is not currently available.

2017-2018:

As noted in the previous assessment, we are about on par with last year, but it is too early to give firm data.

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

We seem to be on an upwards trajectory, but it is a little early to tell if we will meet our objective.

2017-2018:

Of course many areas influencing choice or majors and retention are beyond our control, but we will continue to try to attract students to events, such as readings, and provide good advising and individual attention.

The new administration has been promoting student accomplishments, and we are trying to be very careful to inform them when our students do something positive. The more others know of our success, the more attractive our program should become.

3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Maintain or exceed 2014-2015 levels for MA and MFA. Track graduate student enrollments.

3.1 Data

Graduate Enrollment:

		2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018

Major	Conc.	U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S
ENGL	CRWR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	6	5
	LITR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	0	4	4
	(blank)	3	10	10	1	5	5	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	3	10	10	1	5	5	0	5	7	1	9	9	0	10	9
CRWR	FICT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	7	10
	POET	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	8	10
	(blank)	3	22	22	2	21	21	0	20	16	0	11	11	0	5	2
	Total	3	22	22	2	21	21	0	20	16	0	21	18	0	20	22
Grand Total	6	32	32	3	26	26	0	25	23	1	30	27	0	30	31	

Graduate Completers:

Major	Conc.	2013-2014			2014-2015			2015-2016			2016-2017			2017-2018		
		U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S
ENGL	CRWR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	LITR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	1	6
	(blank)	0	2	11	0	0	6	0	0	9	0	0	2	0	0	0
	Total	0	2	11	0	0	6	0	0	10	0	0	5	0	1	6
CRWR	FICT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	POET	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	(blank)	1	0	8	0	0	6	0	0	7	0	0	5	0	0	0
	Total	1	0	8	0	0	6	0	0	7	0	0	5	0	0	5
Grand Total	1	2	19	0	0	12	0	0	17	0	0	10	0	1	11	

3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

After trying to recruit English teachers from the local parish school systems into the MA program or into MA graduate classes, we only gained one teacher. Hopefully word will continue to spread, especially since the Supervisor of Freshman English mentioned the program at the August 2016 humanities teachers in-service.

2017-2018:

We are doing well here, although we may have trouble with our benchmark in the future, since we have dropped the online MA in Creative Writing program and since we are decreasing the number of students admitted into the MFA program. (This decision was made in order to increase stipends, which were well below those of other comparable schools.)

Still, it is possible that we can increase the MA program enough to compensate, so we will not seek to decrease our goal at this time. We are slowly adding some online MA courses, and we continue to reach out to school teachers in the parish. The MA director sent teachers information about a summer graduate course, but there were no takes. Faculty members continue to offer in-services for teachers, so perhaps we will charm them into taking some of our classes.

It would be good to identify a candidate or two for an MA assistantship and try to find funding for that.

4 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Maintain or exceed 2013-2014 levels of retention.

4.1 Data

Fall 2013-Fall 2014:

	# of students	
--	---------------	--

Major	retained	Retention rate
CRWR	13	92.86%
EGED	4	80.00%
ENGL (BA)	49	65.33%
ENGL (MA)	3	50.00%
FORL	7	46.67%

Fall 2014-Fall 2015:

Major	# of students retained	Retention rate
CRWR	14	66.67%
EGED	1	50.00%
ENGL (BA)	52	68.42%
ENGL (MA)	3	60.00%
FORL	6	46.15%

Fall 2015-Fall 2016:

Major	# of students retained	Retention rate
CRWR	11	84.62%
ENGL (BA)	57	71.25%
ENGL (MA)	1	50.00%
FORL	5	83.33%

Fall 2016-Fall 2017:

Major	# of students retained	Retention rate
CRWR	12	75.00%
ENGL (BA)	53	56.38%
ENGL (MA)	5	62.50%
FORL	2	100.00%

4.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

The retention rates are below what we would like. Much of the problem is probably caused by factors out of our control, such as the rising cost of tuition and the cuts in the TOPS program. Advisors should try to reach out to students who have not registered, but this will be difficult since we have fewer advisors this year than last. Perhaps the departmental administrative assistant could help with this.

Students who leave the MFA program almost always do so for financial reasons. We have made moves to increase stipends but were only able to do so by decreasing the number of total MFA students. This is a mixed bag, but we would rather have fewer, happier students than a few more who are unable to concentrate on their work because of financial reasons.

Performance Objective 6 Provide a comprehensive curriculum that reflects disciplinary foundations and remains responsive to contemporary developments, student and workforce demand, and university needs and aspirations.

1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 80% of students in the BA in English program will rate course availability and offering good or better on exit

surveys.

1.1 Data

Academic Year	Students that rate course availability good or better		Benchmark met?
	#	%	
2013-2014	18/19	94.7%	Yes
2014-2015	14/15	93.3%	Yes
2015-2016	15/18	83.3%	Yes
2016-2017	9/11	81.0%	Yes
2017-2018	12/13	92.3%	Yes

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

The department needs to try to continue finding the right balance between being good stewards and offering a wide variety of courses and sections. Students complain especially that they have trouble getting into mythology, so perhaps we can offer another section or two. Ultimately we need to hire additional faculty.

2016-2017:

The reviews were generally good here, but two English Education majors noted difficulty. The English Education program is very tight, since students have to do student teaching, and since there are so many sequenced courses and courses with only one section. During the education curriculum revamping that is scheduled for fall 2018, we need to see if we can simplify the program. We do try to make appropriate substitutions and offer multiple sections when we can.

One student complained about the paucity of offerings in French. We need to hire a tenure-track person in that area.

2017-2018:

The department seems to be doing a good job here, especially given our limited resources. A few years ago we began offering more multiple time offerings even if the numbers didn't strictly require it. One student with the English education concentration mentioned difficulty, so we need to look into the courses required there, to see if we can facilitate things. One student also mentioned that more French courses need to be offered. We need to hire a full time faculty person in French.

2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Departmental Curriculum Committee will review course offerings and align them with demand and disciplinary needs.

2.1 Data

2016-2017:

The department has consistently assessed the state of the course offerings over the past five years. We look at enrollment from previous terms in determining necessary courses for the upcoming term, and we keep track of enrollment during registration. The department noted some difficulty in offering upper-level classes with consistency. Student comments sometimes point out that classes offered only once a year (or less) can create scheduling conflicts within the department and with classes and responsibilities outside the department.

2017-2018:

The department frequently considers its course offerings, especially during initial set-up of classes and enrollment periods. The department head currently advises, so he is usually aware of problems. He also hands out tentative schedules to a few of the English majors to have them check to see if the schedule will work for their needs. Attempts are made to offer multiple sections and sometimes online offerings when appropriate. Sometimes problems are caused when other departments offer only one section of a necessary course. We try to be flexible with substitutions as appropriate.

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Although we have had to make cuts, we are holding our own or coming close. We have had some extra help by

2013-2014	13/13	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-
2014-2015	6/6	Yes	3/6	1/6	1/6	1/6	-	Yes
2015-2016	10/10	Yes	7/10	-	1/10	-	2/10	Yes
2016-2017	5/5	Yes	4/5	1/5	-	-	-	-
2017-2018	6/6	Yes	1/6	1/6	4/6	-	-	No

4.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

Most of the students in 2015-2016 gave excellent ratings. We anticipate that the QEP's emphasis on advising and career preparation may impact these scores moving forward.

2016-2017:

Ratings were generally good. The MA Director had a meeting about how to apply to graduate school, and we had a seminar by Southern University Law School. We probably need more seminars and workshops.

2017-2018:

The numbers were low here. We need to speak with current students. Probably the MA Director should meet once or twice in the MFA professional endeavors course to speak with students. The problem is probably that most of this year's MA students were also MA students. They are being trained to write creatively, but all are aware that they are unlikely to make a living doing this. Thus we need to get them started earlier in their mission to find employment that will provide a living for them while they engage in their craft.

Most of our MA and MFA graduates to get employment at universities, but they are no doubt uncertain about their future and often confused as to what their next step should be.

Performance Objective 7 This program will adequately prepare MA in English graduates for successful (1) admission in Ph.D. programs, (2) the literary marketplace, (3) the job market.

1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 100% of MA program graduates will complete the graduate exit survey. 75% of these students will rank the advice they have received about the career as "(3) good".

1.1 Data

Academic Year	# of candidates that completed the survey	Benchmark met?	# of excellent ratings	# of adequate ratings	# of sufficient ratings	# of somewhat inadequate ratings	# that did not comment	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	13/13	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-
2014-2015	6/6	Yes	3/6	1/6	1/6	1/6	-	Yes
2015-2016	10/10	Yes	7/10	-	1/10	-	2/10	Yes
2016-2017	5/5	Yes	4/5	-	1/5	-	-	-
2017-2018	6/6	Yes	2/6	4/6	-	-	-	-

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

Advising does not seem to satisfy students' desire for advice on preparing for future careers, and their basic Bibliography course does not seem to be addressing the issue either. The director will ask students to elaborate on their dissatisfaction or satisfaction with "advice received about career." An annual departmental, afternoon seminar on entering the job market is being developed. Highlight would include the three tracts (moving into non-academic jobs, the Ph.D. program, and instructor-level academic positions) available to graduate students after graduating.

2016-2017:

As noted in previous discussion, the career advising seems to be adequate, but we still should offer a few more workshops or meetings on potential career preparation.

2017-2018:

Since most of the MAs are also MFA students, the main venue for improving advising is probably to work on the issue in the professional endeavors course. The MA director and perhaps the department head or others could present alternative careers to creative writing. Voluntary afternoon seminars might also help.

Performance Objective 8 The department will create and foster an effective learning environment.

1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: The department will integrate technology as appropriate to support learning.

1.1 Data

2017-2018:

During the coming faculty evaluation, we will ask professors on merit evaluations how they use technology to support learning. The department head or appointed person will score their response on a scale of 1-5. This could also help with offering another way to evaluate merit with faculty. We will try to incorporate and analyze this measurement and create a benchmark. If this appears not to be a good measurement, we will consider other methods or perhaps revise the objective.

Dr. LeJeune will also be offering a professional development session on using Turnitin, a highly useful program for our field.

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

As noted in the comment above, this objective does not seem appropriate. It is rather vague and hard to quantify, and it is more suited to program review than to review of academic support units. If it is retained, one or more of the methods of assessment mentioned above could be used.