



WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY

Program Review Self-Study Template

Academic unit: English

College: Liberal Arts and Humanities

Date of last review 2011

Date of last accreditation report (if relevant) _____

List all degrees described in this report (add lines as necessary)

Degree: BA in English Language and Literature _____

CIP* code: 23.0101 _____

Degree: BA in Creative Writing _____

CIP* code: 23.1302 _____

Degree: MA in English Language and Literature _____

CIP code: 23.0101 _____

Degree: MFA in Creative Writing _____

CIP code: 23.1302 _____

*To look up, go to: Classification of Instructional Programs Website, <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55>

Faculty of the academic unit (add lines as necessary)

Name

Signature

Mary Waters, Chair

Mary Waters

Christopher Brooks, Graduate Coordinator

Chris Brooks

Fran Connor, Undergraduate Coordinator

Fran Connor

Margaret Dawe, Director of Creative Writing

Margaret M. Dawe

Darren Defrain, Director of the Writing Program

Darren Defrain

Mary Sherman, Assistant Director of the Writing Program

Mary Sherman

Kerry Jones, Director of the University Writing Center

Kerry Jones

William Woods, M.V. Hughes Professor of English

declined to sign. No reason given.

Rebecca Bechtold

Rebecca Bechtold

Jean Griffith

Jean C. Griffith

Josh Barkan

Josh Barkan

Sam Taylor

Sam Taylor

Tina Bennett

Tina Bennett

Albert Goldbarth, Adele B. Davis Distinguished Professor of Humanities

Albert Goldbarth

Melinda Defrain, Basic Skills Coordinator

ill-unable to come in to sign

Kimberly Engber, Dean of the Honors College

Kimberly Engber

(name and title)

1. Departmental purpose and relationship to the University mission (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

a. University Mission:

The mission of Wichita State University is to be an essential educational, cultural, and economic driver for Kansas and the greater public good.

b. Program Mission (if more than one program, list each mission):

(Undergraduate English) The English department offers a broad and flexible program of courses that are central to a liberal arts education while offering students the opportunity for personal enrichment and a variety of career possibilities. The department offers degree programs in creative writing, literature, and English teaching, as well as a range of course in linguistics. Students who combine an English major with substantial work in other disciplines will find the knowledge and communication skills acquired in their work in English a valuable asset as they seek entrance into a wide range of fields that include communication, education, government, law, and even business.

The Master of Arts program in English equips graduate students with the knowledge and skills necessary both to the outstanding teacher and to the well-prepared candidate for further graduate study. The graduate committee of the department accordingly requires its master's candidates to follow a course of advanced study that leads to a comprehensive knowledge of English and American literature. Candidates are also given training in the principles of literary criticism and in the use of bibliographic tools so that they will have a general competence in criticism and research.

The degree program for the Master of Fine Arts in creative writing places emphasis on the development of skills and understanding in the practice of imaginative writing and upon related academic study. It is not exclusively a studio program; rather, it encourages the development of writers who are able, as the result of additional coursework in English, to demonstrate skills useful in teaching, editing and other related areas. A core of workshops and tutorials leads to a final writing project: a collection of fiction or poetry, a novel, or some other appropriate work. Flexibility is provided in academic coursework to allow for a variety of possible interests.

c. The role of the program (s) and relationship to the University mission: Explain in 1-2 concise paragraphs.

Probably the most useful skill in educational, cultural, and economic activity is effective written and oral communication. All programs and classes in the English department have development of these skills as their primary mission. The analysis of effective writing and exploration of imaginative works through writing engages students in critical skills that facilitate educational excellence, career advancement, and effective public engagement. The department sustains the university's foundation on a strong tradition in the arts and sciences. We contribute to the intellectual community through our research and scholarship while maintaining a standard of high quality instruction for our students. Our research and course offerings reflect the diversity of the university community.

The Master's Program has become aware of the need to offer to local secondary school teachers an opportunity to professionalize their credentials. We also recognize that more of our MA students wish to pursue doctoral work. Meanwhile, though our major and graduate programs remain central to our mission, we recognize that through Composition and General Education instruction we serve the entire university.

For those reasons we will hire a Composition Specialist this year and continue to fill or create new faculty lines in order to expand these areas in the near future.

Over the last 3 years we have made a concerted effort to increase our online offerings. We now offer English 101, 102, and 210 in online formats to better serve our students. Our Composition Committee understands the need to keep pace with current pedagogies and best practices and continually strives to integrate approaches that work for WSU's diverse student needs into each addition of their common syllabi. With Dean Matson's help, we've also expanded and deepened the orientation session for incoming GTAs, who teach the bulk of these courses, to better prepare them to meet our students' needs.

- d. Has the mission of the Program (s) changed since last review? ☒ Yes ☐ No
 i. If yes, describe in 1-2 concise paragraphs. If no, is there a need to change?

Our mission statements are listed in the university catalogs and the text derives from those statements. Prior reviews apparently did not use these publicized missions as a basis for the reviews.

- e. Provide an overall description of your program (s) including a list of the measurable goals and objectives of the program (s) (programmatic). Have they changed since the last review?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, describe the changes in a concise manner.

Composition Program:

The composition program is grounded in two basic skills courses, English 101 and 102, College English I and II, which students take in sequence. 101 helps students master basic forms of written exposition—description, narrative, comparison/contrast, and the like. By the end of the semester, students present written arguments. 102 builds on the skills developed in 101; here students consult written sources, learn to summarize and evaluate them, and construct counter-arguments. They learn to distinguish the authority and relative merits of what they read. 102 concludes with a major research paper on some significant question where students stake out their own territory in the field of study. Both 101 and 102 require students to pass a written essay examination with a minimum grade of C. The examination is graded according to a standard department grading rubric, and grades are calibrated in department trainings for faculty teaching the classes. In addition to 101 and 102, the department offers English 100, a course especially designed for non-native speakers of English. For such students, this course replaces 101 in the sequence. English 210, a course in Business, Professional, and Technical Writing, is offered to students who wish to sharpen their skills with the specific forms of writing required in the scientific and corporate worlds.

The measurable goals of composition courses are to teach students

- to communicate clearly and effectively in writing what they think and know;
- to put facts and ideas into a logical, coherent form;
- to think critically about what they hear, see, and read;
- to present informed arguments that are well-conceived, rational, and ethical.

Language and Literature:

The undergraduate language and literature program consists of 33 credit hours that cover a range of historical periods, authors, and genres in order to give students a working knowledge of the breadth and depth of this field. The measurable goals of the language and literature program are to teach students

- to acquire a working knowledge of the field of literature through familiarity with important works of drama, fiction, poetry, and nonfictional prose in a range of historical periods;
- to carry out informed analysis of literary texts;
- to think and write critically about literary texts.

The graduate program in literature comprises three plans ranging from 30-33 units each. Students explore authors and genres in a range of literary periods and do advanced literary research. It is designed for students who plan to seek a more advanced degree with the idea of teaching at the college level, students who are already teaching or aspire to teach at the community college level, and those who wish to pursue advanced literary study for purposes of personal or career enrichment. Most of the courses are seminars, requiring a high level of oral participation and extensive advanced written work. The measurable goals of the MA program are to teach students

- to acquire a broad knowledge of literary works including in depth knowledge of at least three literary fields distributed between American and British literature and over the full historical range of writing in English;
- to develop very strong writing, critical, and research skills as evidenced by a variety of research and critical tasks, including but not limited to effective papers, exams, and projects.
- to carry out extensive analysis of literary texts in the form of written work modeled upon professional conference presentations and publishable articles.

Creative Writing

The undergraduate creative writing program consists of 33 credit hours in a combination of literature and creative writing courses. The literature courses are foundational, familiarizing students with important literary works that in the aggregate comprise the literary tradition with which they are writing. The writing courses themselves are aimed at developing and honing the skills of student writers. The measurable goals of the creative writing program are to teach students

- to understand and appreciate works that comprise the literary tradition they inherit;
- to carry out informed analyses of literary texts;
- to think and write critically about literary texts;
- to produce original works of fiction and poetry that, under optimal circumstances, would be considered publishable.

The graduate program in creative writing is a 48-hour program leading to an MFA, which is a terminal degree in that field. It is a combined studio/academic program designed for students who wish to teach at the college level or seek careers in other areas, such as professional writing, editing, journalism, and the like. MFA students take the same courses as MA students do, with identical performance expectations. In addition, they take advanced creative writing courses, which lead to a book-length final project. It is expected that the resulting work would be deemed—under optimal conditions—publishable.

2. Describe the quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty in terms of SCH, majors, graduates, and scholarly/creative activity (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

Complete the table below and utilize data tables 1-7 provided by the Office of Planning Analysis (covering SCH by FY and fall census day, instructional faculty; instructional FTE employed; program majors; and degree production).

Scholarly Productivity	Number Journal Articles	Number Presentations	Number Conference Proceedings	Performances	Number of Exhibits	Creative Work	No. Books	No. Book Chaps.	No. Grants Awarded or Submitted	\$ Value
------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------	--------------	--------------------	---------------	-----------	-----------------	---------------------------------	----------

	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref	*	**	***	Juried	****	Juried	Non-Juried				
Year 1 (2011)	2	1	3	3								10	1	0	0	1	8,300
Year 2 (2012)	4	1	8	6								4		1	0	2	7,000
Year 3 (2013)	2	2	8	3								7		2	3	6	41,500

* Winning by competitive audition. **Professional attainment (e.g., commercial recording). ***Principal role in a performance. ****Commissioned or included in a collection.

In addition to the above tabulated scholarly productivity, several of our faculty are working in the new and significant field of digital humanities developing collaborative projects and creating digital editions. These scholarly accomplishments do not have an obvious place in the table above.

Faculty submit an annual Faculty Activity Record reporting their productivity in terms of scholarship, teaching, and service. The Record is reviewed by a Salary Committee of three faculty members chosen by their peers from each of the department's major disciplines. Their assessments and the original records are then reviewed by the department chair. Quality of research and creative work is determined by the prestige and significance of the work itself and the venue in which it appears or was presented. Quality and competitiveness of fellowships, awards, residencies, and grants are also considered.

Within the composition program, faculty productivity is primarily teaching and service-oriented. As such, semester reviews of SPTEs, course visitations of GTAs, and annual assessment of English 101 and 102 courses continue to be the most effective ways of monitoring and improving curriculum.

Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the faculty/staff using the data from the table above and tables 1-7 from the Office of Planning Analysis as well as any additional relevant data. Programs should comment on details in regard to productivity of the faculty (i.e., some departments may have a few faculty producing the majority of the scholarship), efforts to recruit/retain faculty, departmental succession plans, course evaluation data, etc.

Provide assessment here:

In 2013 we brought in one new faculty member and are recruiting two for next year. In 2012 we brought in two new faculty members. In 2011 we brought in one new faculty member, and had one authorized search fail because a candidate accepted the position and then failed to begin work. We lost faculty only to retirement, so our record in regard to retention and recruitment is good but could be improved. We need a number of additional positions. See below.

Our faculty research and creative activity is moderate to good over the period. While in the prior review productivity was limited to a small proportion of the faculty, this period most faculty produced some form of significant publishable research or creative product. Some faculty are still more productive than others, but overall achievements seem more widely spread across the entire department, indicating that department faculty engage in the intellectual and creative pursuits appropriate to their specialties. Grant production is noteworthy for a group of disciplines that tend to receive limited or no grant support. One inhibiting factor in the rate of research and creative productivity is the burden of providing extensive department, college, and university service while sustaining with a small full-time faculty multiple demanding programs, some of which serve the entire university. Over half of our faculty, for example, have a named administrative role, while representatives from the English department serve on almost every committee at the college and university levels. Another inhibiting factor is the geographical distance from major research libraries coupled with very limited research travel funding.

The number of department majors is down slightly in 2012 (192 Language and Literature, 29 Creative Writing) after a spike in 2011 (to 218 Language and Literature, 34 Creative Writing [Creative Writing also had higher

numbers in 2009 and 2010)). However, the five-year rolling average remains 200 for Language and Literature, a bit up from the previous average and in line with individual year enrollment averages since 2006. Creative Writing rolling average is also comparable to previous years. Numbers of English department majors thus seem roughly stable over the period.

Departmental instructional productivity is very strong considering the nature of our courses. Our five year average student credit hour production was 16,855, with all years of this review period falling above the average, indicating a steady increase in credit hour production. Graduate teaching assistants and lecturers produce the vast majority of those credit hours (6000 of 8123 hours in 2012 and 5548 of 8253 hours in 2011 as tabulated on November 1 census day). 2012 shows a drop in credit hours produced by tenure-eligible faculty. This anomaly may have been related to some scheduling problems that the department is currently reviewing, and will therefore bear continuing observation. Meanwhile, the per-employee drop in FTE production was very modest, and an increase in units by lecturers helped to offset drops in other categories. The department FTE production overall is significantly below the figures for both the university and the college, largely due to the nature of the department's courses, which, without exception, are writing intensive and require investment of faculty time in individual instruction and commenting on student writing. The difference is, therefore, entirely appropriate and represents no deficit in department instructional productivity.

3. Academic Program: Analyze the quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students for each program (if more than one). Attach updated program assessment plan (s) as an appendix (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information).

- a. For undergraduate programs, compare ACT scores of the majors with the University as a whole.

Some data is missing from the table, but overall mean ACT scores have increased slightly among majors and are about 2 points higher than those for the university overall, indicating that the department is beginning to attract stronger students to its undergraduate majors.

- b. For graduate programs, compare graduate GPAs of the majors with University graduate GPAs.

English department Master's Degree Program has established a set number of hours, a minimum GPA (3.0), and a high level of competence on a written essay in order to be admitted to graduate study. These entry requirements are periodically reviewed by the graduate faculty meeting with the department chair.

Graduate program entering GPA has increased for both the MA program and the MFA program from slightly below the university average of 3.5 to slightly above it, indicating that the department is beginning to attract stronger students to its graduate programs.

- c. Identify the principal learning outcomes (i.e., what skills does your Program expect students to graduate with). Provide aggregate data on how students are meeting those outcomes in the table below. Data should relate to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e. Provide an analysis and evaluation of the data by learner outcome with proposed actions based on the results.

In the following table provide program level information. You may add an appendix to provide more explanation/details. Definitions:

Learning Outcomes: Learning outcomes are statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation. These relate to the skills, knowledge, and behaviors that students acquire in their matriculation through the program (e.g., graduates will demonstrate advanced writing ability).

Assessment Tool: One or more tools to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g., a writing project evaluated by a rubric).

Criterion/Target: Percentage of program students expected to achieve the desired outcome for demonstrating program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of the students will demonstrate satisfactory performance on a writing project).

Result: Actual achievement on each learning outcome measurement (e.g., 95%).

Analysis: Determines the extent to which learning outcomes are being achieved and leads to decisions and actions to improve the program. The analysis and evaluation should align with specific learning outcome and consider whether the measurement and/or criteria/target remain a valid indicator of the learning outcome as well as whether the learning outcomes need to be revised.

Learning Outcomes (most programs will have multiple outcomes)	Assessment Tool (e.g., portfolios, rubrics, exams)	Target/Criteria (desired program level achievement)	Results	Analysis
MA in English: 1. knowledge of specific literary texts 2. knowledge of literary terms and historical concepts 3. understanding of major modern literary critical issues 4. ability to write a coherent essay in a grammatically correct and lucid style	MA Comprehensive exams. See appendix A for grading rubric	95% success rate or above	90% success rate	Courses have been renumbered or resituated at a more appropriate course level in order to better serve our beginning and experienced MA students and utilize faculty in their areas of specialization.
Undergraduate major in English: 5. Skill at critical and expository writing 6. ability to read literary and non-literary texts from a variety of critical perspectives 7. a capacity for academic research 8. a broad understanding of English literature from the end of the Roman empire until the present.	In a capstone senior seminar, which students take in their final year, they develop a research project that incorporates all of these skills. This project is then graded on a rubric that assesses success in both the separate skills and the integration of them in a coherent whole. For some sample rubrics, see appendices.	Students will be able to exhibit sufficient skill on their final projects to merit average, or above 70% level on the assessment.	Since the senior seminar was developed, all but one student was able to attain levels of the specified skills that merited average, or above 70% level on the assessment.	The senior seminar has proved highly successful in both integrating and solidifying skills for prospective graduates and as a measure of the success of the undergraduate program leading up to the senior year. Students are ready for this final step when they reach it and are able to use it productively to take their skills to a higher level.
Creative Writing: Students should be able to write a creative work in their appropriate genre that reflects a strong performance according to assessment criteria.	See Appendix for sample grading rubric	Students will be able to exhibit sufficient skill to merit average or above assessment.	A Creative Writing student must demonstrate an above average performance in the introductory class before being admitted to higher level workshops. About 20% do so. Students below average change majors.	The program is successful in developing students' abilities to author creative work with potential for publication.
Creative Writing MFA: Students will demonstrate a knowledge of the literary tradition within which they are writing.	Written Comprehensive Examination	Students can write critical essays on certain of these works during a three-hour comprehensive examination, in particular being able to apply the craft terms of that student's genre both to works of literature on the	In 2011, the program graduated nine (9) MFA students; in 2012, thirteen (13) students, and in 2013, nine (9) students, all of whom passed	The program has successfully educated students into the literary traditions in which they are writing.

		30-book list and to the student's own work.	comprehensive exams.	
Creative Writing MFA: Students will write a novel, story collection, or poetry collection with a director who specializes in the student's genre.	MFA Final Project, approved by the director and a second reader, rejected, or approved with the requirement that revisions be made.	Production of a significant literary work or collection of potentially publishable quality.	In 2011, the program graduated nine (9) MFA students; in 2012, thirteen (13) students, and in 2013, nine (9) students, all of whom completed final projects.	The program is successful in developing students' abilities to author creative work with potential for publication.
Students are expected to be able to produce college-level essays after successfully passing English 101, and to be able to enter and contribute to larger dialogues, regardless their discipline, and contribute reasoned, ethical arguments in the form of documented essays after successfully completing English 102.	Students are required to take a diagnostic exam at the start of their English 101 and 102 courses. They then take an exit examination in those courses graded using the same rubric as the diagnostic exam, but with an additional grader for each exam.	Students should show significant improvement from their diagnostic scores to their exit exam scores. The exit exam scores should be relatively close to the final course grades as a reflection of overall performance and ability.	Data for these assessments is forwarded each semester to the Office of Assessment for tabulation and for the data to be made public as part of WSU's ongoing accreditation process. For the past 8 years the data shows solid improvement from diagnostic to exit exam scores in both English 101 and 102. See below.	We continue to see solid improvement from students in English 101 and 102 each semester. A broader consideration of the data has led us to look at ways to improve the transition from English 101 to 102, so that diagnostic scores in 102 increase, and to continue to work with USD 259 (WSU's primary "feeder" district) to communicate "college level" writing expectations and challenges.

English 101 Pre and Post Test Diagnostic Scores by Term

Semester/Year	Scale	Pre test	Post test	Semester/Year	Scale
Fall 2009	mean	2.91	3.43	Spring 2010	mean
std dev	0.79	0.68		std dev	0.83
total students	488	488	100%	total students	256
A	16	47	9.6%	A	4
B	127	204	41.8%	B	43
C	154	185	37.9%	C	62
D	167	47	9.6%	D	116
F	24	5	1.0%	F	31
Fall 2011	mean	3.07	3.51	Spring 2012	mean
std dev	0.88	0.85		std dev	0.88
total students	553	553	100%	total students	304
A	56	114	20.6%	A	24
B	156	232	42.0%	B	74
C	152	109	19.7%	C	82
D	160	91	16.5%	D	110
F	29	7	1.3%	F	14
Fall 2012	mean	2.73	3.26	Spring 2013	mean
std dev	0.75	0.63		std dev	0.65
total students	624	624	100%	total students	266
A	8	29	4.6%	A	0
B	119	220	35.3%	B	36
C	207	283	45.4%	C	83
D	281	89	14.3%	D	145
F	9	3	0.5%	F	2

1 Scale ranges from 0 to 5 (high).

*** Pre test score is statistically different from Post test at the <.000 level.

Based on a November 2012 survey of 19 MFA students conducted by the creative writing program director the department's creative writing committee proposed a new MFA curriculum which would offer MFA students classes in the craft aspects of their chosen genre.

As a result of current assessment practices more attention has been given to online courses (specifically related to student engagement), concurrent courses (specifically regarding commitment to the WSU Writing Program's common syllabi), and students' overall desires for more timely feedback via Blackboard. GTA training has been increased to a two week pre-session course in the summer prior to employment, and Blackboard policies have been drafted and executed within the Writing Program.

- d. Provide aggregate data on student majors satisfaction (e.g., exit surveys), capstone results, licensing or certification examination results (if applicable), employer surveys or other such data that indicate student satisfaction with the program and whether students are learning the curriculum (for learner outcomes, data should relate to the outcomes of the program as listed in 3c).

SPTES are mandatory for every section of Composition taught by GTAs. These SPTES are reviewed with section leaders at the end of every semester and returned. Measures are available via the Social Science Research Lab upon request.

According to the most recent undergraduate exit survey, 85% of graduating students were satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of instruction, and 79% satisfied or very satisfied with faculty feedback (less than 1% of graduating students reported outright dissatisfaction with the program.) All graduating students found they had developed a competency in the content of the major and written communication; 96% competency in critical thinking. More than 90% our English students also reported being satisfied with available advising. It is clear that students are happy with the English program, and we continue to develop to best serve our students' needs.

Graduate program satisfaction also showed a dip in percentages but much smaller than that seen with undergraduate programs, leaving department graduate program satisfaction significantly above that of LAS as a whole and roughly comparable to that of the university as a whole. Here, too, the data bears continued monitoring.

See appendices on student satisfaction.

Capstone courses are addressed in 3c. The department has no licensing or certification.

Learner Outcomes (e.g., capstone, licensing/certification exam pass-rates) by year, for the last three years				
Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
1				
2				
3				

- e. Provide aggregate data on how the goals of the *WSU General Education Program* and *KBOR 2020 Foundation Skills* are assessed in undergraduate programs (optional for graduate programs).

Outcomes:	Results	
	Majors	Non-Majors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Have acquired knowledge in the arts, humanities, and natural and social sciences ○ Think critically and independently ○ Write and speak effectively 		

Employ analytical reasoning and problem solving techniques		

Note: Not all programs evaluate every goal/skill. Programs may choose to use assessment rubrics for this purpose. Sample forms available at:
<http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/>

Our department offers general education courses designed to develop skills in critical thinking, written communication, analytical reasoning and problem solving, and knowledge and appreciation of the humanities. We look to continue expand our general education offerings to continue to meet the needs of our local communities. We are committed to meeting KBOR 2020's goals of improving students' written and oral communication of critical thinking/problem solving skills, and we work closely with our students to improve retention and graduation rates. [However, we continue to be dismayed by the KBOR plan's focus on STEM, a result of a misguided and erroneous belief that there is a nationwide shortage of STEM students:
<http://chronicle.com/article/The-STEM-Crisis-Reality-or/142879/>]

Composition courses, by nature and design, adhere closely to stated goals of tier 1 courses for WSU's General Education program. As these courses are "intended to ensure that [students] have fundamental skills in the modes of organizing, analyzing and presenting information that will be required in the rest of [their] collegiate studies," the Writing Program has designed English 101 and 102 with these ambitions, the Kansas Core Outcomes, and KBOR's Foresight 2020 emphasis on critical thinking and writing skills all as primary goals. Furthermore, the Writing Program Director at Wichita State University has attended every KBOR Core Outcomes meeting over the last eight years and has helped articulate, draft, and revise the Kansas Core Outcomes. The entire Writing Program at Wichita State is consistent with all Core Outcomes and students' writing and critical thinking skills are measured, in part, using a six trait rubric (attached) that is standard at higher learning institutions in Kansas and the U.S.

- f. For programs/departments with concurrent enrollment courses (per KBOR policy), provide the assessment of such courses over the last three years (disaggregated by each year) that assures grading standards (e.g., papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs, etc.) course management, instructional delivery, and content meet or exceed those in regular on-campus sections.

Provide information here:

- g. Indicate whether the program is accredited by a specialty accrediting body including the next review date and concerns from the last review. No. Provide information here: N/A

- h. Provide the process the department uses to assure assignment of credit hours (per WSU policy 2.18) to all courses has been reviewed over the last three years. Provide information here:

Syllabi are solicited from every faculty member for every course each semester. GTA syllabi are collected and reviewed by the Director of the Writing Program. Other faculty syllabi are collected by the department administrative personnel and reviewed (a sampling every semester) by the department chair, with emphasis on review of new faculty syllabi. In addition, syllabi are submitted as part of the supplemental file for Faculty Activity records and reviewed at the time. If workload seems to diverge from an appropriate level according to the definition of a credit hour, changes are recommended in the faculty evaluation.

- i. Provide a brief assessment of the overall quality of the academic program using the data from 3a – 3e and other information you may collect, including outstanding student work (e.g., outstanding scholarship, inductions into honor organizations, publications, special awards, academic scholarships, student recruitment and retention).

Provide assessment here:

The quality of all programs seems to have improved somewhat during the review period. The quality of students that the program is attracting has risen somewhat as evidenced by entering GPAs and ACT scores. Student satisfaction is generally strong, though there is variance in the review period that bears continued monitoring. The program is generally successful in helping students meet learner outcomes. The MA program awards Fellowships each semester to deserving students who compete for the award by submitting a scholarly abstract. MA students, while not required to publish or present papers, have a distinguished record of reading scholarly papers and of occasional publication. Similarly, MFA students publish their work in noted journals, literary reviews, and other appropriate venues. Two undergraduate creative writers had their poems and nonfiction published in *Mikrokosmos* and *Mojo*, the print and online student literary journals. Our MFA students have their work published regularly in national literary journals including, recently, in *Poetry* and *Mid-American Review*, which are among the nation's top journals; one had a poem nominated for a Pushcart Prize, and in addition, in a rough count, last year our MFA poets placed their work in 20 different smaller literary magazines, and our fiction writers placed their stories in 9 such journals. Several students in each program have received awards, and a number of graduate students have gone on to PhD programs or to jobs in community colleges. Applications are somewhat down in the MA program, but the proportion of students admitted has risen, indicating a higher quality applicant pool. In the MFA program, applications are up, enabling the program to be more selective. In the October 2012, *Poets & Writers Magazine* a survey of over 120 MFA full-residency programs in the U.S reported Wichita State's rating in a number of categories: 76th in Popularity in 2012; 70th in Selectivity; 62nd in Funding; 56th in Student-Faculty Ratio; 62nd in Fellowship Placement; 38th in Job Placement; also, it described WSU's classes as "small" and the teaching load of Graduate Teaching Assistants as "heavy."

GTAs consistently have SPTE scores in the upper half to upper quartile of total responses. Students in the Writing Program are encouraged to submit superior essays for consideration for publication in the common syllabus, and several have submitted and published essays written in English 101 or 102 in the campus literary magazine and beyond.

We plan to implement a Co-op program very soon with Dzanc publishers. All students, meanwhile, are required to undergo evaluation by an established "teaching effectiveness" measuring system in every class.

4. Analyze the student need and employer demand for the program. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

- a. English has improved in its ability to attract and retain underrepresented students. While the graduate programs continue to rank significantly behind the university and college statistics on underrepresented students, the undergraduate level has improved its recruitment of these students and is now drawing closer to the rates evinced by the college and university. Of particular note is the percentage of underrepresented freshmen and sophomores, which has reached a number comparable to that of the college and university. In terms of degrees conferred on underrepresented minorities, the department has had little success at the graduate level. At the undergraduate level the department again runs behind the university and college, but not by a large margin.
- b. Utilize the table below to provide data that demonstrates student need and demand for the program.
This data is not available for undergraduates and not available year by year for graduates. Some relevant statistics can be found in the excerpted Graduate School exit survey provided in the appendices below. Almost all of the students who enroll in the MFA program complete their degrees in three years. Occasionally in an entering class of 5 fiction writers and 4 poets, one person will drop out, but that's

unusual since our students come from other parts of the country (or the world) to join the program. The MFA is considered to be the terminal degree in creative writing.

Employment of Majors*							Projected growth from BLS**	Current year only
	Average Salary	Employment % in state	Employment % in the field	Employment % related to the field	Employment % outside the field	No. pursuing graduate or professional education		
Year 1								
Year 2								
Year 3								

* May not be collected every year

** Go to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Website: <http://www.bls.gov/oco/> and view job outlook data and salary information (if the Program has information available from professional associations or alumni surveys, enter that data)

- Provide a brief assessment of student need and demand using the data from tables 11-15 from the Office of Planning and Analysis and from the table above. Include the most common types of positions, in terms of employment graduates can expect to find. Provide assessment here:

The career track of a humanities major is different from someone attending college for a specific job. While humanities major often begin their careers in low-paying positions or move immediately into graduate school, most majors attain a viable career. According to the recent LEAP report issued by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, the career earnings of humanities majors is increasingly comparable to professional majors, and unemployment rates are less than the national average. We feel that placement assessments should focus on students' ten-year goals, rather than jobs obtained immediately out of college.

According to the 2013 survey, 4 percent of our student went immediately to graduate school. Many students take some time between undergraduate and graduate degrees, so this number does not reflect the number of our students who move into graduate education; as with employment, a 5- or 10-year assessment would better reflect our students' success.

5. Analyze the service the Program provides to the discipline, other programs at the University, and beyond. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

Evaluate table 16 from the Office of Planning Analysis for SCH by student department affiliation on fall census day.

- Provide a brief assessment of the service the Program provides. Comment on percentage of SCH taken by majors and non-majors, nature of Program in terms of the service it provides to other University programs, faculty service to the institution, and beyond. Provide assessment here:

Between 90% and 97% of the credit hours generated by our department result from non-program majors taking department courses, with composition and general education as the source of most of those credit hours. It would thus be no exaggeration to say that the university simply could not exist as we know it without the English department. Meanwhile, the department seeks to increase interdisciplinary teaching and collaborative research. However, the administration has struggled with how to distribute credits, measure outcomes, and identify opportunities to free up faculty to pursue such opportunities. We do offer some courses for the MALS degree and crosslist some courses with Women's Studies. Our Linguistics offerings also

serve a number of other programs. The Student Government Association gave \$17,000 to the Creative Writing Program for its Writing Now Reading Now 2013-14 series, which offers WSU students, faculty, and citizens readings by the nation's top poets and fiction writers and by its graduate students.

The Writing Program provides a writing foundation for all undergraduate students at Wichita State University, regardless of major. The Writing Center, an important part of the Writing Program, then provides students sustained help in refining their writing throughout their academic careers. The Writing Center maintains hours well into the evening every semester and is available by appointment or walk-in counseling for all Wichita State undergraduate and graduate students. Composition faculty routinely teaches courses on Composition Pedagogy for English Education students and Business and Technical Writing courses. Composition faculty have also recently worked to develop and administrate Science Writing courses, presented in collaboration with the WSU Foundation, and are working on offering a course on the graphic novel for next fall which will intersect with the visual arts and visual rhetoric.

Creative writing is taught in small classes in a workshop style, so SCH in those classes is low; however, the graduate program draws Graduate Teaching Assistants to a nationally competitive program for their own MFA studies and the SCH produced by these GTAs is substantial.

6. Report on the Program's goal (s) from the last review. List the goal (s), data that may have been collected to support the goal, and the outcome. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

(For Last 3 FYs)	Goal (s)	Assessment Data Analyzed	Outcome

7. Summary and Recommendations

- a. Set forth a summary of the report including an overview evaluating the strengths and concerns. List recommendations for improvement of each Program (for departments with multiple programs) that have resulted from this report (relate recommendations back to information provided in any of the categories and to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e). Identify three year goal (s) for the Program to be accomplished in time for the next review. Provide assessment here:

Strengths:

We do remarkable work with a severely limited faculty offering the undergraduate programs in English and English education, including an English minor; we train GTAs, many who have never taught before, and create a successful Composition program; we offer three graduate plans (A, B, C) in literature, all requiring at least 30 hours, doing this with 7 faculty, half of whom have a reduced load. This faculty also meets research requirements for T & P: all candidates for tenure and most candidates for promotion or incentive review in the last decade have succeeded in that effort.

Weaknesses:

Offering a wide range of complex and robust programs with a very small faculty means that a very high proportion of faculty time is devoted to service, with the inevitable effects on faculty productivity. The national ranking of the MFA program has improved because of work on the part of faculty, including processing over

double the number of applications and the director answering more queries about the program, arranging a panel reading by faculty at its national conference, and offering a more sophisticated reading series.

Opportunities:

Opportunities abound if our request for resources are met. We could hire a full-time linguist who could liaison to other departments and establish some inter-departmental courses. Another American Literature specialist would allow the current faculty to teach their specialties more often while allowing us to more frequently offer courses in crucial literary fields. A top-line Writing Center would facilitate tutoring on-line, make walk-in learning more effective, and attract stronger peer tutors. Our current composition search should help us begin to create a state-of-the-art Composition program introducing both additional undergraduate and graduate composition offerings. We need to supplement this hire with at least one more tenure-line composition specialist and at least two full time lecturers. To promote the major, we will expand and diversify our general education courses. Our department hopes to sustain our students' satisfaction with our program, in part by offering and encouraging students to pursue their own individual research projects. We plan to invest more in digital humanities, the most important new field of literary study, and one where Wichita State can, with proper resources and faculty, enhance the department's reputation. We are working to establish Co-op learning for undergraduates and graduates, and continue to teach skills that make our students marketable for employers.

If given an administrative assistant and an advertising budget for recruitment, the Creative Writing program would like to increase applications from approximately 100 in 2014 to 130 in 2017. The quality of the students admitted would increase.

Threats:

The major threat to the program is the perception that English, and other humanities disciplines, are poor career choices for students. While Wichita State remains committed to humanities education, English should be acknowledged for its commitment to helping students enter rewarding careers; English should be promoted as a viable career choice, not a vestigial dumping ground for shiftless students. Additionally, while the contributions of recent hires have already proven a department strength, our faculty has atrophied to the extent that we cannot offer some of the general education courses we aspire to, and we lack the diversity appropriate for an urban university. Our greatest strength is our current faculty, who are demonstrably good teachers with active research agendas.

The GTA stipend is too low, costing us the matriculation of top applicants, and forcing us to occasionally use GTAs who were on the marginal line for a teaching assignment. Although most do well, they require extra training and support, which taxes our mentors, and they earn moderate SPTEs. When WSU students do not learn everything they should in a Basic Skills course, the cycle begins wherein they earn low grades in upper-division courses and faculty complain about the lack of writing skills. Every year Wichita State loses its top applicants to schools that pay at least \$13,000. (Ours receive \$8,500.) Further, English GTAs serve the entire university, working harder and carrying more responsibility than GTAs in other fields. It is exploitative to pay them less than their peers in other departments.

The biggest concern for the Writing Program continues to be faculty support. We have one tenured member of the Writing Program faculty overseeing a program with one of the highest numbers of credit hours in LAS with one more tenure track line on the way. The three other members who are Writing Program administrators all have different job designations, none of which promote or encourage conference attendance. One of the Writing Program faculty, in fact, doesn't even have the ability to submit a Faculty Activity Report at the end of the year due to her designation, thus negating any direct incentive for curricular improvements in spite of the fact that she and all the members of the Writing Program have gone to great lengths to consistently improve and support the curriculum. Online offerings also continue to be a struggle as the current model calls for GTAs and semester-appointment adjuncts to teach these courses. In spite of an important hire in the MRC to help with

many facets of offering online courses, without a more permanent hire to specifically teach and develop these courses they will likely not grow in pace with the projected university growth.

The Writing Now Reading Now series cannot function without money from the university's academic programs. The SGA senators remarked that it was unfair to depend on student funding alone, yet English Department sources of funding are decreasing, leaving a series budget that is profoundly unstable.

Appendix A:

Guidelines for MA Comprehensive Exam Essays

A strong comprehensive exam essay should demonstrate: knowledge of specific literary texts; knowledge of literary terms and historical concepts; understanding of major modern literary critical issues; ability to write a coherent essay in a grammatically correct and lucid style.

Students should prepare for the comprehensive exam during an extended period, preferably the two semesters that precede the exam. They should be familiar with the major texts assigned in the relevant course syllabi, and with the reading lists suggested by the coordinator of graduate study. An effective way to review literary periods and historical concepts is to read the introductions and headnotes included in the Norton, Longman, or Heath anthologies and in other reference books such as the Cambridge histories of English and American literature.

CRITERIA FOR GRADING

1. **ARGUMENT.** Does the writer address the question asked? Is the response guided by a clear thesis or central idea that is directly relevant to that question? Does the writer understand the critical issues raised by the question?
2. **RANGE.** Is the writer familiar with appropriate critical, theoretical, and/or historical contexts? Has the writer demonstrated suitable breadth of knowledge of texts while attending to nuances of meaning?
3. **EVIDENCE.** Has the writer selected appropriate textual examples from the correct historical time period? Has the writer offered a sufficient number of examples and discussed them in an appropriately balanced way? Does the writer pay close attention to details when analyzing texts?
4. **COHERENCE.** Do the examples support the argument of the essay? Is the essay coherent and organized? Have all parts of the question been considered?
5. **STYLE.** Are there a minimum of grammar and style problems?

Appendix:

Grading Sheet

Ideas (25%):

- (23-25) Interesting, demonstrating sophistication of thought. Central idea is stated clearly, worth developing, and limited enough to be manageable. Recognizes some complexity, limitations, contradictions, or qualifications of its thesis. Demonstrates clear understanding of reading and sources.
- (20-22) A solid paper. The writer's position on the argument is clear, but may have minor lapses in development. Demonstrates understanding of the question, acknowledging the central idea's complexity or significance, but may handle the idea in a less sophisticated and effective way. Shows careful reading of sources but may not evaluate them critically. Attempts to define terms, not always successfully.
- (17-19) An adequate paper. Presents central idea in general terms, often depending on platitudes or clichés. Usually does not acknowledge other views. Shows basic comprehension of sources, perhaps with some lapses in understanding. Often depends on dictionary definitions to define terms.
- (15-16) No clear central idea or does not respond appropriately to the assignment. Thesis is too vague or obvious to be developed effectively. May misunderstand sources.
- (≤ 14) Does not respond to assignment or does so superficially, lacks a clear thesis or central idea, and may neglect to use sources where necessary.

Organization/Coherence (25%):

- (23-25) Uses a logical structure appropriate to paper's subject, purpose, audience, thesis, and disciplinary field. Sophisticated transitional sentences and clear topic sentences often develop one idea from the previous one or identify their logical relations. Guides the reader through the chain of reasoning or progression of ideas.
- (20-22) Shows a logical progression of ideas and uses fairly sophisticated transitional devices; e.g., may move from least to most important idea. Some logical links may be faulty, but each paragraph clearly related to paper's central idea. Paragraphs are reasonably unified.
- (17-19) Organization is overly simple or reflects breaks in logical flow. May use transitions, but they are not logic based. While each paragraph may relate to central idea, logic is not always clear. Paragraphs have topic sentences or main ideas, but may be overly general, and arrangement of sentences within paragraphs may lack unity or coherence.
- (15-16) May have random organization, lacking internal paragraph coherence and using few or inappropriate transitions. Paragraphs may lack topic sentences or main ideas, or they may be too general or too specific to provide structuring. Paragraphs may not all relate to the paper's thesis.
- (≤ 14) No appreciable organization; lacks transitions and coherence.

Support (20%):

- (18-20) Uses evidence appropriately and effectively, providing sufficient evidence and explanation to convince. Logic is always clear and defensible.
- (16-17) Offers reasons to support its points, using varied kinds of evidence, but the evidence may need further evaluation or qualification. Examples support the thesis, but connections between evidence and main ideas may need clarifying. May have slight lapses in logic.
- (14-15) Often uses generalizations to support its points. May use examples, but they may be obvious or irrelevant. Often depends on unsupported opinion or personal experience, or assumes that evidence speaks for itself and needs no application to the point being discussed. Often has lapses in logic. May occasionally fail to offer support when it is needed.
- (12-13) Depends on clichés or overgeneralizations for support, or offers little evidence of any kind. May be personal narrative rather than essay, or summary rather than analysis.
- (≤ 11) Uses irrelevant details or lacks supporting evidence entirely. May be unduly brief.

Style (15%):

- (14-15) Clear command of English prose. Chooses words for their precise meanings and uses an appropriate level of specificity and sophistication. Sentence style fits the paper's audience and purpose. Sentences are varied, yet clearly structured and carefully focused. Appropriate transitional wording strengthens the paper's coherence and overall flow. Quotations are fully integrated grammatically, syntactically, and intellectually.
- (12-13) Generally uses words accurately and effectively, but may sometimes be too general. Sentences are generally clear, well structured, focused, though a few may be awkward or ineffective. Most quotes are well integrated.
- (10-11) Range of word choice is limited, creating diction that is often imprecise or repetitive. May rely on clichés or use inappropriate language. Sentence structure is generally correct, but sentences may be wordy, unfocused, repetitive, or confusing. Integration of quotes may be weak.
- (9) May be vague and abstract, or inappropriately personal and specific. Usually contains several awkward or ungrammatical sentences, or sentence structure, though "correct," is simple or monotonous. May contain numerous unintegrated or "dropped" quotes.
- (≤ 8) Usually contains many awkward sentences, misuses words, employs inappropriate language.

Mechanics (15%):

- (14-15) Almost entirely free of spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors. Observes all applicable format and citation conventions.
- (12-13) May contain a few errors, which may annoy the reader but not impede understanding. Format and citation are substantially correct.
- (10-11) Usually contains several mechanical errors, including errors in format and/or citation, which may temporarily confuse the reader but not impede overall understanding.
- (9) Usually contains either many mechanical errors or a few important errors that block the reader's understanding and ability to see connections between thoughts. Format may be inappropriate, or may indicate neglect or misreading of instructions.
- (≤ 8) Usually contains so many mechanical errors that it is impossible for the reader to follow the thinking from sentence to sentence.

Appendix: Assessment Rubric

(1) Content

- The essay has something to say and says it well.
Excellent good adequate needs improvement
- It presents an educated point of view in the form of a clear thesis statement, abundantly supported by specific and well-chosen evidence.
Excellent good adequate needs improvement
- Ideas are engaging or sophisticated.
Excellent good adequate needs improvement

(2) Organization

- An interesting introduction draws the reader into the text, and a conclusion leaves the reader with a sense of resolution.
Excellent good adequate needs improvement
- The author's reasoning can be easily followed and the ideas are presented in a clear order.
Excellent good adequate needs improvement
- Smooth, effective transitions exist among all elements (sentences, paragraphs, ideas).
Excellent good adequate needs improvement
- Paragraphs are coherent, focused by a clear topic sentence, and fully developed using evidence from literary texts.
Excellent good adequate needs improvement

(3) Style

The writing has a natural flow and rhythm:

- A variety of sentence structures and lengths demonstrates conscious planning and/or revision.
Excellent good adequate needs improvement
- Sentences are graceful.
Excellent good adequate needs improvement
- Word choice is appropriate.
Excellent good adequate needs improvement

(4) Conventions

- There may be only minor and/or occasional grammatical errors.
Excellent good adequate needs improvement
- Evidence is explained and analyzed in the author's own words.
Excellent good adequate needs improvement
- All evidence is documented using MLA format.
Excellent good adequate needs improvement

Appendix:

Essay Rubric: Instructor Copy

Name: _____ Assignment: _____

Assignment Requirements, Topic Development, Thesis, and Use of Evidence

- The essay develops a **topic** that meets all of the assignment requirements, is sufficiently narrow for the required length, and does not stray into irrelevant discussion:

Needs improvement Average Above average Excellent

- The **thesis** clear, easily identifiable to the reader, and insightful:

Needs improvement Average Above average Excellent

- The essay displays a level of **analysis** appropriate to the course rather than merely summarizing the topic or literary text(s):

Needs improvement Average Above average Excellent

- The essay shows that the writer understands and can make an argument about both the **stylistic and thematic** properties of literary works:

Needs improvement Average Above average Excellent

- The **argument** is plausible and reasonable, and counter arguments are considered:

Needs improvement Average Above average Excellent

- The thesis is developed with adequate and well-chosen **examples**, with each example revealing a unique facet of the argument and with no under-elaborated points:

Needs improvement Average Above average Excellent

Comments:

Structure and Style

- Paragraphs** follow each other in a logical sequence that is appropriate to the thesis and the essay employs appropriate transitions and repeated words/phrases from paragraph to paragraph:

Needs improvement Average Above average Excellent

- The **introduction** draws readers into the topic and gives them a clear idea of the thesis, while the **conclusion** functions both to wrap up the argument and to suggest its broader implications:

Needs improvement Average Above average Excellent

- The **sentences** in each paragraph are unified by one main idea (with or without a topic sentence), follow a logical sequence, make use of appropriate transitions and repeated words/phrases, are varied in length and type, and are free of mistakes in grammar, punctuation, and spelling:

Needs improvement Average Above average Excellent

- The **language** is vivid and lively, with precise and concrete words chosen and vague words, awkward phrasings, and clichés avoided, and the **style** of the essay is appropriate to a college community:

Needs improvement Average Above average Excellent

Comments:

Format, Documentation, and Editing

- The essay uses proper MLA format (1" margins, etc.) and citation style for in-text documentation and the works-cited page:

Needs improvement Average Above average Excellent

- The essay makes use of signal phrases rather than stranding quotes in their own sentences:

Needs improvement Average Above average Excellent

- The essay is free of typos and looks professional:

Needs improvement Average Above average Excellent

Comments:

Grade:

Key to abbreviations commonly used in comments:

AWK = Awkward phrasing	Cap = capitalize	CS = comma splice
DM = dangling modifier	FP = faulty parallelism	IM = inconsistent mood
IT = inconsistent verb tenses	LC = lower case	MC = mixed construction
MW = missing word(s)	RO = run-on sentence	SF = sentence fragment
VT = incorrect verb tense	WC = poor word choice	WW = wrong word

Appendix

Participation Rubric

Name: _____

Course and grading

period: _____

	Excellent (A range)	Good (B Range)	Average (C range)	Unacceptable (D & F range)
Preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Always brings books, etc. to class Always attends class & is prompt Always shows thoughtful preparation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Usually brings books & notes, etc. to class Usually attends class promptly Usually shows preparation of readings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Often brings materials to class Often attends class on time Unclear whether student has prepared has prepared readings or not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Often does not bring materials to class Often misses class Is often late to class Exhibits little evidence about assigned materials
Speaking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments reflect understanding of course material & remarks of other students Offers thoughtful or insightful ideas and questions more than once per class Displays active engagement with readings & class members Often cites specific ideas or quotations from the reading to back up point Group dynamic and level of discussion are consistently better because of the student's presence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates some interest in the material through frequent comments/questions Offers thoughtful or insightful ideas and questions more than once per class, but otherwise can only speak in overly broad terms about the issues/questions & texts being discussed Occasionally cites from readings; sometimes uses readings to support points Group dynamics and level of discussion are occasionally better (never worse) because of the student's presence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not participate in discussion regularly Comments, when made, indicate lack of preparation or lack of attention to peers' remarks Often monopolizes the discussion when others want to contribute Does not usually refer to the reading Rarely able to cite from readings; rarely uses readings to support points Group dynamic and level of discussion are not affected by the student's presence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not participate in discussion Comments, if made, reflect neither the assignment or the reading Seldom offers relevant comments Unable to cite from readings to support points; cannot keep up with topic at hand Group dynamic and level of discussion are harmed by the student's presence
Listening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Always listens actively and respectfully to classmates Body language shows significant engagement with class discussion Does not interrupt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Usually listens to classmates Body language shows attention to discussion Sometimes interrupts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Often appears to be preparing own comments rather than listening to classmates Body language shows boredom or detachment Often interrupts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not listen to class Regularly sleeps, compounds, or is on phone during class
Writing/group work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Always participates in assignments thoroughly, addressing question or task posed with specific references to the text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Usually participates in assignments, but sometimes does not address question or task posed or use specific references to the text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Often does not participate in group activity, letting others do the work Produces assignments that do not address question or task, do not use the text, and/or addresses only generalities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignments show that student did not read or understand the assignment

Grade: _____

Appendix

Sample creative writing rubric

Quality of the structure	8	16	24	32	40
--------------------------	---	----	----	----	----

(Organized dramatically perhaps into scenes so that tension or conflict

have an emotional effect; point of view used consistently to help the reader experience the setting and feelings that arise from the situation; care taken with paragraphing)

Quality of the language	5	10	15	20	25
-------------------------	---	----	----	----	----

(Uses apt and precise words and phrases, including language which is concrete and appeals to all of the senses and metaphoric languages; uses descriptive verbs; cuts extra words; demonstrates variety in sentence structure as the story requires; presents the people fully through dialogue, physical description, their actions)

Quality of theme	5	10	15	20	25
------------------	---	----	----	----	----

(Organizes description around dominant impressions, uses metaphoric language, and structures narrative to guide the reader to understand the story's theme)

Mechanics	2	4	6	8	10
-----------	---	---	---	---	----

Manages adequately (6), competently (8), or skillfully (10)

- a. Spelling
- b. Punctuation
- c. Grammar and usage

Appendix

Excerpted from the Graduate Online Application for Degree Exit Survey

Note: "Total" reflects the figures for all university graduate programs assessed by the survey administered by the graduate school

Executed on 9/23/2013		GRQ1 prgm provided material on requirements			
		Yes	No	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	100.00%	0.00%	91	0
	English	100.00%	0.00%	20	0
	Creative Writing	100.00%	0.00%	21	0

		GRQ2 faculty well informed on prgm requirements			
		Yes	No	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	93.40%	6.60%	91	0
	English	95.00%	5.00%	20	0
	Creative Writing	100.00%	0.00%	21	0

		GRQ3 faculty were accessible			
		Yes	No	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	91.20%	8.80%	91	0
	English	95.00%	5.00%	20	0
	Creative Writing	81.00%	19.00%	21	0

		GRQ4 overall satisfaction with program					
		very disat	dissatisfied	neutral	satisfied	very satisfied	satisfied or high
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	1.10%	6.60%	20.90%	40.70%	30.80%	71.
	English	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	45.00%	35.00%	80.
	Creative Writing	4.80%	19.00%	28.60%	23.80%	23.80%	47.

		GRQ7 classes offered at convenient times			
		Yes	No	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	85.70%	14.30%	91	0
	English	75.00%	25.00%	20	0
	Creative Writing	90.50%	9.50%	21	0

		GRQ8 prgm course offerings enabled timely deg compl			
		Yes	No	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	85.70%	14.30%	91	0
	English	95.00%	5.00%	20	0
	Creative Writing	95.20%	4.80%	21	0

		GRQ10 satisfaction w faculty on feedback of course wor					
		very disat	dissatisfied	neutral	satisfied	very satisfied	satisfied or high
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	1.10%	1.10%	13.20%	37.40%	47.30%	84.
	English	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%	30.00%	65.00%	95.

Creative Writing	4.80%	4.80%	28.60%	42.90%	19.00%	61.
------------------	-------	-------	--------	--------	--------	-----

		GRQ11 satisfaction w quality of instruction					
		very disat	dissatisfied	neutral	satisfied	very satisfied	satisfied or high
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	1.10%	1.10%	16.50%	30.80%	50.50%	81.
	English	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	30.00%	60.00%	90.
	Creative Writing	4.80%	4.80%	33.30%	33.30%	23.80%	57.

		GRQ13 receive academic advising before enrolling			
		Yes	No	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	70.30%	29.70%	91	0
	English	100.00%	0.00%	20	0
	Creative Writing	100.00%	0.00%	21	0

		GRQ14 times range per term meet w academic advisor					
		none	once	twice	three or more	Mean / Median/ Va	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	3.30%	57.10%	18.70%	20.90%	1.57	
	English	0.00%	65.00%	25.00%	10.00%	1.45	
	Creative Writing	0.00%	76.20%	9.50%	14.30%	1.38	

		GRQ15 academic advisor accessible			
		Yes	No	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	87.90%	12.10%	91	0
	English	90.00%	10.00%	20	0
	Creative Writing	95.20%	4.80%	21	0

		GRQ16 academic advisor informed on deg req			
		Yes	No	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	95.60%	4.40%	91	0
	English	95.00%	5.00%	20	0
	Creative Writing	95.20%	4.80%	21	0

		GRQ17 academic advisor made deg req clear			
		Yes	No	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	92.30%	7.70%	91	0
	English	95.00%	5.00%	20	0
	Creative Writing	95.20%	4.80%	21	0

		GRQ18 academic advisor help select courses			
		Yes	No	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	89.00%	11.00%	91	0
	English	95.00%	5.00%	20	0
	Creative Writing	100.00%	0.00%	21	0

		GRQ19 academic advisor notify me of grad deadlines			
		Yes	No	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	80.20%	19.80%	91	0
	English	80.00%	20.00%	20	0
	Creative Writing	90.50%	9.50%	21	0

		GRQ20 academic advisor help compl grad forms			
		Yes	No	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	76.90%	23.10%	91	0
	English	75.00%	25.00%	20	0
	Creative Writing	85.70%	14.30%	21	0

		GRQ21 satisfaction with academic advising					
		very disat	dissatisfied	neutral	satisfied	very satisfied	satisfied or higher
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	2.20%	5.50%	13.20%	37.40%	41.80%	79.
	English	0.00%	5.00%	5.00%	45.00%	45.00%	90.
	Creative Writing	0.00%	4.80%	14.30%	38.10%	42.90%	81.

		GRQ22 times range per term meet w research advisor					
		none	once	twice	three or more	Mean / Median/ Va	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	7.90%	9.50%	27.00%	55.60%	2.3	
	English	11.10%	0.00%	22.20%	66.70%	2.44	
	Creative Writing	0.00%	20.00%	40.00%	40.00%	2.2	

		GRQ23 research advisor accessible			
		Yes	No	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	91.70%	8.30%	60	31
	English	100.00%	0.00%	8	12
	Creative Writing	84.20%	15.80%	19	2

		GRQ24 research advisor gave feedback on drafts			
		Yes	No	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	94.70%	5.30%	57	34
	English	100.00%	0.00%	8	12
	Creative Writing	94.40%	5.60%	18	3

		GRQ25 research advisor advice on defense prep			
		Yes	No	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	92.90%	7.10%	56	35
	English	100.00%	0.00%	8	12
	Creative Writing	88.90%	11.10%	18	3

		GRQ26 satisfaction with research advisor					
		very disat	dissatisfied	neutral	satisfied	very satisfied	satisfied or higher
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	4.80%	3.20%	9.70%	24.20%	58.10%	82.
	English	14.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	85.70%	85.
	Creative Writing	4.80%	4.80%	9.50%	47.60%	33.30%	81.

		GRQ27 needed access WSU technology			
		Yes	No	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	69.20%	30.80%	91	0
	English	70.00%	30.00%	20	0
	Creative Writing	61.90%	38.10%	21	0

		GRQ27a accessibility of computers					
		not all acc	not accessible	neutral	accessible	very accessible	accessible or high
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	1.70%	12.10%	5.20%	22.40%	58.60%	81.
	English	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	30.80%	69.20%	100.
	Creative Writing	0.00%	45.50%	18.20%	0.00%	36.40%	36.

		GRQ27b accessibility of internet					
		not all acc	not accessible	neutral	accessible	very accessible	accessible or high
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	4.80%	4.80%	9.70%	11.30%	69.40%	80.
	English	7.10%	0.00%	7.10%	14.30%	71.40%	85.
	Creative Writing	0.00%	8.30%	25.00%	0.00%	66.70%	66.

		GRQ27e satisfaction with WSU technology					
		very disat	dissatisfied	neutral	satisfied	very satisfied	satisfied or high
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	1.60%	4.80%	19.00%	33.30%	41.30%	74.
	English	0.00%	0.00%	14.30%	42.90%	42.90%	85.
	Creative Writing	7.70%	7.70%	30.80%	30.80%	23.10%	53.

		GRr51 supported by teaching assistantship			
		Yes	No	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	57.10%	42.90%	91	0
	English	30.00%	70.00%	20	0
	Creative Writing	85.70%	14.30%	21	0

		GRQ65 usefulness of academic prgm for career					
		not very useful	2	3	4	very useful	useful to very use
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	2.20%	5.50%	18.70%	33.00%	40.70%	73.
	English	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	40.00%	40.00%	80.
	Creative Writing	9.50%	19.00%	19.00%	28.60%	23.80%	52.

		GRQ67 is job related to degree program				
		directly related	indirect related	not related	Valid n / Missing	
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	76.50%	20.60%	2.90%	34	57
	English	83.30%	16.70%	0.00%	6	14
	Creative Writing	62.50%	37.50%	0.00%	8	13

		GRQ69 annual salary			
		Mean	Median	Valid N	Missing
mcg_unit MCG program of major	Total	\$30,098	\$30,000	51	40
	English	\$28,955	\$30,000	11	9
	Creative Writing	\$24,050	\$25,000	10	11