

PROGRAM REVIEW: UW ENGLISH

Review Committee:

Stephen Hinds (Professor and Chair, UW Classics) *Committee Chair*

Donald Marshall (Professor, UW Mathematics)

Robin Stacey (Associate Professor, UW History)

Sabine Wilke (Professor and Chair, UW Germanics)

Charles Berger (Professor and Chair of English, Southern Illinois Univ.,
Edwardsville;

formerly Chair of English, Univ. of Utah)

Kerry Larson (Senior Associate Dean, Rackham Graduate School, Univ. of
Michigan)

Andrea Lunsford (Professor of English and Director, Program in Writing and
Rhetoric, Stanford Univ.)

Jean McGarry (Professor and Chair, The Writing Seminars, Johns Hopkins Univ.)

July 12 2002
font]

[formatted in MS Word 97-98 for Mac, with Times 12

SUMMARY OF PROCESS

The committee to conduct a ten-year review of the degree programs of the UW English Department was formally established by the Graduate School in a charge letter dated October 26 2001; a further letter dated November 29 2001 suggested some specific parameters for the review.

After initial examination of the Department's Autumn 2001 Self-Study, a substantial set of preliminary interviews was conducted in December 2001 and January 2002 by the review committee's four internal members, with logistical help from the English Department. First the internal group met with the Department Chair, with eight separate faculty and staff in directorial or other key administrative positions, with the Department's Executive Committee, and with a group of graduate student representatives. Then the internal group made themselves individually available to all the Department's faculty and staff via an open invitation, backed up by extra solicitations to further key persons identified in the early conversations: more than twenty members of the faculty and staff responded. Then and later, the committee accepted additional written data on various aspects of the Department's operations, as well as letters from various Department members.

The site visit, originally scheduled for mid January, was postponed to the end of April because of difficulties experienced by the administration in constituting the external half of the committee. Meanwhile, the internal members released a 'feedback memo' to the Chair of English in March, summarizing some of the recurrent concerns that members of the Department had raised during the preliminary conversations: the purpose was to help the Chair and the Department to prepare for the postponed site visit, and to promote continued departmental discussion and reflection in the interim. This memo, along with some other supporting information, was also sent by the chair of the review committee to the committee's four external members in early April.

The postponement of the site visit meant that the deliberations of an English Chair search committee set up by the A&S Dean (the current chair of English being in the final year of his term) overtook the ten-year review process. The oddity of having two committees simultaneously chasing overlapping questions in the English Department was mitigated somewhat by a meeting between the Chair search committee and the internal members of the ten-year review committee in early April; the final report of the Chair search committee was made available to the entire ten-year review committee during the site visit itself.

As an immediate preface to the site visit, a dinner meeting between the internal and external members of the review committee, and senior College and University administrators, was held on Sunday April 28 under the auspices of the Graduate School. The site visit involved on Monday and Tuesday April 29 and 30 two full days of intensive meetings between the review committee and key individuals and groups from the English Department, and on Wednesday May 1 a period of committee deliberation followed by a two-part 'exit interview', the first part with the Chair, the Director of Graduate Studies and the Administrator of English in attendance, the second not.

The review committee has worked hard, both during the site visit and via extensive e-mail debate since, in coming up with a report to which all its members can subscribe. A word of explanation is necessary on the chosen format of one main report plus two sub-reports (which does not indicate any committee schism). From the outset, one external place on the review committee was designated for a specialist in language, rhetoric and expository writing, and another for a specialist in creative writing. In the event, these two elements in the review each seemed to have sufficiently strong internal logic to justify two distinct sub-reports, each lead-authored by the specialist on the committee, but each with contributions and endorsement from the committee as a whole.

Besides the main report and two sub-reports, to which the entire committee subscribe, three separate letters will accompany the report: two by individual external reviewers (as encouraged by the Graduate School's guidelines) and one by a subset of the review committee making a specific recommendation about the logistics of follow-up and implementation.

The committee is grateful to the members of the English Department for their cooperation and courtesy throughout the review process. In particular, the Department office was most helpful in providing data on teaching load and course enrollment, and in answering detailed follow-up questions on their interpretation, at a busy time of year. The committee is also indebted to Augustine McCaffery of the Graduate School for her assistance at every stage.

FINDINGS

1 INTRODUCTION: FOREGROUNDING FACULTY LOSSES

It is the job of a ten-year program review to note both strengths and weaknesses in a department, and to set both within as many contexts as possible. It is an especial challenge to achieve this balance in a review of a unit as large and as diverse in its functions and missions as is UW's English Department. There are stories to be told here of excellence, hard work, and enterprise in the face of limited resources; there are stories to be told of inertia, defeatism, and indecisiveness in the Department about defining itself to itself, let alone to outsiders. The review committee argued long and conscientiously about how to pitch the overall presentation of this report. On many issues, members of the review committee, very much like members of the English Department faculty themselves in their conversations with us, had honest disagreements as to whether some of the challenges facing the Department are soluble or not without outside intervention, and as to whether they are better addressed piecemeal or systematically. However, the committee as a whole came to feel that, in order to serve the Department's interests best, it needed to tilt the balance of the present report more towards criticism than towards praise.

It is the consensus of this committee that the English Department *as* a department is in the middle of a serious crisis, and that immediate action must be taken both within the unit itself and by the administration in order to prevent this crisis from deepening further. The most obvious sign of this state of affairs is the large and accelerating number of faculty losses: 11 in the three academic years 1998-2001 (not counting retirements), with two more this year. Even more significant than these numbers is the cohort from which the losses are occurring. Notwithstanding the excellences which remain at senior and more junior levels, it is beyond dispute that resignations have come disproportionately from faculty members widely regarded as among the Department's intellectual leaders. In addition, these 'lost' faculty have tended to be either at, or entering, their mid-career years, when they might have been expected to propel the Department forward. To compound the problem, certain key Department strengths in literary study, such as American Literature and Post-Colonial Studies, have been hit especially hard. At this point the Department is coping quite literally with the loss of an entire generation of outstanding scholars and departmental citizens -- many of whom were, at the time of their departure, filling important mentorship roles for junior colleagues whom the Department and University would like very much to retain. One of the trademark strengths of this Department in recent years has been its record of excellent hiring at both junior and senior levels: the evident vulnerability of this generation of recruits to raiding (though offering peer confirmation of excellence in hiring) constitutes a huge challenge to any efforts at program-building. Unless some kind of effective intervention takes place, it seems likely that departures will continue to occur and that the quality of the Department will continue to suffer.

There have been other kinds of losses as well: viz talented senior faculty members who over the years have redirected their energies towards other programs or jobs within the University, in part (on the testimony of some of the individuals themselves) out of frustration with communication and governance issues within the Department.

The University's gain here does not cancel out the Department's loss in terms of its leadership pool.

It needs to be allowed that the outside evaluators arrived for the site visit at a distinct low point in terms of campus-wide faculty morale. This was an academic quarter in which budgetary difficulties in Olympia prompted the imposition at UW of a faculty pay freeze (involving the collapse at its first test of a 'faculty covenant' devised to prevent exactly this), and of precautionary cuts in teaching budgets which threw routine budgetary problems into unusually high relief in the offices of chairs and program directors. More generally, it should be said on the record that, again and again, external members of the review committee expressed frank astonishment at the severe budgetary limitations (in salary and in other categories) within which administration and departments try to maintain nationally competitive programs in our College of Arts and Sciences.

However, even after these allowances are made (and they will be duly elaborated on below), the strong impression remains that the English Department has fewer reserves of morale than do other Arts and Sciences Departments for dealing with challenges which lie beyond its control. There can be no doubt but that salary plays a huge role in the morale and retention problems with which the Department is plagued. However, this alone cannot explain why retention problems have become so much greater than in other departments within the College. While of course the reasons for any individual departure are always going to be complex, and while a run of sheer bad luck seems to have played its part, it seems evident at this point that what is going on in English is extraordinary and must be laid in part at the Department's own door. Interviews with both current and departed faculty members elicited the expected stories about too little done too late by the administration to address insultingly low salary levels; but they also revealed a set of Department-specific discontents militating against retention. Time and again our interlocutors returned to the same issues: governance; communication; inequity of workload; the lack of involvement by key faculty members in matters of departmental concern; and a general sense that good ideas tend to get lost and new initiatives to run out of steam in a unit which often seems defeated by its very size. A particular problem, but a huge one for departmental morale, is the absence of a clear sense of disciplinary focus and intellectual mission among faculty in the literature core, who seem unable to mobilize effectively or (as the Self-Study attests in its more disappointing pages) to articulate a vision of themselves as a group. The most striking symptom of this constellation of problems is that this Department holds no regularly scheduled all-faculty meetings, except for purposes of hiring or other occasional special needs: the will for change here seems to exist, based on how often our faculty interlocutors themselves brought this up to us.

Like the Department itself, the University and College administration must also take a more active role than they have previously done in seeking solutions to the Department's problems. Their responsibilities in this process are two: funding and oversight. In terms of funding, the overall resource problems handed down from Olympia do not absolve the administration from thinking more creatively and energetically than heretofore about what is needed to sustain excellence in academic programs, such as English, which have little or no access to federal and corporate grants and contracts to cover for the lack of support (especially for faculty and

graduate research) in state budgets. In terms of oversight, we note that many of the structural problems that were in place during the last ten-year review process still afflict the Department: it is clear that the then University and College administration failed to follow up strongly on policy recommendations made at that time. The present-day administration will need to be much more active in ensuring that reforms decided upon by Department members are implemented.

We note with pleasure that, to judge from our conversations with faculty and others, the feuds and festering grudges so obviously afflicting the Department during the last ten-year review do not seem to be nearly as much in evidence in today's Department. We encountered a unit in which complaints were more about structures than about individuals, and more about sins of omission than sins of commission. Special praise is due to the Department's leadership for trying to do things in decent and considerate ways, and especially to the present (and now outgoing) chair, whose ability to relate to his faculty and staff on the individual level has smoothed many wrinkles and led to many expressions of personal appreciation in the course of this review. On the other hand, in the absence of overt conflict, something approaching inertia seems now to afflict the Department in addressing some key policy issues and in making effective use of its own structures of governance. It is hard to find obvious or agreed leaders among the senior faculty. Both because of this and because of the loss of so many key senior figures from among the literature faculty, the idea of an external chair search (which has acquired a momentum of its own independently of our review) was one to which our committee found itself increasingly drawn during the site visit.

The lowering of the emotional temperature of the Department (described above) makes this an excellent time to begin the discussions necessary to develop and implement serious reform. Such discussions will require the entire faculty to make a commitment of time and energy to special meetings and retreats (as seems not to have happened, except perfunctorily, in the Department's preparation for the present ten-year review). We disagree among ourselves as to whether this process can be self-starting or whether it must necessarily involve extra-departmental facilitation. Some on the review committee are heartened by the argument (made by several faculty during the review process) that key policy issues are now more capable of being addressed than in past times when divisions within the Department were more raw; others feel strongly that a departmental habit of avoiding or postponing difficult policy issues is now so ingrained as to require some kind of outside intervention.

English is one of the most popular undergraduate majors in Arts and Sciences; it is one of the most visible departments in the University and the linchpin of the Humanities Division, not least in terms of faculty involvement in and leadership of the University's Simpson Center for the Humanities. It is the home of one of the most visible journals in the field, *Modern Language Quarterly*, and (in its Creative Writing Program) of no fewer than three MacArthur Fellows (winners of the so-called 'genius award'). It contains many stories of faculty accomplishment and of devotion to teaching; the potential for building intellectual community, at present underexploited, is great. If the Department is allowed to decay, or is starved of funds, or continues to avoid the sort of serious internal discussions about curricular and governance issues that any unit must have in order to keep functioning, the result will be disastrous: for the Department, the Humanities Division, and the University as a whole.

2 GOVERNANCE AND COMMUNICATION

2.1 It needs to be acknowledged by all concerned that the Department's sheer size and structural complexity poses real challenges, and means that governance can never be merely improvised or good communication taken for granted. This has ramifications from the most formal level (careful engineering of committee structures and chains of command) to the most informal level (encouragement and subsidy of Department-wide parties and receptions).

It is evident from our conversations that only a small number of faculty were actively involved in the ten-year review process up to and including the composition of the Self-Study document: in other words the first half of the review process failed to engage the Department at large. It is striking to the review committee that nowhere in the Self-Study can one find an example of the Department scrutinizing its mode of governance, despite the widespread disaffection in this area revealed in interviews during the site visit and before.

Some members of the review committee feel strongly that current problems of communication are such as to justify the extraordinary measure of involving extra-departmental or even extramural mediators or facilitators in the Department's strategic response to the review process; others feel equally strongly that the Department should be allowed to craft its response within normal channels, but that great care should be taken that those normal channels be used fully and effectively. We are agreed in recommending that the Department hold a retreat early in autumn quarter 2002 to react to the issues raised by the ten-year review and to prepare themselves for the upcoming external chair search.

Whatever the procedures to be used, the review committee recognizes that the commitment to rebuilding the Department which we seek from the administration must go hand-in-hand with clear departmental self-improvement in the areas of communication and governance.

2.2 Faculty meetings

The very striking fact that the Department holds no regularly scheduled all-faculty meetings, except for purposes of hiring or other occasional special needs, came up almost every time that issues of governance and communication were discussed. Given how many faculty raised this, the very fact that the Department has not taken charge of the issue itself, but has had to wait for the intervention of a ten-year review, speaks poorly of the Department's ability to maintain a healthy level of debate on policy issues. We understand that at a particular period in the past a suspension of routine all-faculty meetings may have made temporary sense in promoting a kind of cooling-off period after a period of high tension among faculty. However as most faculty now seem themselves to feel, regular meetings (outside the highly-charged context of hiring season) are necessary in order to improve both flow of information and engagement in policy issues. No one wins in the present situation. In the absence of regular meetings, administrative knowledge fails to circulate widely in the Department: current policy-makers are starved of constructive feedback from faculty, potential new leaders are starved of the access to policy issues which would allow

them to step forward effectively, and habits of collective responsibility for policy are lost.

Furthermore (a point brought up by one of the junior faculty), in the absence of routine departmental meetings, no regular venue exists in which to announce achievements and accomplishments by members of the Department. Minor triumphs occur in a large department like this every month; greater recognition by faculty of their own colleagues' and students' accomplishments would be good for self-esteem.

The review committee strongly recommends that the Department meet henceforth on a regular basis, monthly at minimum, with an agenda prepared by the Chair and Executive Committee in consultation with Program Directors (see next section here), and published in advance. It would be desirable to keep to a regular time-slot when the scheduling of faculty-taught classes might be minimized.

2.3 *Executive Committee*

It was hard to identify real executive functions for the Department's Executive Committee outside of procedural matters: the only area in which it initiates action, by constitution or in practice, seems to be in its annual appointment of standing committees. This is partly bound up with the previous matter: if the faculty resumes a pattern of regular meetings, the EC can and must find a role in focussing and presenting issues for all-faculty meetings. Neither the Chair nor the faculty at large seem to feel that the EC works optimally for them in its present form: we received the strong impression that it operates neither as an effective cabinet for the Chair nor as an effective conduit of communication on policy issues for the faculty. By the account of some of its own members, the EC has itself been unable and perhaps reluctant to take responsibility for policy.

The difficulties here seem bound up in the constitution of the EC. Election is for one year only, so that each new committee starts the year with a steep learning curve, and ends the year with unfinished business; continuity and institutional memory from one year to the next is weak (a problem mentioned by some of our interlocutors in relation to other Department committees too). The review committee recommends staggered three-year terms for the EC. Three years is long enough to provide continuity and to lessen the learning curve, and it is short enough that a significant number of faculty members can cycle through the job, gaining experience for other positions. A faculty leave during the three-year term should not disqualify a faculty member from eligibility for candidature. More importantly still, the review committee is agreed in recommending that a true executive committee for a unit as large and complex as English should include its major program directors *ex officio*: i.e. Director of Undergraduate Studies, Director of Graduate Studies, Director of Expository Writing Program, and Director of Creative Writing Program.

2.4 *Questions of devolution*

Special tensions relating to budget, resources, and belonging arise in the 'semi-devolved' subunits which are so important to this Department, notably the Creative Writing Program and the Expository Writing Program. These programs will have their own free-standing sub-reports of findings and recommendations: here let some common issues be noted.

Given how much of the Department's business involves the balancing of priorities between its own subunits, it was a major surprise to learn that the Chair does not routinely meet with the program Directors (both those mentioned in 2.3 above and others) as a group: we recommend a routine of monthly meetings to ensure good communication.

Lack of congruence between devolution of administrative responsibility and devolution of budgetary control brings certain inherent tensions. The 'semi-devolved' groups tend to feel vulnerable to finding themselves in runner-up position within the Department in times of internal competition for limited resources; but in the larger competition for College and University resources they do see advantages in their association with the '800-pound gorilla' of the English Department. The Creative Writing groups and the Language and Rhetoric groups see themselves as well-focussed in their missions, and feel consequent frustration at having to run so many of their policies through a larger Department which they see as lacking policy focus. Creative Writing faculty are in turn criticized by faculty in the literature core for aloofness and lack of engagement in overall departmental governance. Language and rhetoric faculty are among the most active in departmental governance, but their very ability to caucus effectively on issues attracts some grumbles from literature faculty.

It is worth asking whether issues of communication between subunits might be helped by the introduction of an associate chair in the Department, or whether, on the contrary, this would create an unnecessary buffer between Chair and Directors: the review committee does not have a strong recommendation here, but invites the Department (and the future externally appointed Chair) to ponder the idea.

In the context of the exploration of problems arising from devolution, both the Creative Writing Program and the Expository Writing Program were invited by the review committee to consider what it might feel like to 'go it alone'. The idea was not necessarily to advocate secession -- though strong minority opinions on the review committee would keep this option open in both cases -- but to promote vigorous discussion of the various options for refining or redefining the present systems of devolution.

2.5 From Chair to Dean, from Department to College

There has been a good working relationship between the outgoing Chair of English and the Divisional Divisional Dean of Arts and Humanities. As the Department's chief administrative officer, the Chair has shown a strong understanding of how resources are allocated within the College, and has been an effective advocate for the Department in competing for them. Under his leadership, and through the appointment of a faculty member as Director of Development, the Department has positioned itself very well (and ahead of many other departments) in the vital area of fund-raising, which will play an increasing role in leveraging resources from the College and University. On the other hand, the Chair seems not to have done enough to educate his faculty in how the important relationship with the Dean's office works; this may have led some of his own work to be underappreciated, and contributed to the overall problem of faculty communication. The committee encountered significant levels of disinformation about the College's treatment of the Department among rank and file faculty; many faculty seem not to understand the importance of

the relationship between Chair and Dean, or the give and take involved in securing College- and University-level resources.

2.6 Future leadership

Although a separate committee (to whose report we have had access) was charged with the search for the Department's next Chair, the program review committee was naturally interested in the question of future leadership. Despite its size, the Department seems to be short of real leaders at the senior levels capable of envisioning change and generating consensus. While excellence in research does not necessarily a leader make, it was disappointing to find that the Department's most distinguished literary scholars seemed to be unable to use their prestige to rally the literature core, much less the Department at large. In general it was hard to find long-serving faculty who would talk about the Department's future spacioously and strategically, and with more than a fraction of the energy devoted to talk about its past; sometimes the emphasis upon ancient history seemed pathological. The point needs to be made that there is nothing more depressing and disempowering for new colleagues, whether hired at entry or at senior level, than to find discussion of policy issues in a department mired in the rehashing of past battles and disappointments. In general (as noted in connection with the absence of all-faculty meetings), the alienation of rank and file faculty from structures of governance, unless reversed, will militate against the emergence and education of a new generation of leaders in the Department.

Arguably, a Chair appointed from the outside will be the one be best placed to bring forward future leaders. As will be remarked in the section on assistant professors, there are some issues on which the Department needs quite simply to skip a generation. It may be easier for a newcomer than for a long-serving faculty member to disregard traditional pecking order in planning departmental governance for the years ahead.

By way of offering our committee's support to what has already been implemented by the A&S Dean's office in the wake of the report of the separate Chair Search Committee, we will include at the end of our report a formal recommendation that a search for a Chair of English from outside the University be initiated in autumn 2002, with an interim Chair to be appointed internally for 2002-03.

2.7 Conviviality

We note with approval that that the Department already spends some of its own funds on receptions and convivial activities (Self-Study p.2). Our conversations with faculty about morale suggest that still more could be done here. We recommend that the Department's discretionary funds be used creatively to foster collegiality, including the staging of the kind of Department-wide receptions on a reasonably grand scale (the Department of History has them 2-3 times a year) which can help to build and to rebuild bridges within the unit.

3 PERSONNEL ISSUES

3.1 FACULTY SALARY

3.1.1 *Salary depression*

In ways which are of course more startling to external than to internal members of the review committee, the Department faces continuing problems of the utmost seriousness in the area of faculty salary. The decade under review started and ended with financial cuts, in both cases involving a university-wide faculty salary freeze. Small rallies in state support dollars in the middle of the decade failed to undo the damage done to the salary system. The basic facts need to be repeated here with full emphasis. While entry-level assistant professorial salaries are kept fairly close to the market rate, faculty salaries in the English Department lag 24.3% behind peers at associate professor level, and 29.3% behind peers at full professor level (2000-01 figures). While the lag percentages can be replicated in other parts of the University, the further point needs to be made that, in the Humanities, where average salaries are well behind averages for UW as a whole, this is a matter not just of maintaining status but of basic, break-even logistics for new faculty trying to build lives in a city with rising property prices, as their salary curves flatten in the years following their hire.

3.1.2 *Outside offers*

The broken salary system is a big morale problem for all faculty; its particular consequences for faculty retention efforts also need to be highlighted. Once a low salary level causes a faculty member to start looking at options elsewhere, the process of courtship acquires its own momentum, and the first battle for faculty retention has already been lost. Neither the Department nor the College stands to gain from a situation in which the solicitation of outside offers is seen as the only effective way of addressing salary stagnation. The fact that the College does not have a fully-funded war-chest makes a bad situation worse: this is an institution in which outside offers are not generally matched, but are met part-way at best. Most indications suggest that the Department of English has been as effective as any other Humanities department in securing a College and University response to outside offers: but even so the odds are stacked against retention.

3.1.3 *Merit salary increases*

The review committee has been given to understand that decisions on merit salary increases have voluntarily been ceded by the faculty to the Chair in most recent years, on the grounds that the amounts concerned are too nugatory to justify a review with fuller faculty involvement. Despite the very limited sums involved, the committee recommends that, in any year in which even the smallest margin above the 2% basic merit is available in the pool, it is crucial for morale and recognition that a broad-based merit review process be in place, with the Department's salary committee functioning actively from year to year.

3.2 FACULTY TEACHING LOAD AND COURSE RELEASE

The English Department seems, through its Chair, to make unusually heavy use of course releases, even beyond the across-the-board reduction given to the Department's assistant professors (see below). While some course releases come with College or University funds to pay for replacements, the committee was struck by the number of releases simply absorbed by the Department, with obvious consequences for its overall teaching capacity.

The policies governing course-load reduction seem to be poorly understood by most of the faculty and to be insufficiently transparent, to judge from the number of times

that equity of course-load was brought up as an issue to the committee. Perceived inequity here was in fact a significant source of dissatisfaction among faculty to whom we talked. The review committee strongly recommends that the new departmental administration make policies on course release much more open and understandable to the faculty at large.

For the Chair, the most common use of course releases is to reward heavy faculty service commitments in this large and unwieldy unit. In light of the problems which the Department has (by its own account) in finding faculty to cover its current courses, it should perhaps investigate ways of diversifying the means by which it remunerates faculty for service so as to include other options besides course reduction. More than one faculty member involved in such service actually volunteered to us that a summer stipend bonus would have been an option preferable to course release. We recommend that the administration help out substantively here by making available to the chairs of this and (for equity) other departments a number of weeks of summer salary, proportionate to the size of the unit, to be used for this purpose.

While the review committee has a certain range of opinion on the issue of course release, we all recognize that this can be a valuable tool for a Department Chair. The present call for more openness is not intended to remove from the Chair one of the few means available to offer strategic temporary support for faculty service and for the completion of faculty writing projects, when University-level support is not forthcoming.

3.3 HIRING POLICIES AND PRACTICES

A department depressed by faculty losses needs to be commended for the resilience which, so far, it has continued to show in making the kinds of hire which allow the idea of programmatic rebuilding to be not only viable but potentially exciting. The Department's commitment of both care and actual resources to its junior faculty (even over and above recent university- and college-level initiatives in this area), under the leadership of the present Chair, has been striking: see rank-specific section 3.4.1 on Assistant Professors below.

But junior hires, which of course make up the bulk of new appointments, cannot solve things alone. The loss of a dynamic mid-career cohort means that (even in these straitened times) some associate professor and full professor appointments do need to be funded as part of the mix, not least in order to give back to the current junior faculty the kinds of intellectual context which will keep them here. A few recent hires at the senior level, both planned and serendipitous, have shown the advantages of injecting new blood into the senior professoriate. The Department must invest time, and the administration money, in crafting a strategic set of tenured hires, preferably timed fairly close together so as to make some impact nationally.

Given how rarely positions are authorized for hire at the tenured level in the College's current budgetary climate, the funding of such senior positions must be conditional upon a very strong and strategic hiring plan from the Department. The review committee recommends overall support for the Department's requests for new positions at both senior and junior levels to deal with the consequences of recent losses, and is in basic agreement with its description of needs. However, we were

disappointed that, in making its case for new hires, both in the Self-Study and in faculty interviews, the Department was more concerned to describe gaps than to offer accounts of how new hires might complement or otherwise interact with existing areas of strength. Although the Department has experienced serious losses, it still has many faculty strengths to be proud of, and it is important that new building be responsive to already existing dynamics in the Department rather than planned in isolation.

Finally, once a hiring priority has been identified, the Department must do its utmost to run the actual search well. Despite the impressive overall track record of hiring in recent years, the review committee has also heard stories of frustration and division, both over ideology and over 'turf', arising from recent faculty searches. The level of overall faculty engagement in searches, as measured in attendance at job talks, has sometimes been poor. Faculty need to be reminded strongly that the votes which they hold on appointments bring a responsibility to be well-informed about candidates, and that every appointment has department-wide consequences.

3.4 FACULTY BY RANK

3.4.1 *Assistant professors*

One of the outgoing Chair's initiatives has been to follow through upon the Department's track record of strong hiring by putting in place a support system for assistant professors. An across-the-board course reduction from 5 to 4 is not uncontroversial in terms of equity across the ranks, but may well be a shrewd move in a hiring market in English in which (at least in areas perceived to be 'hot') deal sweeteners seem to be more extensive than in other Humanities disciplines. By and large assistant professors regard their relative freedom to pick teaching assignments (see below on Undergraduate Program), especially in the literature group, as a distinct plus. We were told that, where possible, the geography of office assignments has been arranged so as to promote junior faculty collegiality. The Chair's organization of the junior faculty into an 'assistant professors' benevolent society' (with recently tenured members included as 'emeriti') early in his term of office was a most welcome innovation; much more can and should be done to tap the energy and creative thinking of this cohort. The thought given by the Department to the support of assistant professors does not go unappreciated: one of the junior faculty to whom we spoke went so far as to characterize UW English as the best place in country to be an assistant professor. On the negative side, assistant professors feel more immediately impacted by the recent pattern of faculty losses than does any other rank, and more worried about the resultant gaps in intellectual leadership: the faculty lost are in many cases their closest mentors, their most important UW research contacts, and the people who were most instrumental in hiring them.

The committee emerged with a strong feeling that the nurturing of this junior cohort represents one of the very best investments in its future which the Department can make. This is the most optimistic group on the faculty, and the group to which ideological divisions seem to matter least. In the literature core, in particular, there are some issues where the longer-serving senior faculty seem so mired in past controversies that the debate needs quite simply to skip a generation and to be directed by the Department's junior and recently tenured faculty. If some senior appointments are envisaged to replace the 'missing generation', we strongly

recommend that the assistant professoriate be actively involved in the search process, and so too when a search for an external chair is initiated; assistant professors have contributed valuably to several recent searches in the Department. Here is another reason why the course reduction from 5 to 4 makes sense. The Department is scrupulous about not saddling assistant professors with major service responsibilities. However, as a group they offer the kind of fresh thinking which the Department so badly needs; and a Chair or Executive Committee needs to feel free to put them on (say) search committees without qualms concerning exploitation. The 5 to 4 course reduction makes it very fair to continue to ask them for such contributions, especially in kinds of service which may actually help their own intellectual growth.

3.4.2 *Associate professors*

The Department's current cohort of 19 associate professors has seen no promotions to full professor in the past five years. 10 associate professors have been in the rank for 14 years or more, 8 for 20 years or more. These are remarkable and depressing statistics. The reasons seem various, but all worth thinking about in terms of mid-career challenges. First, many of the recent faculty losses have been at the associate professor level, and from among those who were likely to be on a quicker pace for promotion to full professor. In some cases an associate professor has simply stalled, either in terms of research or more broadly. In others, research productivity has continued, but at a slower pace as a result of heavy service commitments or of kinds of teaching which amount to program-building. It is deeply worrying -- and a matter of reproach to the administration as well as to the Department -- that the system can seem to treat associate professors in the latter category (research-active colleagues whose contributions are weighted towards heavy service) interchangeably with associate professors in the former category (colleagues whose contribution is simply substandard), in terms both of salary level (often frankly insulting, and often as low as the mid-\$40,000 range) and of other forms of recognition. Even by the low standards of salary equity in the Humanities Division, there are some appalling cases here. (The Department's recent loss of one of its best administrative and consensus-building talents to a chairship at a lesser institution is a direct consequence of this kind of combination of salary neglect and category confusion.) Even in the university's terrible salary bind, we recommend that salary intervention, in partnership between the administration and the Department, be flexible enough to address vital service as well as vital research.

Although some responsibility here rests with the College, which is currently sending very mixed signals on the criteria for promotion from associate to full professor, it is fair to ask whether the English Department's own full professors have been doing enough to mentor associate professors towards promotion, and have been scrutinizing the records of all current associate professors energetically enough. (This is a problem in the Humanities Division at large, but especially acute in English.) Members of the review committee itself hold differing philosophical views on the question of whether a rigid 'two book' criterion (meaningless in the Science Division) is always appropriate, or whether different kinds of mix should be entertained for promotion from associate to full. At all events, the morale in the associate professor rank is lower than anywhere else in the Department; and the stagnation in promotion from associate to full is in danger of giving rise to a corrosive 'us' and 'them' mentality between the two ranks.

3.4.3 *Full professors*

The full professoriate contains (as one might expect) a high proportion of the Department's most distinguished and most highly visible scholars and writers. Although the recent pattern of faculty losses has hit home here too, there is still a critical mass of senior scholars whose prestige can keep the Department on the radar screen of research departments as it negotiates the present crisis, and can help to attract strong applicants if and when tenured searches are initiated. The strong record of the Creative Writing Program in retaining high-profile faculty makes the overall picture here better than it would otherwise be.

This review has already mentioned the shortage of real programmatic and administrative leadership at the Department's senior level. Although of course there were exceptions, it is disappointing to record that the full professors of literature who convened as a group to meet the committee during the site visit seemed less engaged in the review process than any other group with which we met.

Even after one allows for all sorts of variables (including leaves and releases), it remains noticeable that the Department's full professors teach fewer courses, and those to fewer students, than do the Department's associate professors. In 2000-01, more than half of the Department's full professors taught 3 courses or fewer, whereas the great majority of the associate professors taught 4 courses or more. (These figures take account of all courses at UW with more than two enrolled students taught by English Department faculty.) And, even in a Department whose commitment to large lecture classes is small (see below on Undergraduate Program), the almost complete absence of the full professoriate from the upper end of the Department's range of class sizes is noticeable. During the four academic years 1997-2001, only 10 courses were taught in the English Department with more than 100 enrolled students; only one of these was taught by a full professor (*versus* 8 by associate professors). Of 19 English Department courses enrolling more than 61 students in the same period, only 3 were taught by full professors (*versus* 15 by associate professors); one additional course in Comp. Lit. (enr. 82) was taught by a full professor.

Given the greater concentration of research productivity in the full professoriate, which will translate into more grants and fellowships, it is no great surprise that the overall number of courses taught per faculty member should be smaller at this rank. It is less clear why full professors should be so underrepresented in large-class teaching. In a department which has expressed concern about undergraduate access to its faculty, full professors should perhaps be encouraged to think of including some larger-enrolment 'impact' classes in their smaller teaching profiles, so as to help attract the College's best and brightest students to the English major.

3.5 FACULTY BY GROUP

3.5.1 *Literature*

The Department's heaviest faculty losses have been to its strengths in literary studies, most strikingly among mid-career faculty and in the once-enviable cohort of Americanists. The large literature core is the undoubted epicenter of the Department's crisis in confidence. One index of the negative effect of recent faculty losses upon morale is that, when asked by the review committee to name areas of especial

research strength in literary and cultural studies within the Department, faculty tended most often to begin with the past tense in identifying such strengths. But it is important not to be overly obsessive about what has been lost. Many excellences still exist. The English Department's literature core is the permanent home of one major journal (*MLQ*), and has provided the most recent editor of another (*Signs*). It still contains, in the words of one of the external members of the review committee, at least six senior scholars with national or international reputations, so that to join in the rebuilding of this faculty would be, for many, an invigorating career move.

To move beyond the issue of faculty loss, many of the difficulties in the literature core seem self-inflicted. The major challenge facing the large literature group is one of reconciliation between various perceived interests within the group itself, whose lack of internal cohesion stands in marked contrast to the strong sense of common mission and team spirit among the language and rhetoric group and (to a lesser extent) the creative writing group. The failure of core literature faculty to caucus effectively (which may explain their weak self-presentation in the Self-Study) needs to be pondered long and hard by them. This is an important failure for which, in the final analysis, they can blame none but themselves.

In particular, the external members of the review committee find the Department's literature group to be lagging behind other Departments of English in offering a strong response in its academic curricula to the many changes to hit the field in recent decades. The Department's own Self-Study drew attention to the problem in its strikingly open acknowledgement (pp.63-4) of a policy impasse on the reform of the undergraduate curriculum. In this case, however, the overt naming of the problem has already turned out to be the first step to a cure: we have learned that under the leadership of the new Director of Undergraduate Studies a reorganization of the Department's Honors concentration is already in place, and is being followed by a Committee for the Reorganization of the Undergraduate Major (CRUM): see on Undergraduate Program below, section 4.1.1.

It is only fair here to acknowledge that, as has been attested in high-profile disputes in English departments elsewhere, problems of disciplinary focus and intellectual mission are endemic to English as a discipline: UW English cannot be expected to solve what has not been solved in the field at large. What is important, however, is to be up to date with the best available models in the field for living productively with ideological difference. External members of the review committee share with some of the Department's own faculty (especially at the more junior levels) a sense that the lines of ideological debate viewed by many faculty members as paralysing progress are anachronistically rigid. This brings us back to the effects of the recent losses, which cannot be minimized: the faculty who have departed include many of those most capable of transcending old boundary disputes.

It is encouraging here to report that, just as the Department's junior faculty seem committed to thinking beyond old lines of debate within the literature group itself, so too they tend to see overlaps in interest and intellectual focus between the literature faculty (on the one hand) and the language and rhetoric faculty (on the other), where senior faculty in both groups (perhaps worn down by years of competition for budgetary resources) see only firm boundaries.

3.5.2 *Language and Rhetoric*: see Sub-Report A.

3.5.3 *MATESL*: see Sub-Report A.

3.5.4 *Creative Writing*: see Sub-Report B.

3.6 ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

The English Department's administrative office has a staff which operates both effectively and happily; some internal tensions reported at the time of the last review have long since disappeared. The Department's great size brings with it dedicated resources in such areas as undergraduate advising and computer support, which contribute enormously to the life of the unit and are the envy of many smaller departments. It is clear from high faculty and student praise that the administrative staff is doing a superb job of support for the Department's academic programs; and it is clear from staff members' own discussions with the review committee that they take pride in their membership of the Department.

Despite high morale, it needs to be said that the administrative staff is overstretched. While staff members have adapted well to the past decade's major technological changes in the office environment, further College-funded positions are a strong desideratum in computer technical support and in budget/fiscal support, and our recommendations will support the Department's case for additional staffing in these areas. The staff, though large by the standards of other Humanities departments, is anything but large in the context of the sheer numbers involved in many of the Department's operations. Again and again, we heard of the need for feats of administrative improvisation in the face of inadequate staff support. This is a familiar picture across the College. However a point which needs to be made for this department is that in some cases English is supplying clerical and administrative support for programs which benefit the College at large, and for which the College should therefore share the costs of staffing (see Sub-Report A on writing programs).

The outgoing Chair is to be commended for running an administrative office which seems to be a model for collaboration between faculty and staff in an atmosphere of mutual respect. The high retention rate among the Department's administrative staff in a decade in which salaries for university staff fell well behind salaries for comparable private sector jobs is especially striking.

4 *ACADEMIC PROGRAMS*

4.1 UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

4.1.1 *The Major*

The committee was deeply concerned at a policy impasse described in the Department's Self-Study (esp. pp.63-4) in the area of curricular reform to the undergraduate major. In a department which has such faculty strengths in approaches to (and research on) pedagogy, and which does such a great job of outreach in supporting pedagogy outside the institution, this account of near-paralysis at the

Department's very instructional heart is all the more remarkable. As we have already suggested in the section on literature faculty, and as Kerry Larson remarks in his independent letter, some of the ideological quarrels viewed as paralysing progress on curricular (and other) issues, especially between 'traditionalists' and 'theorists', seem outmoded and ready to be transcended by a new faculty generation.

Fortunately, things seem to have moving in the months since the Self-Study was published. The committee was impressed by the focus and drive with which the new Undergraduate Director is approaching the overhaul of the major, and hopes that faculty will find her optimism contagious. We understand that reforms to the Honors concentration are already in place, and that a Committee for the Reorganization of the Undergraduate Major (CRUM), chaired by the Undergraduate Director, is actively at work. We applaud these initiatives, and cannot emphasize too strongly how important it is that they maintain their momentum and not be stalled. We recommend that CRUM produce at least an interim set of conclusions by the beginning of the calendar year 2003: among other considerations, an up-to-date account of faculty thinking on curriculum will help the Department and the anticipated Chair search finalists to get better reads on one another.

The review committee met with only a small group of undergraduate majors; but they were unstinting in their praise of their new Director, who has clearly already done much to build collegiality in the Honors concentration and in the undergraduate major in general (a formidable task in a department with over 800 majors). In that same meeting we were most impressed by the depth of the appreciation expressed by the majors (speaking both for themselves and for their peers) for the English Advising staff: this is indeed one of the Department's best stories.

4.1.2 *Lower course levels*

Several English faculty expressed concern about the near-disappearance of faculty-taught courses from the Department's 200-level offerings, and more generally about the extent of the Department's reliance on TAs and AIs (Acting Instructors) below the 400 level. The recent acceleration of faculty losses has exacerbated the problem, in speeding the erosion of the already small faculty presence at 200 level, and in causing a (temporary?) surge in the number of AIs employed at 300 level. While undergraduate access to faculty is by no means an uncommon concern in large public university departments, there are real issues here: let us bring together some contexts for thinking about the specifics of the present case.

A major structural reason for the dearth of faculty at lower levels is to be found in the commitment made by the Department to its system of faculty-taught senior seminars (Engl 498), in the wake of the last ten-year review. Since that move was not accompanied by any major injection of new resources, the redirection of faculty effort had inevitable consequences at the lower undergraduate levels. On the balancing of faculty effort across the curriculum see further section 4.1.3 below.

The Department's heavy use of course releases (see earlier section) has consequences for curricular flexibility, and leaves the curriculum coordinator with fewer faculty bodies to assign to courses. When releases are put together with leaves and everything else which can take a faculty member out of the classroom, the average number of courses per year actually taught by English faculty in 1997-2001 averaged

3.2 for full professors and 3.6 for associate professors; for the current assistant professoriate (all hired since 1997) the one-year average for 2000-01 was 3.2.

Finally, class size. As already noted (see section 3.4.3 above on full professors), this is a department whose investment in large lecture classes is minimal. During the four academic years 1997-2001, only 10 courses in total were taught in the English Department with more than 100 enrolled students; only 19 courses in the same period enrolled more than 61 students. In many other English departments, and in many other UW departments, the lower course levels are where premajors get access to faculty -- including high-profile faculty -- by means of larger lecture courses, with or without TA sections. In logistical terms, here is the case for such courses: faculty respond to the challenges of popularizing and proselytizing; greater numbers of undergraduates, including some outside the major, get access to 'name' faculty; TAs learn about collaboration and get ongoing high-level mentorship in teaching broad-based courses of the kind that they will be called upon to teach in their future professional lives. The idea of offering larger lecture courses (to compensate for the redirection of faculty effort to senior seminars) came up in the Department's last ten-year review, evidently with little impact. This year, the idea met with a lukewarm response from some; others, including two or three who recalled formative lecture courses in their own undergraduate years, showed more interest. We recommend that the idea of large lecture classes at least be revisited.

4.1.3 *Faculty commitment across the curriculum*

We learned that the Department has a teaching culture in which the faculty is given an unusual degree of freedom to choose its own teaching assignments, and in which every faculty member (even if on a reduced load?) has the opportunity to offer a graduate course each year. Such a system can work if two things are in place: first, a strong curriculum coordinator (and the Department has such a person in place now); and second, if all levels of teaching are valued by most faculty for the different kinds of challenge and reward which they bring. Here, anecdotal evidence suggests that the Department needs to have a better language for valuing premajor teaching, especially at the gateway level, in order to motivate its faculty (including its higher-profile faculty) to volunteer for (or to enjoy being assigned) teaching in lower division or gateway courses. Even in terms of a narrow ambition to teach the academically strongest students, this should not be a hard sell: based upon experience in comparable UW departments, in any given year the Department of English is likely to have as much emergent academic talent at the top of its undergraduate pool as in its graduate program.

4.2 GRADUATE PROGRAM

4.2.1 *Numbers*

At the time of the last ten-year review, only 50% of graduate students in English were funded; now the percentage has risen to 78%. The Department is to be commended for having taken the decision to reduce the size of the graduate program (from 260 overall in 1991 to 185 overall in 2000) so as to improve this figure so dramatically, in the context of an essentially flat support picture. However, at 22% the percentage of unfunded students still seems high. There may still be room for discussion about

optimal program size, which should have a rationale beyond the staffing needs of the EWP.

4.2.2 *Fellowship support*

In the area of graduate student support, it is profoundly dispiriting to record that (despite a recent initiative from the A&S Dean's office which made limited seed money available for stipend bonuses), a system of entry-level fellowships in the Humanities seems no closer than ever. Furthermore, at a time when other institutions have been improving their support structures, the amount of dissertation support in the Humanities offered for competition from the Graduate School's severely limited resources has actually gone down: students nominated from some 15 eligible departments, including English, compete division-wide for a single year-long endowed fellowship (whose endowment is now actually insufficient to cover a full academic year) and for fewer than ten individual *quarters* of dissertation support.

It is astonishing that a major research university can hope to achieve top-twenty competitiveness in any Humanities program on TAships alone, and with no significant mix of fellowship support at entry and at dissertation levels; it must be asked whether the central administration has any understanding of the basis upon which Ph.D. programs in the Humanities compete. A graduate program funded by unsubsidized TAships (and not the most competitively salaried TAships either) will not prosper in the present market. The fact that the Graduate School's 'recruitment packages' award the English Department a total of four quarters of RAship per year to recruit its entering year of some 50 students (when four quarters of RAship *per student*, with zero fellowship support, would still put the Department behind peer institutions) simply defies belief, in a national perspective.

This criticism is directed not alone at the Graduate School, which probably makes the best of its present pitiful resources for the support of graduate research (and uses tuition waivers astutely when it can), but at an upper administration which expects Ph.D. programs in the Humanities to prosper in such a funding environment. Whether the solution is to come from fund-raising alone or from a combination of fund-raising and a readjustment of priorities in the Provost's office, the present situation, for English as for other Humanities Departments, poses an immediate and deepening threat to graduate program quality. Three two-quarter dissertation fellowships now advertised each year by the Simpson Center for the Humanities offer a model for the future; the fact that these fellowships have almost doubled the size of the University's overall investment in graduate research in the Humanities just serves to dramatize the depth of the problem.

4.2.3 *Placement*

In most recent years the overall figures for placement of Ph.D.s in the English Department have been very good -- and this within a discipline in which the job market is slow to uneven. The Department's placement committee has clearly put in a lot of work here, and graduate students themselves have much praise for the preparation which they receive for going on the job market, both in terms of mentoring on application technique, and in the opportunities provided to put together strong teaching portfolios.

However, if the Ph.D.s who receive temporary AI jobs within the English Department itself are subtracted, the placement figures receive a dent. If quality of job placement is taken into account, the Department's record cannot be described as better than mediocre: placements in peer institutions and in good liberal arts colleges are rare. The Department's graduate students themselves seem in general to have a realistic view of what jobs they will be competitive for, and to be reconciled to this; the students' perception is that there is a gap between their own job expectations and the job expectations which faculty have for them.

4.2.4 *Structure and requirements*

The M.A./Ph.D. concentration in literature contains no required courses; in general (as the Self-Study notes) the emphasis is firmly upon self-customized programs. This system seems to be popular with some students (especially those who come with M.A.s already in hand), by whom the freedom to shape one's own program is regarded as a recruitment incentive and a distinct plus; it seems to work much less well for others (especially those who come with B.A.s), and to lead to feelings of rudderlessness. The present Director of Graduate Studies has organized a useful 'show and tell' meeting in which faculty introduce entering students to the resources of the different parts of the Department. We understand that the idea of expanding this into a full-scale proseminar has been raised, and we recommend that this idea be pursued.

In the present system, the responsibility for steering graduates towards courses and course-types appropriate both for addressing weaknesses in prior preparation and for locating and pursuing specialization appears to depend very heavily upon a system of nominated faculty mentors. While graduate students in our meeting with them were unstinting in their praise of 10-15 faculty for extraordinary efforts of intellectual leadership here, there is a widespread perception that faculty mentorship fails too often -- in some cases because the faculty member nominated as mentor is temperamentally unsuited to the role, in others because a successful mentor attracts such traffic that prompt access becomes a problem, and finally (in recent years) because faculty losses have been, disproportionately, from those to whom the graduates looked most for mentorship.

The review committee recognizes that the *laissez-faire* structure of the M.A./Ph.D. in literature represents a conscious choice (see Self-Study p.36). However we feel that a policy distinction should nevertheless be made here between the M.A. and Ph.D. stages. As is already the case with the M.A. concentration in language and rhetoric (Self-Study p.37), we recommend that the Department consider instituting some required foundation courses to give more direction to the M.A. in literature.

In this connexion, the committee felt that the lack of structure in the M.A. showed some potential to result in a lack of agreed benchmarks in the early years of graduate study, making it hard to remove a weak student from the program.

On the other hand, the practice of requiring students who enter with M.A. degrees to undergo a trial period before admission to the Ph.D. program may interpose a hurdle where one is not always appropriate (and may hurt post-M.A. recruitment). We recommend that the Department consider making it possible for students with strong M.A. degrees to enter directly into the Ph.D. program.

4.2.5 *Graduate morale*

The committee would like to record that its group meeting with about 25 graduate students was one of the best and most productive during the visit. As a group they carried themselves professionally, they seemed appreciative of the good things in the Department, their criticism was constructive, and they seemed capable of taking the initiative whenever things broke down: e.g. student-generated communication of practical information to supplement official channels. By and large, this had the feel of a group which the Department (and College) was fortunate to have recruited, and a group which would amply repay the investment of proper graduate research support.

4.3 LANGUAGE & RHETORIC CONCENTRATION / MATESL / WRITING PROGRAMS

see Sub-Report A

4.4 CREATIVE WRITING PROGRAM

see Sub-Report B

5 **FORMS OF OUTREACH**

5.1 *Intellectual collegiality within UW*

Several interdisciplinary ventures in the Humanities are unimaginable without the contributions of English Department faculty. The Department has provided both the recent and the current leadership for the energetic Humanities Center, and several English Department faculty are active in Humanities Center initiatives. Many faculty maintain strong interests outside the Department, through joint or adjunct appointments in, and cross-listing of courses with, (among others) Comparative Literature, Women Studies, and the Programs in Comparative History of Ideas, Theory and Criticism, and Textual Studies (this last an English-led initiative). (The very extent of this interdisciplinarity is not without its downside in terms of the deflection of faculty initiative away from the English Department's own issues of identity and curriculum.) We learned of a most enterprising faculty-sharing initiative with the Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences program at UW Bothell, which allows a research-active associate professor there to offer courses in the English Department (and to be on the Department's graduate faculty) while making (senior) English Department faculty available for IAS courses at Bothell. As is discussed in more detail elsewhere (see Sub-Report A), the service the Department provides to the University with respect to the teaching of writing to undergraduates is huge.

5.2 *Town and gown*

The Puget Sound Writing Project, historically associated with the English Department, and still (since its shift to Distance Learning) masterminded by English Department faculty, is UW's most successful Humanities-based K-12 partnership: see findings and recommendations in Sub-Report A.

The Creative Writing faculty are ambassadors not just for the Department but (especially through the prestige of the MacArthur fellowships) for the University at large. Many are regularly visible in the larger world through readings, and through features and reviews in the mainstream media.

5.3 Development / Fund-raising

The Department has positioned itself very well (and ahead of many other departments) in the increasingly vital area of fund-raising, not least by the appointment of a faculty member as Director of Development. The Self-Study (pp.71-4) identifies the major goals of fund-raising in the years ahead. Rightly in our view, two areas of major need are positioned front and center: faculty salary and research support (especially through endowed professorships); and graduate fellowship funding.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION

The review committee recommends continuation of the Department of English's BA, MA, MAT, MAT(ESL), MFA and PhD degree programs. We couple this with a recommendation that the next program review be held in five years rather than the customary ten. The present report lays the responsibility for the unit's future both upon the Department itself and upon the University and College administration: the commitment to rebuilding the Department which we seek from the administration must go hand-in-hand with clear departmental self-improvement in the areas of communication, governance and curricular reform.

RECOMMENDATIONS (LANGUAGE & RHETORIC, MATESL, WRITING PROGRAMS):

see Sub-Report A

RECOMMENDATIONS (CREATIVE WRITING PROGRAM):

see Sub-Report B

RECOMMENDATIONS (DEPARTMENT-WIDE, LITERATURE 'CORE')

TO THE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE

1. New hires should be approved both at senior (associate and full professor) and at junior (assistant professor) levels to make up for recent faculty losses and to build for the future. The review committee recognizes that the funding of senior positions, in particular, must be conditional upon a strong and strategic hiring plan from the Department. [See sections 1 and 3.3]
2. An interim Chair should be appointed internally for the 2002-03 academic year. During this year, a search for a Chair of English from outside the University should be conducted. [See section 2.6]
3. Faculty salary depression in the English Department, especially at the associate and full professor levels, should be reviewed by the administration, paying attention not just to the overall statistics on compression and peer gap but also to the specifics of the more egregious cases: e.g. active mid-career faculty earning salaries as low as the mid-\$40,000s. [See section 3.1.1; also recommendation 4 below]
4. With an especial eye on mid-career faculty with major service commitments, we recommend that salary intervention, in partnership between the administration and the Department, be flexible enough to address vital service as well as vital research. [See section 3.4.2]
5. So as to help the Department to address the problem of stagnation within the associate professor rank, the Deans and College Council should clarify current thinking on the criteria for promotion from associate to full professor, and should

work to increase broad comparability across divisions and departments in this area. [See section 3.4.2]

6. The administration should make available to the Chairs of this and other departments a number of weeks of summer salary to compensate faculty who shoulder heavy service commitments -- as an alternative option to course release for such faculty. [See section 3.2]

7. The review committee endorses the Department's request for new positions in computer technical support and in budget/fiscal support, and calls for increased funding for the clerical and administrative needs of programs originating in English but benefiting the College as a whole (e.g. EWP). [See section 3.6; also Sub-Report A]

<Graduate Program>

8. The administration should take serious steps to address the absence of significant fellowship support at graduate entry and at dissertation level, which is anomalous for a major research university, and poses an immediate and deepening threat to graduate program quality in English (as in other Humanities departments). [See section 4.2.2]

TO THE DEPARTMENT

1. The Department should hold a retreat early in Autumn Quarter 2002 to begin discussion of the issues raised by the ten-year review and to prepare for the upcoming external chair search. [See section 2.1]

2. The Department's faculty should meet henceforth on a regular basis, monthly at minimum, with an agenda prepared by the Chair and Executive Committee in consultation with Program Directors. [See section 2.2]

3. The mission and function of the Department's Executive Committee should be more precisely defined. Membership of the EC should be for a three-year term, with individual terms staggered in ways that ensure continuity from year to year. Faculty members who anticipate going on leave during their three-year term of service should not be disqualified from candidature. The review committee recommends that the by-laws be further changed to include major program directors as *ex officio* members of the EC. [See section 2.3]

4. The Chair should meet monthly with the Department's Program Directors as a group. [See section 2.4]

5. The Department should consider the pros and cons of creating an Associate Chair position. [See section 2.4]

6. Both the Creative Writing Program and the Expository Writing Program should actively discuss ways of refining and redefining their present systems of 'semi-devolution' within the Department; the Department and the A&S Dean's office should encourage and facilitate such discussions. [See section 2.4; also Sub-Reports A and B]

7. The Department should review how it wants issues pertaining to salary increases and retention to be handled. (It is our recommendation that the Department's salary committee be convened whenever there is more than 2% 'basic merit' available in the 'pool'.) [See section 3.1.3]

8. Policies on course release should be reviewed by the new departmental administration, and made much more open and understandable to the faculty at large. [See section 3.2]

9. The full professoriate should take a more active role in mentoring associate professors towards promotion, and in reviewing their records to determine whether promotion is within reach. The Chair and Department should continue their good work in mentoring assistant professors towards tenure. [See section 3.4.2 and 3.4.1]

10. Time and care should be invested in building broad consensus for and engagement in a strong and strategic hiring plan, so that the Department can make its best case to the administration -- especially for the funding of senior positions. [See section 3.3]

11. Assistant professors should continue to be actively involved in search processes at all levels, including the search for an external Chair. [See section 3.4.1]

12. The Department should increase its investment in convivial activities, including Department-wide receptions, to foster collegiality within the faculty and between faculty and (esp.) graduate students. [See section 2.7]

<Undergraduate Program>

13. The Committee for the Reorganization of the Undergraduate Major (CRUM) should produce an interim set of recommendations by the beginning of the calendar year 2003. [See section 4.1.1]

14. The Department should revisit the idea of developing large, lower-division faculty-taught classes that can serve as gateway courses within the major and stimulate interest in the Department among non-majors. High-profile faculty should be encouraged to join in this enterprise. The Department should review the logistical consequences of its commitment to the system of faculty-taught senior seminars (English 498). [See sections 4.1.2 and 4.1.3]

15. The Department should work to increase the number of tenure-line faculty involved in lower-division instruction generally. The Curriculum Coordinator should take an activist role in ensuring that tenure-line faculty are well used across all levels of the curriculum. The faculty should recognize that curricular needs may entail some abridgement of their traditional freedom to choose their own teaching assignments. [See sections 4.1.2 and 4.1.3]

<Graduate Program>

16. The Department should consider ways in which to add more structure to the graduate program at the pre-M.A. stage: creating some required foundation courses for literature students, for example, or expanding the current informal 'show and tell' into a full-scale proseminar for entering students. [See section 4.2.4]

17. The Department should consider making it possible for students with strong M.A. degrees to enter directly into the Ph.D. program. [See section 4.2.4]

LIST OF ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS

SUB-REPORT A:

LANGUAGE & RHETORIC, MATESL, WRITING PROGRAMS:
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
(LEAD AUTHOR ANDREA LUNSFORD)

SUB-REPORT B:

CREATIVE WRITING PROGRAM:
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
(LEAD AUTHOR JEAN MCGARRY)

SEPARATE LETTERS:

1) FROM KERRY LARSON

2) FROM CHARLES BERGER, ANDREA LUNSFORD, JEAN
MCGARRY, ROBIN STACEY (JOINT LETTER)