English for New Media Program Review

College of Arts and Science College of Computing

Dakota State University

Site Visit: October 12, 2017

Joshua Call

Professor of English

Grand View University

Part 1- Executive Summary of Findings

This review covers some breadth of the English for New Media program (ENM), while maintaining focus on specific key areas. There is clear agreement between the provided review document, faculty interviews, and conversations with administrative representatives that the program is a worthwhile addition to the curriculum. Concerns for the review focus primarily on program organization and staffing, as well as finding successful ways to market the ENM major to students. This means a direct need to address some issues of faculty workload, as well as how to best frame the value proposition of the major to generate increased enrollment.

Part 2- Schedule of Visit

Wednesday, October 11
Motel reservations at AmericInn in Madison for one person

Thursday, October 12
8:45 AM Pick up at Motel (John Nelson)
9:00 AM Dr. McKay, Provost and Academic Vice President, President's Conf Room (820 North Washington Avenue)
9:30 AM Ben Jones, Dean of Arts and Sciences, President's Conf Room
10:00 AM Dr. Jay Kahl, Director of Assessment, President's Conf Room
10:30 – 12:00 PM English for New Media Faculty, Beacom 116 (requested in 25Live).
12:00 – 1:00 PM Lunch, Marketplace (ENM faculty)
1:00 – 2:00 PM English for New Media Students, Club Hub, Trojan Center
2:00 – 3:00 PM John Nelson, tour facilities
3:00 – 4:00 PM Open time – prep for exit interview – President's Conf Room
4:00 – 5:00 PM Exit Interview with Dr. McKay, Ben Jones, John Nelson, Stacey Berry, President's Conf Room

Part 3- Program Evaluation

A. Program Goals and Strategic Planning

Assessing the success of program goals is a complicated endeavor at the best of times. Given that this is the first program review for English for New Media, there are some particular challenges present. The program's goals are largely overshadowed by some immediate necessities regarding enrollment. Additionally, because the program is still relatively new, it is very much finding its feet as it evaluates its own identity. In all, the program has done commendable work building a strong foundation for future success. Its curriculum and mission match well with institutional priorities, while also representing a clear vision of how it sees itself in the field. At present, strategic planning and goal setting are, by virtue of need, focused on growth and sustainability. Because of this, much of this section will focus on how current data demonstrates successful completion of learning outcomes, as those best reflect the current vision of program success.

Looking at the goals overall for the ENM program is a fascinating example of what happens when a department sets a more complicated standard for itself then it needs to. Individually, the ENM program has every possible permutation of learning outcome that it might need in order to demonstrate successful student learning. This is also a case where they might make some particular and strategic revisions to their outcomes in order to both simplify their assessments, while also developing a more refined sense of what their students are capable of. Specific suggestions for change will come in the final section of this review, but there are some easy ways that the learning outcomes can be made to work better for the department. For example, having seven distinct learning outcomes may not be the best, or most efficient way to document student learning when several of those outcomes overlap in easily collapsible and assessable ways.

In terms of meeting goals, the department's assessment data is still just emerging. As this is a new program that is still early in its life, there is not much longitudinal data to parse in any kind of fine way. Still, the data that is present is positive. Of the seven learning outcomes, the department considers itself passing on five and failing on two. The failing evaluation seems a bit extreme, when looking at the assessment measure, but it's difficult to fault a program that sets such internally high standards for itself. Some of this tension will be resolved as further data is collected in the future (this is related to recruiting and enrollment), and through some potential revisions to how data is collected and assessed for the program. More on this in part 3. In all, the department has done a commendable job building the curriculum for a new major, and has provided a tremendously fertile ground for a programmatic future.

In terms of institutional mission and larger national trend, the ENM program is very much focused where it should be. As a part of DSU's larger programmatic mission "to educate leaders for the information age," the ENM program is positioned to serve the larger campus value proposition by supporting a quality humanities basis within a digitally focused curriculum. Its outcomes reflect an alignment with disciplinary standards, specifically the *NCTE Framework for 21st Century Curriculum and Assessment*. These standards remain the benchmark for success when English programs work in digital environments, and the ENM program seems to be well versed in applying them.

In terms of the landscape of Digital Humanities work, DSU has been incredibly forward thinking. The program review document mentions University of Nebraska-Lincoln as a model of what DH work can look like, but the field is currently seeing some expansion with undergraduate program. Penn State

recently announced its DIGIT program, which intersects an undergraduate Digital Humanities major with its existing graduate program and lab. DSU is, remarkably, the only regional school with a Digital Humanities program. Visibility is all that really holds it back. When comparing the courses, goals, and work of the program against other institutions, DSU is well configured to produce strong graduates with a range of skills to pursue a variety of positions within the field.

B) Program Resources

For the sake of effective organization, this review will divide program resources into two specific categories: 1) Curriculum and Faculty, 2) Facilities and Equipment

Curriculum and Faculty

Overall the curriculum of the ENM program has been built on an efficient intersection of traditional English courses and various media modalities. In effect, it represents a best of both worlds approach. There are some complications the department is experiencing as a result of lower enrollments that are producing particular pressures on the curriculum, as well as availability of classes. Conversations with students in the program reveal the worries over course availability are the largest concern with the program, although students were also quick to highlight the great lengths that faculty go to in order to address these issues.

There are opportunities for some efficiencies in the curriculum related to better assessment measurements mentioned above. Some courses in the ENM major are better matched to the English Education program, but due to concerns over course and program enrollments, these classes have been maintained. Some of these classes (ENGL 310: Applied Grammar) might be better used to redesign some curricular focus for both majors. Other courses are simply in need of increased enrollment to avoid being placed on rotations that are unhealthy for majors, and for the sustainability of the program. Addressing this issue requires specific intervention of recruiting efforts and strategic planning. This issue in particular cannot be resolved through further austerity. The program cannot cut its way into vitality.

The total number of credits (currently at 73) available in the major might seem high, particularly given the number of elective courses shared between the ENM program, and the English Education curriculum. Given DSU requirement that students take at least 50% of their total credits in the chosen program, that number seems more manageable. Still because of overall enrollment numbers, faculty are reporting difficulty with courses reaching minimum capacity. The question to be resolved here is if there are specific courses that might be removed or altered from both ENM and English Education in order to reduce the total number of elective courses and reduce teaching strain on the department. Some of the Literature electives might be a consideration here. The distribution of the Literature Electives (two courses each of World, American, and British Literature) compete not only in the major, but within the broader university core as Arts and Humanities electives. In effect, there is too much competition for classes that are producing lower course enrollments. This translates into teaching strain as under-enrolled course don't contribute equally to faculty load and compensation, or become courses that are cut outright. In similar fashion, if those elective courses are removed it represents a significant strike to faculty morale as they represent areas of specialty interest. Given this, some creative alterations to the way the curriculum is offered might be necessary to see the courses (and programs) survive until enrollments can be stabilized. Specific suggestions for this will follow at the end of this report.

There is a related issue of appropriate staffing for the programs as currently defined. As of fall 2017, the English department is down two faculty due to a failed search, and a retirement left un-replaced. Each of those positions was linked directly to the development and perpetuation of writing focused courses for the program. One of the consequences of this has been an absent voice for leadership, program assessment, and development of writing specific courses for the program. An additional consequence is an increase in the number of faculty outside of a writing specialization teaching writing focused courses instead of their areas of expertise. Some of these courses are being taught to compensate for reduced faculty loads from having under-enrolled or cancelled courses due to low enrollments. In similar fashion, the abundance of composition courses is a result of legislative priorities regarding dual-credit availability. While it is not possible to reduce these offerings due to legislative requirements, there is a desperate need for having a faculty member in the program that can provide leadership and direction on the implementation of this area of the curriculum; effectively ensuring that DSU's offerings are meeting the disciplinary guidelines of NCTE, and the Conference on College, Composition, and Communications. Given the sheer abundance of writing courses being taught out of the English department a Composition specialist would help shape the department's ability to better direct writing classes to serve the needs of the institutional core. On a related point, the emerging Cyber Securities program that will have heavy writing requirements represents an emerging opportunity for the program to serve the university through specific attention to its writing curriculum.

Beyond the absence of composition faculty, the current staffing for the program are well suited for the needs of their students. Student comments repeatedly centered on the generous and supportive nature of their professors, and their ability to cover an exhaustive range of topics, modalities, and technology. The scholarly work of the faculty in the program is noteworthy, given the amount of courses they teach and the current programmatic strain of sustaining their major. The program is truly staffed by a group of teacher-scholars. It's also worth mentioning here that faculty in the English department wear a large number of hats, and fill a variety of roles. This is not uncommon at teaching focused institutions. Still, the degree to which faculty are doing this well is something that has been noticed by students.

Facilities, Equipment, and Technology Integration

One of the great virtues of the many technological partnerships at DSU is the ready access to a host of technology resources. The program review and the campus visit clearly demonstrate a ready commitment to making technology available to students and faculty, as well as a significant amount of classroom infrastructure. During the visit, there was ample evidence of available lab space and digital classrooms to meet any student need. The availability of technical support for students and faculty was well represented in the review document itself. The physical facilities for such help were in transition to the library at the time of the visit. Digital resources for the research work of the program are considerable, and the ready access to integrated technology and support more than meets the needs of the program.

C) Program Assessment

The skills map provided for the ENM major shows a largely even distribution of competencies across the majority of the program, which suggests a solid progression for students to follow. This is particularly relevant given the larger percentage of transfer students for the major. A student can experience a mostly even progression, regardless of what stage they transfer into the program. An unfortunate consequence of a high number of transfer student though, is that making effective assessments almost always falls on exit measurements in upper-division courses. This means that while a program can demonstrate the effectiveness of its students as they leave, they often have a more difficult time documenting all the work they accomplish along the way; capturing how effectively they "move the needle" of student success.

In similar fashion, the ENM program has an assessment measure that is absolutely appropriate for its needs. A culminating capstone experience that reflects some form of self-directed student portfolio is an excellent measure to reflect both student ability and student interest. The current issues with the portfolio assessment are largely logistical in nature, and easily resolved. That being said, one of the more troubling results of this logistical difficulty is that it likely translates into some slight skewing of the data. The program review notes that some students fail to take the exit portfolio seriously as a result of the less structured nature of the work; there is little incentive for excellence due to a lack of corresponding consequences. Some specific suggestions for resolving this issue will come at the end of this review, and can be achieved in conjunction with other strategic revisions.

As mentioned previously, the assessment data is more positive than the department claims. It is worth reiterating that they are more critical of themselves than necessary. The departmental conclusion that they "fail" on assessment outcomes 3 and 7 is made because they are the only places where some (not all) student evaluations achieve a rank of "does not meet." While establishing such high standards for the program are admirable, the department is also rightly aware that there is some disconnect between how the exit portfolio translates into a measure of program success, as opposed to student success. Some careful and strategic revisions might alleviate this concern, while also helping establish a better benchmark in their data for determining both student and program success.

There are several significant virtues to the assessment process at DSU, not the least of which is that assessment is driven by faculty buy-in at the program level. Across the board, there is a sense that faculty are in control of their assessment practices, and this is a positive reflection of the emerging assessment culture at DSU.

D) Student Support / Student Enrollments

This is the single area that requires the most direct attention for the success of the program. As a relatively new major, there are several things the program still needs to address in order to effectively stabilize and grow their enrollments. At present, the bulk of departmental recruiting is happening through courses offered to fulfill the arts and sciences requirements of the core curriculum, and through welcoming transfer students seeking the program. Not surprisingly, these numbers are not enough for the program to be sustainable. There are specific steps the department can take to help build a more stable recruitment funnel for itself, but those efforts will require significant time, attention, and support from the institution.

In order to be successful, the department will need to build some stable partnerships with those institutions likely to produce transfer students (possibly creating 2+2 programs through some articulation agreements). This could generate a relatively consistent, and stable enrollment funnel that could also be used as a model for future agreements with other programs. In similar fashion, conversations with the department suggest that DSU is largely invisible in the landscape of secondary English programs because of the university's focus on technology. This will require some direct attention from both the program, in addition to admissions and marketing in order to build a more visible standing in the state community. There are some tools at the department's disposal to achieve these efforts (undergraduate publications, for example), but success here will require that they have some contributing data from the institution. At present, the department does not have access to any enrollment funnel data for their programs. While it's clear that the narrow end of the funnel is not yielding many students, the department needs access to the front-end funnel data in order to make successful strategic decisions. What search terms are being utilized on the university website that relate to the program? Are there ways to make the program's offerings more closely resemble the searches of prospective students? What about total number of hits and inquiries? What percentage of those are translating in applications, or admissions? Depending on how these questions are answered, the ENM program can make some targeted decisions about how to represent and advertise their program to prospective markets. Without this data, decisions function as more of a guessing game. Specific suggestions on how to develop these strategies will come at the end of this review.

When imagining enrollment predictions, it is worth remembering that initial returns should be conceived of in manageable sizes. If the program were to add 5-7 students every fall, for the next four years, the total cohort would increase considerably. That additional growth can be used to leverage for additional resources, and more strategic marketing initiatives. This work will take a considerable amount of investment in time and energy from the program. To be successful, the institution will need to allocate time on a short-term basis in order to ensure that this is successful.

While the current number of majors is small, the program has seen some significant success in its placement numbers. Recent data suggests a placement rate of 91%., which is exceptional. While that data is from 2014, more recent work in the program review suggests that graduates of the program are finding meaningful employment in a variety of online and digital publishing venues (7). The absence of further data is largely a reflection of the small size of the program.

Within the existing student cohort though, support services like advising are represented positively. Comments from students highlight the ease of meeting with faculty and getting questions answered. In addition, students report feeling complete confidence in faculty as disciplinary mentors that are deeply invested in their success. This also indicates that if students can be drawn to the program, they are highly likely to persist and be retained.

E) Program Strengths and Areas for Improvement

For the sake of clarity and simplicity, this section is best presented through a simplified SWOT analysis breakdown. These are addressed in more detail in the descriptions above, and the suggested changes below. Some of these points reflect places where the program should celebrate its successes, while others represents opportunities for ongoing conversation. Others reflect things that emerged during the site visit that seem significant, but couldn't be further investigated due to time constraints.

Strengths

-Curriculum is built on a strong model for disciplinary excellence.

-Faculty owned assessment culture.

-Support from Provost and Dean for departmental autonomy and sustainability. All stakeholders want to see ENM be successful.

-Agreement that an increased need for marketing/awareness is crucial to departmental survival. Everyone is moving in the same direction.

-Strong student support due to exceptional faculty commitment.

-Excellent support for technology.

Weaknesses

-Faculty workload is a struggle, particularly with course rotations (echoed by students).

-Number of faculty is a concern. Two positions reduced/reallocated. There is a need for a compositionist/WPA/ Writing Center Specialist.

-Lack of institutional data to make sound decisions (relates to both need for Comp. faculty, and recruiting efforts).

Opportunities

-Simplify your assessments. Partner with your assessment director to build processes that are easier for the department to manage.

-Likewise, simplify your learning outcomes. Some outcomes could be removed. This would simplify your skills map.

-Further collaboration with academic affairs/admissions/marketing to build better institutional recruitment.

-Develop you own recruitment funnel alongside work you do with admissions (2+2 programs, double major tracks, New Tricks as outreach).

-Increased Cyber Securities enrollments means a need for more composition and general education classes. This is where English departments thrive. Get in front of this.

-Use your students! They are your best ambassadors. Students repeatedly offered that none of them wanted English until they saw "this" English program.

Threats

-General sense of fatigue and needing help with strategic planning/ finding where to begin with so many possible initiatives moving forward.

-Recruiting and retaining faculty. There are concerns over distribution and access to professional development funds, lack of sabbatical time, and lack of release time for specific short-term tasks. These contribute to a growing sense of being "not valued," or "at risk." While mostly a function of institutional logistics, resolving some of these tensions would generate considerable investment from the faculty and contribute to a more successful search if the institution adopts that recommendation.

Part 4- Recommendations for Change

Overall, the program is in an excellent position to enact the strategic changes it needs in order to be successful in growing. It has the advantage of administrative support from both the Provost and Dean, and a collective sense of good faith efforts by all involved to invest in the future success of ENM.

Students report a great degree of faith in their instructors, and in the worth of the program. This suggests a strong value proposition that, once marketed in a much more targeted way, will produce quality graduates.

There are several things the department might do in order to effect the kinds of necessary changes described above. Fortunately, there seems to be agreement between the program and administration regarding the immediate focus areas for change. Suggestions will be listed here in order of importance.

Program Enrollment/Recruiting

The single greatest challenge the department needs to overcome is recruiting and enrollment. Some specific suggestions to address this:

1) **2x2 Program-** Establishing a collaborative agreement with funnel institutions is a sound way to begin. Because the program has several offerings that exist in both humanities, as well as more computer-focused curriculum, there are some potential opportunities to build articulation agreements with any institutions offering two-year degrees. It would require some strategic concessions to identify what courses are covered in the transfer agreement (those courses would not necessarily see a boosted enrollment for these agreements), but the result would be a net gain in total program graduates. The fact that the program is already transfer heavy suggest that this might be a viable place to begin. Some easy classes to consider for ideal transfer points might be:

CSC 105 Introduction to Computers
CSC 150 Computer Science
ENGL 283 Intro to Creative Writing
MCOM 161 Graphic Communication
Any ENGL 2xx Literature Class

The goal would be to identify similar 2-year programs that have students that could be funneled into the major, and build a specific map with those programs. For example, the department might make an agreement with an English program to count creative writing and literature classes towards the program goals, while a computer science focused program might count the CSC or MCOM classes. Having this built as an articulation agreement allows you to build a dedicated funnel into the program where student don't have to worry about how their credits transfer. In effect, you expand your recruiting base. Many two-year school are often excited about these opportunities because students moving through 2x2 programs count as positive results in their student placement data (much like undergraduate programs reporting on students attending graduate school).

2) **Use existing publications**- Currently the program produces a fantastic literary magazine New Tricks. It's a tremendous opportunity for students in the program to make their work visible, and to gain some useful practice with digital publication. Expanding the magazine beyond the program would require some effort, but has significant potential to yield tremendous results. Building a version/edition of New

Tricks dedicated to secondary writers would serve to get the ENM program visibly in front of potential students. It would also let them tangibly see a product that the department produces, and serve as both incentive to contribute, and incentive to join the program. Administering the expanded journal experience could function as a kind of honors internship experience for students in the ENM major, and would provide additional experience for their portfolio and resume. This would also help improve how secondary school advisors and teachers think about the work of ENM. Currently, according to department members, ENM and English Education are both largely invisible in the landscape of secondary options. There might even be opportunities to use English Education students to assist in manuscript selection, making this a collaborative effort that helps all aspects of the English department, reducing the increase in workload this would produce.

3) **Redesign recruiting materials-** Currently there is little clarity about what materials the department is sending schools for recruiting. This would suggest that there is some disconnect between what the program thinks of itself, and how that is communicated to external audiences. This redesign though needs to happen in conjunction with some scrutiny of the enrollment funnel data. The department needs to know what students are looking at via the university website in order to make any adjustments.

4) **Explore Collaborations with other Programs**- English programs have long been the bedrock for collaborative efforts in universities, largely because of the versatility of what we offer. All English programs, at some level, teach students to research well, read/think well, and write well. There is no major or job that does not benefit from further development in these areas. In this regard, English is often a natural choice for a secondary major or minor for students. There are likely programs that would benefit from students having increased course experience within English. Capitalizing on these possible partnerships may present opportunities to grow internal enrollments, without cannibalizing student numbers. Based on conversations with faculty, exploring possible partnerships with Game Design or Art/Design may be fruitful places to begin. Other programs may yield opportunities as well, but these inter-disciplinary efforts are common tools to help English programs thrive.

Caveat- The options above represent a spectrum of possibilities. A best-case scenario would be some level of implementation of each of these. Each initiative alone represents a small increase in students. Taken together, they represent a broader strategic plan for enrollment. Each of these measures will take some time and energy to establish, in particular building a 2x2 program. Rebranding the department, while a task often linked to a VP of Marketing, will require significant investment of faculty time in researching, writing, and connecting to specific audiences. In order to accomplish this, some use of course-reassignment time should be used. A single, 3-credit course of reassignment for 1-2 semesters (depending on the scope of the efforts) should be allocated for a single faculty person to prioritize, develop, and implement these efforts on behalf of the department.

Program Curriculum

One point that was clearly reiterated by several faculty during my conversation was the difficulty of staffing the literature classes in the program that also count towards the Arts and Humanities core. Faculty report that these classes often struggle to fill, but are also primary recruiting zones for the major as they represent points of significant contact. This is an unfortunate consequence of a core education using a distribution model. Changing the model isn't an option, but there are some short-term solutions that might work here to alleviate some of the tensions. While these literature courses are likely on rotation, it's hard to justify having six distinct sections with current enrollments. An immediate solution might be to revise those credits into repeatable categories. In other words, one class for American

Literature, one class for World Literature, and one class for British Literature. If the course is flagged as repeatable in the curriculum, then you won't need to change the requirements of the program, but you create some flexibility in both the scheduling, and the offering. This might also allow you to be a bit more playful with the course content (without adjusting the learning outcomes) in order to attract more students. This also allows individual faculty members to still have the opportunity to teach sections in their areas of expertise, while be more strategic in the offerings. To be clear, it would not be advisable to simply remove classes wholesale. It would disenfranchise faculty. This represents an effective compromise between the needs of the program/institution, and the expertise and commitment that faculty bring to their work.

In related fashion, there are some additional places where the curriculum might be revised to facilitate further departmental efficiencies. The current placing of ENGL 310: Applied Grammar does not seem to genuinely serve the needs of the ENM program. Instead, it seems to be a place where ENM and English Education have a partnership. The skills map though, suggests that it's not a highly iterative course in the program, and possibly under-contributes to the skills students need to learn. Given that there is also a Linguistics course in the major, it also seems somewhat duplicative. Instead, ENGL 310 might be better converted into one of several different possibilities. Two immediate suggestions for consideration:

1) An undergraduate research experience course. This could help resolve some of the pressures that faculty articulate about the push for further undergraduate research projects. Rather than relying on the advising relationship to foster this work, build a requirement into the program. There are ample opportunities for undergraduate publication, conferencing, or creative submissions. The standard should be submission, not acceptance, but the experience would yield tremendous growth for students.

2) Senior Capstone/Portfolio Course- Given the existing complications with graduating students effectively completing the exit portfolio, building a course that embeds this work as a requirement seems a natural solution. This would eliminate the need for the dean's office to serve as the collection and filtering mechanism for this work. By attaching a course and grades to the work, it would also ensure that students are incentivized to contribute their best efforts to the work.

Staffing

This issue is one that represents a dire need for the program, in the same fashion as boosting enrollment. Currently, the department is down two faculty lines that have been reallocated. While restoring both lines isn't viable with current enrollments, there are some adjustments to staffing that are necessary for the department to thrive.

Several conversations with faculty indicate that a significant portion of current department load is being filled through teaching composition courses for the general education core. That in and of itself is not unusual, given the role that English programs play in developing institutional writing courses. What is unusual in this case is that there is no dedicated composition person on staff in the department. Typically, this person would function as a kind of Writing Program Administrator (WPA) and provide oversight, assessment, and support/training for writing courses. Given the abundance of dual-credit composition courses staffed at DSU, the absence of this person is hindering the department's ability to make good decisions about its own writing courses, and effect positive changes. Five immediate aspects of this rise to attention:

1) No assessments have been conducted to measure or document the success of the writing curriculum for the institution.

2) Faculty are somewhat unsure to what degree the curriculum is standardized, and to what degree outcomes and assessments might be held in common

3) There is no (apparent) data on what percentage of students are taking composition courses through DSU as a function of dual credit.

4) There has been no attempt to track what percentage of dual credit students in composition courses actually matriculate through DSU beyond their writing course. This is another area where the department has a need for data, as this represents some potential untapped demographics for institutional (possibly departmental) recruitment.

5) Current composition classes do not meet the standards set by the Modern Language Association. More importantly, the do not meet the standards and expectations of Composition as a discipline. In particular, items 11 and 12 of the linked disciplinary standards are not currently being satisfied. These would focus on maintaining appropriate limits on course enrollments for writing classes (no more than 20), and assessing the effectiveness of writing within the curriculum, and across the institution.

The current department cannot simply absorb these tasks into their current workload, but these are significant missing pieces for an effective curriculum, and a healthy program that serves the institution well. The restoration of one of the required faculty lines with an emphasis in Composition and New Media/ Writing Program Administration would afford the program some of the support it needs to stabilize the significant amount of intellectual and curricular energy required to teach courses that are not in their primary field of expertise. It would equally benefit the institution by providing leadership and support for successful writing initiatives across the institution. It may not be possible to solve all of the tensions represented in the five items listed above, but adding this component to the program will place considerably more resources at the program's disposal to address these issues in strategic and successful ways.

Given the enrollment challenges for the program, a restored line is a significant request. In many ways, it is the "golden ticket" of a program review that shouldn't be asked for. In this case though, given the previous reduction in faculty lines, restoring one line is more about providing the necessary balance to the department so that it can successfully accomplish its current work, as well as the additional tasks posed by this review. In truth, this is the one significant recommendation for change where the necessary work comes from the administration rather than the faculty. It is offset by the fact that the resource allocation in this case benefits not only the program, but the institution as a whole.

Program Assessment/Outcomes

The department has clearly established its learning outcomes, and done an admirable job looking for ways in which their curriculum embeds them across the major. While some logistical suggestions have been offered for their assessment measure above, there are some ways in which the outcomes more broadly might be streamlined to ease some strain on the department and facilitate better data collection.

Currently, there are seven learning outcomes for the program. While these outcomes certainly cover the content area for the major, there are several redundancies in the language of individual outcomes, and

places where the language might certainly be simplified, if not eliminated entirely. The following section covers some possible pairings and revisions to existing outcome language by organizing the existing outcomes around a simplified skill. It might also be useful to consider an additional outcome to reflect the work that students in writing, new media, and English programs broadly take on.

Analysis Outcomes

1. Analyze and critically respond to a variety of texts, including both traditional, literary print texts and new media texts, including interactive texts, film, still images, etc.

7. Demonstrates critical thinking that is clear, insightful, in depth, and relevant to the topic (BSR 3). To this end, the student can see, appreciate, and pursue conceptual connections among texts from across time, genres, cultures, and media.

* These outcomes are functionally equivalent. They contain the same learning oriented verbs and descriptions (analysis, critical response, and critical thinking). They also make the same stipulations for student ability to read/engage various textual modalities. Appreciation is almost impossible to measure in any learning outcome unless the student has an assignment that specifically addresses it. Based on the programs exit assessment, this does not seem to be the case. Because of this, it would make sense to remove this clause.

Revised Outcome: Analyze and articulate critical responses to traditional and contemporary texts from a variety of genres and modalities.

Composition Outcomes

2. Express themselves clearly and effectively in writing, whether creative or expository,

3. Express themselves clearly and effectively in verbal discussions and presentations.

6. Identify or formulate an appropriate rhetorical framework to communicate effectively for the purpose and audience (BSR 1).

* Each of these outcomes reflect a classical rhetorical tradition of thinking about audience/purpose/context, while also attempting to reflect the department's attention to delivery and modality. Having multiple outcomes for individual modalities is unnecessary given how much of the departments work covers multi-modal practices.

Revised Outcome: Identify and express communication in appropriate and intentional rhetorical modes for targeted audiences.

Design Outcomes

4. Integrate elements of design to best serve rhetorical purpose (See Item 5 of the Ball State Rubric, multimodal project).

5. Create a variety of texts (traditional expository prose, hypertext, creative writing, etc.) that integrate multiple modalities into a variety of media (traditional documents, web-based texts and content, video, audio, etc.).

*Each of these outcomes reflects the media and modality work that students learn in the program, with a focus not on the rhetorical success of the artifact, but the coherence of the integration. In this way it is distinct from the composition outcomes.

Revised Outcome: Implement various design and modality choices to reflect the needs of targeted audiences.

Process Outcome

Given the amount of writing, designing, and thinking that accompanies the work of the program, there does appear to be one missing outcome to reflect the overall progression of a student's thinking around this work. This could be demonstrated in their existing portfolio assessments, and through a summative reflection on their time spent in the program. Additionally, it would help measure their growth through the program, giving the department a sense of how much they have moved that student's ability over the course of their studies. This would also help represent a student's ability to be reflexively self-critical. To that end, a process outcome might be a useful consideration:

Proposed Outcome: Reflects on evidence of process, highlighting the success or failure of choices made and considers alternative possibilities.

While this might seem like a radical shift, it would reduce the total number of outcomes, while still retaining the necessary components of the program. It would simplify and streamline the existing assessments without any effective reduction in meaningful data. To compliment this, it would be useful for the department to consider revising its rubrics. While the current assessment rubrics were not in the review materials, the assessment data suggests that the program uses a three-point rubric (Exceeds/Meets/Does Not Meet). While this does make for fast assessments, there are complications with using three-point rubrics; most notably that they produce data which trends towards the middle. This is largely a factor of those students that fall in the "grey area" between performance ranks. What happens to a students that isn't quite exceeds, but has done a bit more than meet? Where do they fall? Because of this a five point rubric might better illustrate the gradations in student performance. Ready examples can be provided to the program if they believe this to be useful. Finally, working closely with Dr. Khal, the Director of Assessment on these initiatives would help facilitate these revisions.

Final Conclusions

In all, the ENM program represents a unique place in the field of English Studies by combining the best aspects of both humanistic and STEM related inquiry. While still new, the program has done considerable work building a stable curriculum that produces well-qualified graduates. The challenges facing it can be resolved with some effort and attention, but the results will yield a significantly improved programmatic experience. The faculty are tremendously qualified and invested in their work, having built a major of best-practices with an excellent value proposition. With some careful attention and support for the areas listed above, the program should grow into a sustainable and vibrant contribution to the DSU community.