11/30 Faculty meeting

In attendance: John Golden, Steve Blakemore, Emily Stockard, John Leeds, Papatya Bucak, Adam Bradford, Taylor Hagood, Lisa Swanstrom, Kate Schmitt, Julieann Ulin, Rafe Dalleo, Sika Dagbovie-Mullins, Eric Berlatsky, Wendy Hinshaw, Barclay Barrios, Andy Furman, Mark Scroggins, Jeff Galin, Mary Faraci, Lynne Hahn, Jennifer Low, Julia Mason, Joanne Jasin, Dan Murtaugh

The meeting is called to order at 1:00 p.m.

Andy Furman reminds everyone of the collection for the staff holiday gift.

Announcements

1. Andy Furman: the 2012 program review has been turned in.

2. Lower-division surveys (AF): we decided to cap them higher (50), make pedagogical adjustments. So be aware of this when you list course preferences: you will teach them differently. Enrollment will start at 35, raise to 50.

Discussion: The courses are 2000-level AMLs and ENLs (2 each semester). These courses are in fact being fully enrolled at 35.

World Literature (Sika Dagbovie-Mullins): this will be developed next semester. LLCL will require a Great Books course (2000-level), called LIT 2100, Global Great Books, as a core course.

3. New announcements?

Discussion: yesterday’s security issue.

Discussion Items

1. Assessment (Emily Stockard): all assessment committees will now give their reports. ES suggests doing the graduate programs first. The discussion will involve how the assessment will be conducted next year.

Graduate committee (Mark Scroggins): MS reads the goals of the graduate program and the method of assessment: reading of random theses: 6/17 submitted; ranked on 4-point scale; none of the theses were ranked as weak; one thesis average; 5/6 were above average or superior; 3 above average; 2 superior. Focus on early proposal and completion has paid off. Prose style is often flaccid; a workshop in the spring will address this. Conference/publication: 5/17 presented papers at conferences, 1 has published critical article, which exceeds criteria for success in professionalization. Program improvements: faculty-run workshops for conference participation and professionalization; new graduate journal of criticism overseen by faculty; MS has made exit survey a requirement before thesis is approved. 3/17 have gone onto excellent Ph.D. programs; many others are teaching; 11/17 have achieved career in teaching or teaching-related field or gone onto further education; this exceeds the criterion of 20%. Sub-committee will continue to help with applications, job placement; special emphasis this year on applying for Ph.D. programs and interview preparation.

ES: Next step will be to lock in a plan for next year. Can be the same plan, or tweaked.

AF: we should increase the benchmark for job placement from 20% to 50%.

MFA committee (Papatya Bucak): Evaluating MFA theses: exceeded expectations; program improvement: assess thesis essay. Professional development: exceeded expectations; program improvement: enlarge exit survey. Job placement: exceeded expectations for teaching; program improvement: increase acceptance in Ph.D. programs. For the future: trying to figure out how to measure success, which for M.F.A. graduates often comes well after the program is over.

ES: plan will be revised to measure success 2 or so years out.

Barclay Barrios suggests breaking down the results for Ph.D.-program acceptance by genre.

Undergraduate committee (SDM): Lisa and Taylor looked at two classes—papers (50 total) from both classes were read for various criteria (content, competence, critical thinking, quotation integration). Emily: we measured 4 different aspects for each paper; we met all targets except in the category of “strong” (wanted 40%; always 30%).

AF: but if “superior” is exceeded, this should count for “strong,” right?

ES: 80% should receive at least competent; 10% should receive superior; 40% should be ranked strong. Roughly they fell into thirds, with “content” being the best aspect (30% superior) and “quotation integration” the worst and “critical thinking” the next worse.

AF: revise to “at least strong” (etc.). Sika should bring this revision to the committee.

Discussion: difficulty, necessity of 4-category measurement.

Jeff Galin suggests tracking who these students are, how many of them are in our major.

AF: this could be done in the future.

ES: we should think about what the criteria for writing assessment should be next year, especially the specific category “quotation integration.”

Program improvement will be discussed in committee.

2. African-American tenure line hire candidates (SDM): applicant pool was disappointingly small: 51 applicants is low for general Af-Am position. But there are good applicants: 22 writings samples requested. MLA interviewees will be selected from these. List will be generated today.

AF: department should have the opportunity to look at them.

CVs will be in file at front desk. If there are no objections by next Wednesday, then AF will assume we can arrange the interviews.

3. New business?

Lisa Swanstrom asked who evaluates applications to Ph.D. program. AF: thsea re handled by different committee; applicants can contact the head of the committee directly (see program web site). Eric Berlatsky: graduate-level courses are filling.

Jeff Galin: has undergraduate committee talked about making more courses WAC? Pros and cons discussed. We have to decide how many courses, which courses. If we decide to go ahead, JG needs a one-page proposal. AF: department feels we should pursue it (produce proposal with criteria). The lower-division courses won’t be writing-enriched, but most higher-level courses would be. JG: criteria are set by department, not by WAC committee. AF volunteers to sit with committee to develop criteria during the spring.

AF: Next semester, several departmental conversations will be started, including developing a mission statement for the program.

The meeting is adjourned at 2:00 p.m.