



## English and Foreign Languages

#6 Plan cycle - 6

Plan cycle 2020/2021

7/1/20 - 6/30/21

## 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
2018-2019	100%	11/11*	Yes
2019-2020	100%	16/16	Yes
2020-2021	100%	18/18	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.

2018-2019:

Involvement with the community is a central concern of the faculty, and all of the faculty are engaged with community or University service. In the recent APR review, the tenure-track faculty members recorded significant activity in service. In fact, all of our tenure-track faculty members reported the expected level of service activity. Several of them ranked as very good. Our faculty members consistently serve on committees deemed as "most significant" to the university. We have two members on the GERT Force and another was very involved in the graduate council and RNL development. Our engagement with the community is also very strong as our department consistently sponsors programs that are free and open to the public. Faculty members also make use of their academic talents by offering translation services,

tutoring, offering in-services, and providing readings.

While 100% of the tenure-track faculty serve on committees at the department level and 50% served on committees at the University level, areas of improvement would be for at least 75% to serve at the University level.

2019-2020:

A new APR form and process was developed. The form is more specific, offers weights for various activities, and tries to offer a more transparent mode of evaluation. The new APR process also tries to provide more feedback and a documented feedback loop.

Involvement with the community is a central concern of the faculty, and all of the faculty are engaged with community or University service. In the recent APR review, the tenure-track faculty members recorded significant activity in service.

100% of the tenure-track faculty serve on committees at the department level. We are encouraging faculty to participate in service at the college level. The new APR form should promote this.

2020-2021:

100% of the tenure-track faculty serve on committees at the department level. Other University activities were hampered during the last year. The new APR form should promote this. However, the department did use various media platforms and online delivery methods to ensure that our community outreach and public programming continued. 100% of faculty did volunteer to help with the hurricane comeback.

## **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).

2018-2019:

The department sponsored seven creative writing programs and co-sponsored the Joe and Lydia Cash lecture. It also helped with the Southern Law School visit, the Women's Studies Brown Bag Luncheons, and a lecture sponsored by the Honors College.

2019-2020:

Many of the activities scheudle for the spring were cancelled due to COVID.

2020-2021:

The department sponsored seven creative writing programs. The Joe and Lydia Cash lecture was not held. The Women's Studies Brown Bag Luncheons were not held this year.

#### **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 MFA 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.

2018-2019:

The department continues to do well in this area despite the limited resources. Most of this can be attributed to the connections various faculty members have with outside artists and strong relationships with former students. The attendance at these events is also strong. The Joe and Lydia Cash Lecture had a full room at the Alumni Center, and several community members were in attendance. The department has been mindful of bringing in a diverse group of presenters and readers. This is an area in which we would like to improve. Additionally, the department plans to work with the ENGAGE app to publicize events and attract more undergraduate students.

2019-2020:

The department continues to do well in this area despite the limited resources. Most of this can be attributed to the connections various faculty members have with outside artists and strong relationships with former students. COVID caused many of our spring events to be cancelled.

2020-2021:

The department's efforts to continue with public programming during the hurricane is admirable. In fact, the streaming nature of the events facilitated attendance by a wide audience.

## **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 (tenure-track and non-tenured track) 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
2018-2019	75%	12/16	Yes
2019-2020	81%	13/16	Yes
2020-2021	71%	13/18	No

#### **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.

2018-2019:

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. There is no main area of weakness in the evaluations. Our retention rate for majors was 96%.

2019-2020:

The department is on track here. COVID's mandated switch to online instruction made this assessment problematic.

2020-2021:

The department's various number of low SEIs is understandable due to online instruction and the single semester's worth of data, but those faculty with low scores have been consulted. A faculty-driven PD activity is scheduled for Fall 2021 to help with SEIs.

## 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
2018-2019	100%	16/16	Yes
2019-2020	94%	15/16	Yes
2020-2021	83%	15/18	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.

2018-2019:

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.

Additions to faculty should improve advising. Advising will begin to be focused on concentrations--linking specialized advisors to specific areas of concentration.

The department's graduation rate is high. In Fall 2018 we graduated 100% of applicants. By August 1st, 2019, only eight majors in the department had not registered for Fall 2019. After reaching out to these students, that number dropped by 25%.

2019-2020:

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.

Additions to faculty should improve advising. Advising will begin to be focused on concentrations--linking specialized advisors to specific areas of concentration. This was done. More faculty members are advising. It appears we only have one faculty member who does not participate in some form.

2020-2021:

Potential areas for improvement are to increase faculty presence on recruiting days and in Literary Rally. One member of the department is serving on a college-wide recruitment committee. The department is also in development of recruitment and PR materials. The department has also tried to develop various retention strategies. The department has made marked improvements in advising. A few members of the department still don't advise, but this number has been reduced from last year. More faculty members are advising. It appears we only have three faculty members who do not participate in some form of advising. The department is also working on improving ENGL advising. The department's graduation rate is high. In spring 2021, we graduated 90% of applicants.

### **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
2018-2019	87%	14/16	Yes
2019-2020	48%	7/16	No
2020-2021	62%	11/18*	No

\*Includes the department head, director of honors college, and director of the Write to Excellence Center. In the last two years, these three people were not included. This is the reason the base number went from 16 to 18, not because new people were hired or lines were filled.

### 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.

2018-2019:

Faculty members do a good job in this area. ECCB still has not resumed publication, but faculty members are finding other venues. 50% of faculty members have been able to complete significant publishing projects, despite the limitations faced with a diminished faculty. Since the department was able to hire three new faculty, publication should increase dramatically. Unfortunately, participation in conferences is limited due to the amount of travel funding. The department has emphasized attending state and regional conferences.

2019-2020:

While some faculty members did publish during this academic year, COVID in the spring prevented conference attendance. The change in EP also limited the opportunity for research as the funds were designated for campus improvement rather than faculty development and research. The lack of pay increase or merit raises also causes faculty members to prioritize other activities, such as teaching and service. The low number of faculty in the department also require faculty members to do more service work and teach larger classes, which prevents time for research. There is also limited money for travel and currently our new faculty hired at 45,000 find it difficult to fund conference travel out of pocket.

2020-2021:

While some faculty members did publish during this academic year, COVID and the hurricanes prevented conference attendance and hampered scholarship activity. Last year's change in endowed professorships continued to have repercussions. The carryover from the previous year's use of funds for campus improvement rather than faculty development and research was obvious. This year's late notice of the continuation of EP also discouraged participation and limited much of those funds from being used for publication or research this year. The lack of pay increases or merit raises continues to encourage faculty members to prioritize other activities, such as teaching. The low number of tenure-track faculty in the department also requires faculty members to do more service work and teach larger classes, which prevents time for research. Currently, the department has 4 non-research instructor positions in this list of



18 positions. The number 18 also includes the department head, director of honors college, director of the Write to Excellence Center, and director of freshman writing, which all have extensive administrative responsibilities. There is also limited money for travel and currently our new faculty hired at \$45,000 find it difficult to fund conference travel out-of-pocket. That being said, faculty did use online conferences to their advantage. Many attended these virtual conferences, which helped to increase the percentage of faculty conducting research. The department also broadened its definition of scholarship to include activity beyond publishing and attendance at academic conferences.

## 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
2018-2019	65%	11/17	Yes
2019-2020	41%	7/17	No
2020-2021	33%	6/18	No

#### 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.

2018-2019:

The departmental faculty members have done a good job here. Most of the few faculty members who did not publish this year contributed to a conference. The cost-of-living increase last year should motivate faculty members to prioritize scholarship, as it often determines rank since most faculty members engage in significant service and are excellent teachers.

2019-2020:

COVID prevented conference attendance and paused publication of various journals. The change in EP also limited the opportunity for research as the funds were designated for campus improvement rather than faculty development and research. The lack of pay increase or merit raises also causes faculty members to prioritize other activities, such as teaching. The low number of faculty in the department also require faculty members to do more service work and teach larger classes, which prevents time for research.

2020-2021:

COVID and hurricanes prevented conference attendance and paused publication of various journals. The hurricane also severely strained people's ability to be productive. The change in EP also limited the opportunity for research as the funds were designated for campus improvement rather than faculty development and research. The lack of pay increase or merit raises also causes faculty members to prioritize other activities, such as teaching. The low number of faculty in the department also require faculty members to do more service work and teach larger classes, which prevents time for research. The department did stress the need to submit material in the hopes of things might be published. We also tried to promote a department-level writing group. It will take time to see if these bear fruit. Diminishing publication due to various factors seems to be a trend.

#### **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 release time for administrative or research/creative duties.

##### **1.1 Data**

2016-2017:

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

2017-2018:

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

2018-2019:

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

2019-2020:

Six individuals were granted release time for administrative purposes for the year. Two were granted release in order to complete PH.D.

2020-2021:

Six individuals were granted release time for administrative purposes for the year. Two were granted release in order to complete PHD. One of these was for creative purposes.

##### **1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2016-2017:

Gaining release time has proved difficult because of budget cuts. Although the University is being somewhat cooperative in this regard, we could use more help with release 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 release 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 release 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 MA director and the editor of the McNeese Review.

Fortunately, the current administration essentially is leaving release 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 release 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.

2018-2019:

The most significant change this year was the institution of release time for the assistant department head.

Fortunately, the current administration essentially is leaving released time up to departments, provided that we cover our work. This is a good change, and the 2019-2020 academic year should see significant benefits from this investment.

We still need to hold on to the idea of granting release 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. The administration did support the application of an ATLAS grant. The department is delighted to say that the faculty member was awarded the grant. We should see the fruits of this in the 2019-2020 report.

2019-2020:

Six individuals were granted release time for administrative purposes for the year. Two were granted release in order to complete PH.D. The administration did support the ATLAS grant.

2020-2021:

The use of release time has seen dividends. The department is much better positioned to recruit and retain students. Our MA program is the most obvious example of this. We have also worked hard to promote the completion of the Ph.D. by two current faculty members. This is an important goal for the department, as it provides the requisite level of expertise to maintain a program of graduate study.

## **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.

2018-2019:

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. One faculty assumed the responsibility of an additional endowed professorship. An additional outside grant was awarded to a member of the department.

2019-2020:

Faculty members received six endowed professorships, although two were dedicated ex-officio to the director of the Honors College and two to the director of the MFA program.

2020-2021:

Faculty members received six endowed professorships, although two were dedicated ex-officio to the director of the Honors College and two to the director of the MFA program.

### 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.

2018-2019:

The department is doing very well in this area. Five faculty members were awarded endowed professorships (in addition to those slated for the department) and outside grants. One faculty member was also awarded a residency based on her work with the EP.

2019-2020:

Three faculty members were awarded endowed professorships (in addition to those slated for the department) and outside grants. One faculty member was also awarded a residency based on her work with the EP. One was awarded an ATLAS grant.

2020-2021:

Two faculty members were awarded endowed professorships (in addition to those slated for the department) and outside grants. Two faculty members were awarded residencies based on work with EP. The shift in EP back to a research-focused approach should help with numbers.

## 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
Fall 2018	27-28	28-30	Yes
Spring 2019	21-23	27-29	Yes
Fall 2019	26-27	32-36	No
Spring 2020	26-27	32-36	No
Fall 2020	27-28	30-31	Yes
Spring 2021	26-27	30-31	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.

Eventually we need to add an extra position or two to help with composition courses. If we could find good M.A. candidates, we could add a couple of assistantships there. The MA director should be on the lookout for such persons.

Even though we are not fully reaching this benchmark, we should consider changing it to a goal of the upper-to-mid twenties for composition classes; 30 students in a composition class is too many.

**2018-2019:**

The administration's willingness to fill two one-year temporary positions for the 2018-2019 year made a significant impact on our course numbers, especially composition courses. Since the enrollment in these courses remained manageable, the pass rate in those courses was in the high 70s.

Finding good, qualified adjunct faculty is difficult. More problematic is since for most of them teaching at McNeese is a second job, they are unable to teach during the day.

Even though we are not fully reaching this benchmark, we should consider changing it to a goal of the upper-to-mid 20s for composition classes; 30 students in a composition class is too many. The national studies indicate that every student beyond 22 reduces the course pass rate.

**2019-2020:**

Class sizes are a constant source of focus and development. Tracking class sizes is an ongoing endeavor. The benchmarks themselves should be analyzed as even these class sizes challenge the effectiveness of teachers, reduce the retention of students, and limit one-to-one student-student or student-teacher interaction.

**2020-2021:**

The benchmarks for these class sizes work counter to the department's core mission. While lecture-based courses at the sophomore level could increase class size, composition courses should not exceed 25 at an university this size. McNeese should increase its VL budget.

## **Performance Objective 5 Increase enrollment, persistence, retention, and graduation rates for each program offered by the department.**

### **1 Assessment and Benchmark**

Benchmark: Increase enrollment by 5% each year, overall and in each undergraduate program offered by the department.

- ENGL - BA English
  - CMPL - Comparative Literature
  - EGED - English Education Grades 6-12
  - FOLL - Foreign Languages and Literature
  - LITR - Literature

- WRIT - Writing
- FORL - BA Foreign Languages (inactive effective 201540)
  - FLED - Foreign Languages Education Grades 6-12
  - FREN - French
  - LATN - Latin
  - SPAN - Spanish

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was track undergraduate student enrollment at all levels and completers for all ENFL programs and concentrations.

Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was to maintain or exceed 2014-2015 levels, and maintain a three-year BOR average of eight completers for the BA in English program.

### 1.1 Data

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
<b>Total</b>		<b>31</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>14</b>

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
<b>Total</b>		<b>35</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>6</b>

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

<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>6</b>
--------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	------------	----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------

2018-2019:

Major	Conc.	Fall						Spring					
		F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP
ENGL	CMPL	1	0	2	2	5	0	0	1	1	3	5	1
	EGED	11	10	11	9	41	3	13	3	15	7	38	5
	FOLL	4	3	0	3	10	1	6	1	2	1	10	0
	LITR	1	2	2	15	20	3	4	2	0	15	21	9
	WRIT	3	9	3	4	19	2	4	6	8	1	19	0
	(blank)	4	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>12</b>

2019-2020:

Major	Conc.	Fall						Spring					
		F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP
ENGL	CMPL	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	0
	EGED	11	15	7	8	41	1	6	12	3	12	33	2
	FOLL	1	5	4	1	11	1	1	5	1	1	8	0
	LITR	1	5	4	6	16	2*	1	4	5	5	15	3
	WRIT	5	4	10	3	22	0	3	4	8	7	22	0
	(blank)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>5</b>

\*includes 1 graduate in Summer 2019

2020-2021:

Major	Conc.	Fall						Spring					
		F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP	F	S	J	Sr	T	CMP
ENGL	CMPL	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
	EGED	4	11	8	10	33	2	7	9	10	8	34	2
	FOLL	2	1	4	2	9	0	1	2	4	3	10	1
	LITR	1	3	6	5	15	2	3	1	2	5	11	0
	WRIT	7	7	5	12	31	5	4	8	6	9	27	4
	(blank)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>7</b>

Percentage Change between 2017-2018:

Major	Fall	Total	% Change
ENGL	2017	104	-4.807%
	2018	99	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>-4.807%</b>

	<b>2018</b>	<b>99</b>	
--	-------------	-----------	--

Percentage Change between 2018-2019:

Major	Fall	Total	% Change
ENGL	2018	99	-8.081%
	2019	91	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>-8.081%</b>
	<b>2019</b>	<b>91</b>	

Percentage Change between 2019-2020:

Major	Fall	Total	% Change
ENGL	2019	91	-1.098%
	2020	90	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>-1.098%</b>
	<b>2020</b>	<b>90</b>	

### 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 BA in Foreign Languages was eliminated a few years ago and we not then have a BA 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 Foreign Languages majors, and in 2017-2018 we have 8.5 English majors with a concentration in Foreign Languages. 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.

2018-2019:

We see a significant drop in enrollment (4%), but this seems to correlate with the enrollment in the University. 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. We have tried to be more active in recruiting and we have discussed various strategies to market the degrees the department offers. One of the main issues is the number of ENGL ED majors. The department plans on working with the EDUC department to brainstorm reasons for this dip in enrollment and possible solutions.



2019-2020:

The numbers were down, but not as much as previous years. The department has worked hard on reaching out to students. We have actively participated in calling programs to majors who haven't registered for the upcoming semester.

2020-2021:

The department's completion numbers show the success of the department's hard work in the face of the hurricanes and COVID. Our completion numbers for 2020-2021 is comparable to previous years and even exceeds several earlier years. The focus on advising based around concentrations has improved these rates. The department also continues its calling campaign.

## 2 Assessment and Benchmark

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

- ENGL - MA English
  - CRWR - Creative Writing (inactive effective 201940)
  - LITR - Literature
- CRWR - MFA Creative Writing
  - FICT - Fiction
  - POET - Poetry

### 2.1 Data

Graduate Enrollment:

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	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
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
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
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>31</b>

Major	Conc.	2018-2019			2019-2020			2020-2021			2021-2022			2022-2023		
		U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S
ENGL	CRWR	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0						
	LITR	1	3	1	0	4	7	0	8	12						
	(blank)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>						
CRWR	FICT	0	8	9	0	10	8	0	6	6						
	POET	0	8	9	0	8	7	0	8	7						
	(blank)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>						
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>25</b>						

## 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
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>
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
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>

Major	Conc.	2018-2019			2019-2020			2020-2021			2021-2022			2022-2023		
		U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S	U	F	S
ENGL	CRWR	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
	LITR	0	2	7	0	1	6	0	0	4						
	(blank)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>						
CRWR	FICT	0	1	3	0	0	4	0	0	1						
	POET	0	0	4	0	0	3	0	0	3						
	(blank)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>						
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>						

## 2.1.1 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.

2018-2019:

We intensified efforts to recruit English teachers from the local parish school systems into the MA program or into MA graduate classes, but this didn't generate many results. Perhaps some incentive (a 1/2 tuition waiver) would help to motivate high school teachers to return to school.

As predicted, enrollment has dropped significantly now that the online Creative Writing concentration MA in English has been cut 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.)

2019-2020:

The department agrees with IRE.

2020-2021:

The department needs to reevaluate this benchmark. With funding rates as they currently stand and the difficulty we have recently faced in recruiting qualified candidates, the completion rate will be difficult to meet.

### 3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmarks:

- A persistence rate (retained students from fall Y1 to spring Y1) of 85%.
- A retention rate of 70% from Y1 to Y2.
- A retention rate of 55% from Y1 to Y3.
- A retention rate of 45% from Y1 to Y4.
- A 4-year graduation rate of 35%.
- A 5-year graduation rate of 40%.
- A 6-year graduation rate of 45%.

Major:

- ENGL - Bachelor of Arts in English
- FORL - Bachelor of Arts in Foreign Languages

#### 3.1 Data

2012:

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ENGL	13*	Same	10	76.9	6	46.2	5	38.5	5	38.5	5	38.5	5	38.5	5	38.5
		Changed	1	7.7	2	15.4	3	23.1	1	7.7	2	15.4	3	23.1	3	23.1
		<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>84.6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>61.5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>61.5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>46.2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>53.8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>61.5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>61.5</b>
FORL	1	Same	1	100	1	100	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
		Changed	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100	1	100	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
		<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	14	Same	11	78.6	7	50.0	5	35.7	5	35.7	5	35.7	5	38.5	5	38.5
		Changed	1	7.1	2	14.3	4	28.6	2	14.3	2	14.3	3	21.4	3	21.4
		<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>85.7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>64.3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>64.3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>57.1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>57.1</b>

\*1 student was previously undeclared before declaring ENGL.

2013:

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ENGL	23*	Same	12	52.2	9	39.1	7	30.4	6	26.1	5	21.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
		Changed	8	34.8	7	30.4	4	17.4	4	17.4	0	0.0	2	8.7	0	0.0
		<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>87.0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>69.6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>47.8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>43.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
FORL	4	Same	3	75.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
		Changed	1	25.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0
		<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>25.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	27	Same	15	55.6	10	37.0	8	29.6	7	25.9	5	18.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
		Changed	9	33.3	8	29.6	4	14.8	4	14.8	0	0.0	2	7.4	1	3.7
		<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>88.9</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>44.4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>40.7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>18.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3.7</b>

\*3 students were previously undeclared before declaring ENGL.

2014:

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ENGL	19	Same	12	63.2	11	57.9	9	47.4	8	42.1	4	21	8	42.1	8	42.1
		Changed	6	31.6	6	31.6	6	31.6	6	31.6	2	10.5	6	31.5	6	31.5
		<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>94.7</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>89.5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>78.9</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>73.7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>73.6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>73.6</b>
FORL	2	Same	1	50.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0	1	50	1	50
		Changed	1	50.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	1	50.0%	0	0	1	50	1	50
		<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Total</b>	21	Same	13	61.9	12	57.1	10	47.6	9	42.9	4	19	9	42.8	9	42.8
		Changed	7	33.3	7	33.3	7	33.3	7	33.3	2	9.5	7	33.3	7	33.3
		<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>95.2</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>90.5</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>81.0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>76.2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>28.5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>76.1</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>73.6</b>

2015:

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ENGL	22	Same	18	81.8	15	68.2	9	40.9	9	40.9						
		Changed	3	13.6	5	22.7	5	22.7	5	22.7						
		<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>95.5</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>90.9</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>63.6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>63.6</b>						

2016:

Major	Cohort	Same	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ENGL	23	Same	18	78.3	12	52.2	10	43.5	9	39.1						
		Changed	1	4.3	6	26.1	5	21.7	5	21.7						
		<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>82.6</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>78.3</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>65.2</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>60.9</b>						

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ENGL	25	Same	21	84.0	15	60.0	13	52.0								
		Changed	3	12.0	2	8.0	5	20.0								
		Total	24	96.0	17	68.0	18	72.0								

[illegible][illegible]

Major	Cohort Size	Same Major?	Persistence Rate		Retention Rate						Graduation Rate					
					Y1 to Y2		Y1 to Y3		Y1 to Y4		4-Year		5-Year		6-Year	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

ENGL		Same																	
		Changed																	
		Total																	

### 3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019:

As the data indicates, we have far surpassed our benchmarks as this is the real strength of the department. Our persistence rate is 96%. The department strives to work with students. Our FFND course is central to this. The focus of this department goal should be recruitment.

We only have one section of data for graduation rates, and those are 10-15% points above the benchmarks. This is good. Of course, the department would like to see all our students graduate and would like to investigate methods of finding students close to graduation. We will begin this semester by finding any ENGL majors with 12-15 short of graduation and contact them.

The department's retention rates also exceed the benchmarks. One year was lower than others. That year was the year the department had the fewest filled positions. The department suffers from enticing people to major in ENGL and encouraging them to persevere in light of the community's emphasis on STEM careers. The department has started several initiatives to offer detailed information on career possibilities.

2019-2020:

The department considers this an important portion of our core mission. It has tried to improve advising by offering more specialized advising and holding departmental advising workshops as PD activities.

Many of these figures have been difficult to track due to COVID.

The department has started several initiatives to offer detailed information on career possibilities. One in particular has been guests speakers who discuss their own career paths. We have also encouraged the attendance at the Women's Luncheon series, which often has various career professionals discussing their paths.

2020-2021:

The department's retention rates and persistence rates exceed the benchmarks. The department suffers the ENGL ED major strict course sequence. Many JR and SR majors were forced to shift degree due to the new Education degree program and the new student teaching requirements.

## **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
2018-2019	18/18	100%	Yes

2019-2020	—	—	—
2020-2021	13/17	76%	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.

2018-2019:

The department seeks to meet the needs of students. A great deal of time and energy is devoted to staggering class times so ENGL courses do not conflict with each other. The limited number of faculty slots and the enrollment requirements limit how much can be done to offer multiple sections at various times during the week. We do continue to offer multiple time offerings even if the numbers didn't strictly require it, but with that in mind, the department has devoted resources into being predictable with courses offerings, realizing that is one way of facilitating student needs. We hired a full-time faculty person in French to help address that need.

2019-2020:

This information was not collected due to COVID or is inaccessible due to the closer of buildings damaged during the multiple hurricanes.

2020-2021:

The department seeks to meet the needs of students. A great deal of time and energy is devoted to staggering class times so ENGL courses do not conflict with each other. This past year a great deal of energy and planning went into scheduling courses so they would not conflict with EDUC classes. The limited number of faculty slots and the enrollment requirements limit how many specialized courses we can offer. Many students would prefer special topics, but these courses usually don't have the same number of students found in the required survey courses. The department charged its curriculum committee with this task. Over the next year we hope to see some improvement.

## 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.

2018-2019:

The department assesses course offerings, especially during initial set-up of classes and enrollment periods. 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. The department also is flexible to ensure students graduate and are prepared for certification exams.

2019-2020:

The department does a good job with its course offerings.

2020-2021:

The curriculum committee was called at the close of the spring semester. They were given the charge to review course offerings, AP credit, prerequisites, and course sequencing. A specific focus was the writing skills of certain students in senior-level courses. Improvements should

### **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 generous retired faculty members as well as others. Again, we probably need to hire at least one tenure-track faculty member and one instructor within the next few years, if enrollment stays steady. We are working on a rotation system for necessary classes. The department head gives the proposed schedule to a few majors to check for time conflicts, etc.

2017-2018:

We will continue with our general procedures, which seem to be working. Additional examination of the English Education concentration should take place this fall, since we are required by the state to make changes in that program.

We will try to use adjunct faculty as much as possible in French until we find a better solution. We do not currently have a full time, tenure-track position in French. Such a position is much needed, but we can make a better case for it if enrollment in French rises some.

2018-2019:

The English Education concentration limited hours is a problem. The required ENGL continued to be cut.

2019-2020:

The department does a good job with its course offerings. the department continues to track offerings. It made a point of offering ENGL 353 in the spring, which was needed. It will also offer ENGL 496 soon.

2020-2021:

The department sees three main concerns from recent surveys: ENGL courses must not conflict with required EDUC courses, a healthy number of courses to fulfill the required electives in the Writing Conc,



and more courses that teach diverse writers. The department is working to address all of these issues. ENGL 496 was offered in Fall 2021. ENGL 353 was offered in Spring 2022. A course focusing on the third lack will be offered in spring 2022.

### 3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: MA English program faculty meet at least once an academic year to review student progress, curricular offerings, and appropriate professional contacts and opportunities.

#### 3.1 Data

2016-2017:

The department chair and the MA program director met to discuss the lack of world literature courses offered and graduate students' demand for them. Graduate students do not identify courses on ancient classical literature, which the department offers on a regular rotation, as representative of world literature. This semester, a professor is teaching a course on Shakespeare's European sources, and the reading list includes authors spanning the European continent.

2017-2018:

With the resignation of one teacher, there was a meeting of faculty to discuss future needs. Although we were not allowed to replace this teacher for 2018-2019, we expect to be able to do so the following year. In this case, it is likely that we will seek someone versed broadly in literature, perhaps in comparative literature. The department head also consults regularly with the directors of the MA and MFA programs on appropriate course offerings.

In the spring of 2018, we offered three graduate classes in modern or contemporary literature, so we are doing well on that front.

2018-2019:

The department hired three new faculty members to begin in Fall 2019. All three of these specialize in modern or contemporary literature or culture. The faculty met to discuss these needs, and these hires were faculty-driven. The department head also consults regularly with the directors of the MA and MFA programs on appropriate course offerings.

2019-2020:

The department hired one new faculty members to begin in Fall 2020. All three of these specialize in literature or culture. The department head also consults regularly with the directors of the MA and MFA programs on appropriate course offerings.

2020-2021:

The department head consults regularly with the directors of the MA and MFA programs on appropriate course offerings. The new MFA hire addressed specific concerns of the graduate students.

#### 3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Courses on non-European and non-American courses are deeply needed. Two new faculty members were hired to replace outgoing faculty members who taught graduate courses in Medieval studies, literary theory, and Renaissance literature.

2017-2018:

We did well with offering modern and contemporary literature. It would be good to be more geographically and perhaps temporally diverse. Still, it is important that students know the canon well, since most of our MA students will read a good bit of contemporary literature on their own and with their classes.

2018-2019:

Three new faculty members were hired to teach modern and contemporary literature and culture. Each possesses a great deal of diverse specialization. One focuses on South and Central America. One focuses

on indigenous people, including American indigenous people and indigenous Filipinos. One focuses on Asian literature and Asian-American literature.

2019-2020:

We did well with offering modern and contemporary literature. Our new faculty hires did a great job of diversifying our course offerings. Unfortunately, one of these new hires left in August 2020, citing low pay as the primary reason.

2020-2021:

This last year proved difficult in maintaining the momentum of diverse course offerings. The vacant ENGL World Lit line continues to hamper our efforts to offer various courses.

#### 4 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 "(2) sufficient" or higher.

Ratings on survey:

(4) excellent

(3) adequate

(2) sufficient

(1) somewhat inadequate

##### 4.1 Data

Academic Year	Candidates completing exit survey		Benchmark met?	Ranked advice sufficient or higher		Benchmark met?
	#	%		#	%	
2013-2014	13/13	100%	Yes	—	—	—
2014-2015	6/6	100%	Yes	4/6	66.6%	Yes
2015-2016	10/10	100%	Yes	8/10	80%	Yes
2016-2017	5/5	100%	Yes	5/5	100%	Yes
2017-2018	6/6	100%	Yes	6/6	100%	Yes
2018-2019	9/9	100%	Yes	9/9	100%	Yes
2019-2020	—	—	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	9/9	100%	Yes	9/9	100%	Yes

##### 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.

2018-2019:

Ratings were good. The MA director will continue meetings about how to apply to graduate school, and we will include at least one more informal professional discussion. This will be incorporated into professional endeavors or at another venue. In addition, visiting writers and readers will be encouraged to share their ideas about the professional field as a closing statement at their event.

2019-2020:

This information was not collected due to COVID or is inaccessible due to the closer of buildings damaged during the multiple hurricanes.

2020-2021:

Ratings were generally good. The MA Director will continue meetings about how to apply to graduate school. Professional Endeavors continues to be an important part of our courses in order to maintain proper training. That being said, the most useful training our graduate students receive is their work in the classroom. To continue this, we need to make the MA and MFA program more competitive in its funding and more appealing as a place to work due to it offering a livable wage.

**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 “(2) sufficient” or higher.

Ratings on survey:

(4) excellent

(3) adequate

(2) sufficient

(1) somewhat inadequate

##### 1.1 Data

Academic Year	Candidates completing exit survey		Benchmark met?	Ranked advice sufficient or higher		Benchmark met?
	#	%		#	%	
2013-2014	13/13	100%	Yes	—	—	—
2014-2015	6/6	100%	Yes	4/6	66.6%	Yes
2015-2016	10/10	100%	Yes	8/10	80%	Yes
2016-2017	5/5	100%	Yes	5/5	100%	Yes
2017-2018	6/6	100%	Yes	6/6	100%	Yes
2018-2019	9/9	100%	Yes	9/9	100%	Yes
2019-2020	—	—	—	—	—	—
2020-2021	9/9	100%	Yes	9/9	100%	Yes
2021-2022	7/7	100%	yes	7/7	100%	Yes

### 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.

2018-2019:

The professional endeavors course is a useful tool to help development in this area. The department faculty could present alternative careers to creative writing. Voluntary afternoon seminars or some other means of sharing career advice will be explored.

2019-2020:

This information was not collected due to COVID or is inaccessible due to the closer of buildings damaged during the multiple hurricanes.

2020-2021:

While the benchmark was met, the surveys themselves reveal more scores closer to sufficient than exceptional. The professional endeavors course is a useful tool to help development in this area, but the department has also decided to alter ENGL 610 to include discussion of and practice in certain skills. A change in instructor for that course was also made. The department continues to explore specific training for faculty to become better career advisors.

2021-2022:

Reflection: Students met the benchmark and ranked the quality of advice about future careers as well above sufficient. Most selected either "good" or "excellent." (The language of the ratings was changed to be more exact: (4) excellent, (3) good, (2) sufficient, (1) inadequate.) Perhaps circulating (whether in email or in the department newsletter) the ways our students are participating in academia before and after they graduate helps keep advisees abreast of potential futures. The department and MA director have tried to be more present in career advice/training. The change of instructor in 610 also seems to have improved the connection between students and career advice, as the MA director now teaches 610 and can add this information to the class as needed.

## 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.

2018-2019:

The department seeks to integrate technology for student learning in two ways, teacher instruction and capital outlay. 90% of the faculty received specialized instruction on two technological tools meant to improve instruction. The department also devoted certain resources to improve the use of technology in the classroom.

2019-2020:

The department seeks to integrate technology for student learning in two ways, teacher instruction and capital outlay. 100% of the faculty received specialized instruction on various technological tools meant to improve instruction. The department also devoted certain resources to improve the use of technology in the classroom. The department created various training modules and films for faculty to use as resources.

2020-2021:

The department excelled at training faculty in the use of new technology. Most of this was done by Michael Horner. 100% of the faculty received specialized instruction on various technological tools meant to improve instruction.

#### **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.

2018-2019:

While this is a minor step, faculty members were sent several training videos on TurnItIn and Moodle grade book in order to reduce scholastic dishonesty and to improve the real-time display of students' course grades as the semester progresses.

Since several faculty members mentioned issues with equipment in classes, the department also purchased several micro-projectors to encourage professors to incorporate technology in the classroom.

For the 2019-2020 year, the department also plans on providing instruction for Screen-cast-o-matic and to provide more training for incorporating technology.

2019-2020:

The department seeks to integrate technology for student learning in two ways, teacher instruction and capital outlay. The department emphasized the use of video instruction for online courses. The department will continue to offer PD sessions.

2020-2021:

The department plans to partner with the CoLA dean's office to offer professional and specialized instruction in order to improve online pedagogy. The department believes this will be the most significant and efficient means of improving online instruction.