

HSU Academic Program Criteria

Academic Program in English Graduate

I. The Vision for Humboldt State University (Limit: 2 pages) [15%]

Describe up to 5 curricular or co-curricular features of the program that are consistent with the Vision of HSU, and indicate which aspect(s) of the Vision align with that particular feature. Please provide sufficient information such that an individual unfamiliar with your program will clearly understand the feature's relevance.

English MA students are admitted to one of three options: 1) Literary Studies (MA-Lit), 2) the Teaching of Writing (MATW), or 3) Masters International (MI). All students may also opt to include a graduate minor in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL). Reflecting the current state of the discipline, "Literary Studies" these days has effectively morphed into Literary and *Cultural* Studies, particularly at the graduate level. That is: having absorbed influences from philosophy, history, sociology, women's studies, and ethnic studies, the MA-Lit prepares its students to examine literary and other texts as discursive objects that both shape and reflect various social, historical, cultural and ideological contexts. The MATW, meanwhile, is in effect a pre-professional degree whose curriculum is heavily oriented towards composition theory and pedagogical theory. While some graduates go on to pursue Ph.Ds in Rhetoric & Composition, most aspire to teach composition at the junior college level. Finally, the MI program, which is run in conjunction with the Peace Corps, combines elements of the MATW and TESL Minor curricula with a two-year field assignment in the Peace Corps. The culminating project for this option grows out of the Peace Corps field experience, which normally consists of teaching college-level English abroad; this teaching assignment in turn puts into practice the theoretical training acquired through coursework taken here at HSU.

1. Over the past decade, roughly 60% of our MA students have chosen the MATW option, 30% the MA-Lit, and 5% the MI. The remaining 5% have completed the required coursework and culminating projects for *both* the Lit and TW options. The MATW is unique to HSU (and distinct in its focus on pedagogy from master's programs in Composition and Rhetoric at other CSU campuses), and the MI program is one of only two affiliated with an English department in the entire state of California (the other—in TESL—is at Sacramento State). It should be self-evident how those seven-tenths of our students who have set their sights on teaching as a profession, whether at home or abroad, have chosen our programs because they

“seek above all else to improve the human condition” (Vision Statement #1), because they are committed to “social...responsibility and action” (#4), and because they expect their “learning to make a positive difference” (#8). Graduates of these programs who exercise their pedagogical training in the schools of the world and the community colleges of California are precisely those “individual citizen[s] who [act] in good conscience and [engage] in informed action” (#6). Those who apply their skills abroad or—as at least two recent students have done, on nearby Indian reservations—are obviously “commit[ted] to increasing our diversity of people and perspectives” (#6), as well.

2. But even the minority of students who pursue the MA-Lit are hardly engaged in some effete, esoteric endeavor. Many are preparing for doctoral study and academic careers at four-year institutions (indeed, one or more graduates of our MA-Lit program are accepted for doctoral study at R1 and R2 institutions each year)—or for other business, professional, governmental, non-profit, or public service careers that require superior analytical and communication skills. All of our MA-Lit students, moreover, seek to improve their skills in research, writing, and cultural analysis. In particular, they strive to understand the production and consumption of literary and other cultural texts as complex social practices with real-world consequences. Inspired by their professor-mentors, they bring their expertise in discourse, semiotics, textuality and culture to such forums as the Campus Dialogue on Race, the Social Justice Summit, and the Fall English Studies Conference on Undergraduate Education. This past summer, one of our graduate faculty joined an MA-Lit student and two MATW students from his “Literary Field Studies” seminar to form a panel entitled “Field Studies for Change: Teaching Students *For*, Instead of *About*, the Environment” at the “Thinking Through Nature: Philosophy for an Endangered World” conference at the University of Oregon. MA-Lit students, then, are also helping to realize those elements of the “Vision” Statement mentioned above.

II. Demand (Limit: 1.5 pages per option, not including tables) [20%]

A. Internal demand for the degree program and courses in the degree program

1. Headcount Data
- 2.

Major Academic Year (Fall/Spring) Average Headcount Summary Majors_overview_ENMA report generated: 16-APR-08									
Major Code	Major Description	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07	AY 07/08
ENIP	English(International Program)-Grad	0	1	2	1	3	3	1	1
ENLI	English (Literature)-Grad	16	15	20	17	12	15	16	13
ENTW	English (Teaching of Writing)-Grad	36	39	41	30	21	15	17	22
Total		52	55	63	47	36	33	33	36

Second Majors by Academic Year (exclusive of primary majors) Majors_overview_ENMA report generated: 16-APR-08									
Major Code	Major Description	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07	AY 07/08
ENLI	English (Literature)-Grad	2	1	2	3	1	0	0	0
ENTW	English (Teaching of Writing)-Grad	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total		3	1	2	3	1	0	0	0

Minors enrolled AY Average in Teaching Engl-Second Lang - MA minors_enrolled_TESG report generated: 06-MAR-08								
CLASS	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07	AY 07/08
Jr	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Sr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Grad	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Majors by Sex and Ethnicity Majors_overview_ENMA report generated: 16-APR-08									
SEX	Ethnicity	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07	AY 07/08
Female	Asian	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Black	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Hispanic	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	2
	Native Amer	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0

	White	22	24	27	18	13	13	12	14
	Other	1	1	2	2	0	0	1	1
	Unknown	3	4	6	7	7	5	4	4
sum		29	31	35	27	20	20	20	21
Male	Asian	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Hispanic	2	3	2	2	2	0	0	1
	White	16	14	20	15	11	9	10	11
	Other	1	1	1	1	2	2	0	0
	Unknown	4	6	5	3	2	2	2	2
sum		23	24	28	20	16	13	13	15

English-Grad (with options) Degrees Awarded (incl. primary and second majors) degrees_awarded_M_ENMA report generated: 25-JUN-08									
MAJOR		AY 99/00	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07
English(International Program)-Grad		0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
English (Literature)-Grad		5	2	5	5	5	3	6	1
English (Teaching of Writing)-Grad		7	8	4	8	7	14	9	6
sum		12	10	9	13	12	19	15	7

English-Grad Degrees Awarded by Sex and Ethnicity (incl. primary and second majors) degrees_awarded_M_ENMA report generated: 25-JUN-08									
SEX	Ethnicity	AY 99/00	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07
Female	Asian	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
	Black	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	Hispanic	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
	Native Amer	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	White	3	5	4	6	5	7	5	2
	Other	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
	Unknown	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	0
sum		5	7	6	6	8	10	8	2
Male	Asian	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	Hispanic	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0
	Native Amer	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	White	3	2	3	4	1	6	6	3
	Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

	Unknown	3	1	0	3	0	2	0	1
sum		7	3	3	7	4	9	7	5

Minors Awarded by Year in Teaching Engl-Second Lang - MA minors_awarded_TESG report generated: 25-JUN-08								
MINOR	AY 99/00	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07
Teaching Engl-Second Lang - MA	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0

3. FTES by Course Code

ENGL	Graduate	English-Grad	36.7	26.4	20.7	19.2	23.6	19.5
		Natural Resources (Fisheries)-Grad	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.7
		English	.9	.0	.3	.0	.1	.3
		Education-Grad	.4	1.0	.2	.2	.0	.0
		Nat Resources (Watershed Mgmt)-Grad	.2	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	Sub-total		38.9	27.8	21.6	20.4	24.2	20.4

FTES taken in English classes by Majors (AY 02/03 - AY 07/08) course_ftes_smry_ENGL report generated: 30-JUN-08								
SUBJ	Course level	Student Major	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07	AY 07/08
ENGL	All Levels	English	102.3	103.7	100.7	103.4	101.1	109.9
		Undeclared	45.6	45.6	31.7	27.6	29.1	36.7
		English-Grad	47.0	34.0	25.3	25.0	28.7	23.1
		Liberal Studies-Elementary Ed	46.3	36.6	33.5	25.4	21.0	20.3
		Biology	15.6	15.3	13.1	14.8	15.4	19.8
		Psychology	10.7	13.3	15.3	12.3	14.6	14.1
		Business Administration	9.4	10.1	9.2	8.0	10.6	14.0
		Art	15.3	15.7	12.2	12.4	7.7	12.3
		Kinesiology	4.9	6.7	5.4	6.5	5.0	7.0
Total			398.1	377.7	343.8	329.8	341.6	371.1

4. Service to other HSU program/options

Document other HSU programs/options (including GE) with required coursework from your program

Other HSU program/option name	Courses required List course number and units	Restricted elective courses List number and units
CHIN	105 (4), 106 (4)	
FREN	105 (4), 106 (4)	
GERM	105 (4), 106 (4)	
SPAN	105 (4), 106 (4)	

The MA-Lit option has an “external” foreign language requirement. All students must demonstrate basic competency in a second language, either through a language proficiency exam or by completing at least two semesters of college-level language study at HSU or another accredited institution.

5. Comment on the internal demand **FOR EACH OPTION** of the Major. Explain any significant changes in internal program demand over past 7 years. Provide any additional relevant information of internal demand.

English (International Program)-Grad

Remarkably, for an institution that boasts of its high rate of graduates who enter the Peace Corps, demand—as measured by enrollment and completion figures, anyway—has been remarkably and consistently low since this option was inaugurated in AY 2001-02. We receive several dozen queries about the program each year, but only a handful of applicants, many of whom show little or no background in English or weak academic backgrounds generally. We, like the Peace Corps program officers with whom we consult (and to whom we report) annually, are at a loss to explain this low demand. The Peace Corps assures us that we are not unique, however: our sister campus, Sacramento State, has had much the same experience. However, since there is no real “cost” (i.e., no program-specific faculty or courses) of running the program, and some tangible benefit (this is a relatively exclusive affiliation, with only 80-some participating campuses nationwide), there is also no real incentive to discontinue it.

English (Literature)-Grad

Demand for this option has been relatively consistent over the past seven years.

English (Teaching of Writing)-Grad

Demand for this option has been more consistent than the “headcount” data would suggest. In the early years of this decade (before HSU’s “continuous enrollment” policy was enacted), the MATW program in particular included many students who were still technically within their seven-year limit to completion of degree (and who therefore remained on the rolls) but who had nonetheless effectively left the program. Beginning in AY 03-04, after the implementation of the new campuswide policy, such students were effectively *dropped* from the rolls, and consequently by AY 04-05 the headcount figures more accurately reflect the reality “on the ground,” as it were. The “Degrees Awarded” table gives a still more accurate picture overall.

Teaching Engl-Second Lang – MA Minor

While few students choose to formally declare this minor, many take one or more courses within the minor (indeed, ENGL 614, “Teaching ESL Writing,” is required of *all* MATW students).

B. External demand for “graduates” from the program

Imagine you are answering a parent’s question about job prospects and the demand for graduates of your program/option. Describe evidence of external demand for this program. Evidence may be cited from one of the following sources: the State of California <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/>, the US Department of Labor <http://www.bls.gov/OCO/>, the National Association of Colleges and Employers, <http://naceweb.org>. Evidence may be cited from an additional source from, for example, a professional society relevant to your discipline.

Although some options in our graduate program (notably the MATW) present more obvious job prospects than others, we would like to begin with some prefatory comments applicable to *all* options. The job tracking sites listed in the prompt do not furnish especially useful data for job-seekers with training that is primarily humanistic in nature. And although our discipline’s major professional organizations, the Modern Language Association (MLA) http://www.mla.org/career_resources and the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) <http://www.ncte.org/cccc/jobs> list job announcements and—in the

case of the MLA—track job trends, those data pertain almost exclusively to doctoral degree holders. The English Department has neither been mandated nor funded to track its alumni in the past, and we have only recently begun taking steps to do so in any systematic way. Consequently we can not satisfy the report’s demand for empirical “evidence,” narrowly defined. There are other meaningful ways to answer this hypothetical parent’s (or prospective student’s) question, however.

English (International Program)-Grad

Most of the response for the “Teaching of Writing” option (below) pertains equally to the Masters International option. MI students, of course, have even more training—not to mention more field experience—in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL), and are consequently even more employable in that field. Beyond this, however, the MI option offers a set of core competencies and experiences that make them attractive to multinational corporations, nongovernmental organizations, and government agencies; these include advanced skills in writing, research, analysis, cross-cultural communication,. Having lived abroad, furthermore, MI graduates are of necessity more “worldly” than the average M.A.: they have proven that they are at ease inhabiting a wider world and that they can adapt to unfamiliar environments. They are well suited for jobs not just in (overseas) education but in foreign trade, diplomacy, international law, human rights, environmental activism, marketing, consulting, arts administration, intelligence, humanitarian and relief services, community development, language services and journalism.

English (Literature)-Grad

The professional outlook for an MA in Literary Studies is no more obvious than for a BA in Literary Studies (or in any other humanistic discipline, for that matter). That is to say: there is a wealth of careers for someone with advanced training in research, writing, and cultural/discursive/rhetorical/semiotic analysis, but the trick is often to “translate” those skills and qualifications into terms that someone outside the discipline will readily appreciate. Logical fields of employment are of course those which put a premium on a facility with language: writing and editing (including business, technical, and professional writing and editing—not to mention copywriting and speechwriting); publishing; advertising; film, radio and television;

journalism; arts administration. Credentialed secondary school teachers with Master's degrees are of course eligible for a higher rate of pay. Literature graduates are surprisingly well positioned for admission to Law programs. Beyond this, however, some of our MA-Lit students use our program as a stepping-stone to *doctoral* study in English or related fields (Cultural Studies, Comparative Literature, etc.). As mentioned above, we have been especially successful at placing our graduates into reputable doctoral programs throughout North America. In the past five years, our MA-Lit graduates have gone on to Ph.D programs at UCSD, UC-Davis, Northern Arizona University, Kent State University, SUNY-Stony Brook, and the University of Edmonton, among others.

English (Teaching of Writing)-Grad

While the academic job market in English remains comparatively bleak for something like the fifteenth year in a row, the one subfield in which there reliably *are* plenty of job listings is Composition. This axiom is borne out by the experience of our MATW graduates, particularly those who have also completed the College Faculty Preparation Program (CFPP). Anecdotal reports strongly suggest that the majority of our graduates in this option have found at least part-time work in their field within five years of graduation. We have first- and secondhand reports of recent MATW alumni who are employed locally (at College of the Redwoods, HSU, Arcata High, Eureka High and Hoopa Valley High) and at junior colleges throughout California, as well as at reputable institutions abroad (Zhejiang University and Humboldt College of Xi'an International University). Several other recent alumni have gone on to Ph.D programs in Rhet/Comp at the University of Washington, UCSB, Kent State University, and Rensselaer Polytechnic University; one has just begun a tenure-track Assistant Professorship at George Mason University.

Teaching Engl-Second Lang – MA Minor

See “[Master’s] International Program,” above. We of course like to think that a bona fide graduate *minor* in TESL is more valuable than the sorts of TESL “certificates” that have proliferated throughout the country over the past decade or so—even though we are considering such a certificate program ourselves, largely because of external demand. Unlike an accredited academic course of study, however, such “certificates” are not governed by any common

standards or accrediting body and they vary wildly in their requirements and (needless to say) their quality.

III. Program Quality (Limit: 6 pages, not including tables) [30%]

A. Students

1. For graduate and post-baccalaureate professional programs

Total Fall Applications received appsXmajorFall report generated: 24-JUL-08						
Explicit major	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
English (Literature)-Grad	16	14	10	13	17	18
English (Teaching of Writing)-Grad	19	11	21	15	15	6
English(International Program)-Grad	1	4	6	4	4	0
Total	9,057	10,047	11,000	10,958	12,193	13,197

Total Fall Applicants who enrolled appsXmajorFall report generated: 24-JUL-08						
Explicit major	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
English (Literature)-Grad	5	3	4	6	1	3
English (Teaching of Writing)-Grad	6	2	4	7	10	1
English(International Program)-Grad	1	2	2	0	1	0
Total	2,374	2,281	2,319	2,477	2,708	1,471

Provide an explanation of the above data, if necessary, and/or provide additional evidence indicative of program quality related to student achievement.

We defy anyone to make sense of the “totals” in the above charts (!). Quite apart from that, however, we fail to see how the above data is indicative of the quality of our students. A more significant measure, perhaps, would be the ratio of applications received to offers extended, which might speak to the “competitiveness” of our admissions process (we have, in fact, tightened our admissions standards over the past few years in an effort to boost the overall quality of our student body). Average GRE scores or undergraduate GPAs of enrollees might also furnish meaningful indicators of the quality of our students, but again we have not been asked (nor have we cared) to track such statistics.

But to the data at hand: apart from 2008—an anomalous year—the annual numbers of applications received and applicants enrolled have been relatively steady, and they are

appropriate for a program and faculty of our size. Our graduate admissions does not seek to fill a numerical quota of enrolled students, but extends offers of admission solely on the basis of merit, judging each applicant's aptitude and potential holistically on the basis of GRE scores, undergraduate GPA, a statement of purpose, an academic writing sample, and three letters of recommendation. Each year at least two, and often more, of our top candidates for admission choose instead to attend other institutions not because of any deficiency in the quality of our program—quite the contrary, they tell us—but because HSU does not offer grants, stipends, teaching assistantships or other financial incentives.

Once our students are here, they excel. Over the past several years, in particular, we have placed a strong emphasis on professionalization in both our teaching and our mentorship, and the results have been impressive: in great numbers, our graduate students have presented their work at local, regional, and national conferences—including those of the top professional organizations in the field, such as the Conference on College Composition & Communication, the Modern Language Association, the Popular Culture Association and the Cultural Studies Association. They have published in refereed journals both before and after graduating from our programs. They have written for the *North Coast Journal*. (One student's criticism received an honorable mention in *Best Music Writing 2007*.) And they have won prestigious scholarly awards: in the past six years we have had two CSU Pre-Doctoral Scholars, and in the past *two* years we have had an Ali C. Razi Scholar (the award given to the top CSU Pre-Doctoral Scholar systemwide), a William Randolph Hearst/CSU Trustees' Award for Outstanding Achievement, a McCrone Graduate Fellowship Award, and a McConkey Outstanding Project Award.

For some observers, “placement” will stand as the ultimate measure of the quality of our students. While we do not necessarily concur with this conclusion, we would repeat (see Section II.B. above) that our graduates go on in great numbers to good teaching jobs and Ph.D programs. Even alumni who are caught in “adjunct” limbo are achieving wider recognition: one 2006 MATW graduate now teaching part-time at College of the Redwoods has recently contracted to continue his weblog “Adjunct Central” for Bedford/St. Martin's Press, one of the premiere textbook and academic publishers in English and Composition Studies.

B. Faculty

1. Provide evidence of teaching effectiveness and commitment to continuous improvement of teaching. Include, for example, engagement in professional development for teaching (including around campus themes on learning outcomes and diversity, and on accessibility training), program approaches to ensure quality, and/or recognitions, honors, and awards for excellence in the classroom as appropriate for your program.

Both the full-time “ladder” faculty and the cadre of lecturers and teaching associates in the English Department are closely involved in campuswide co-curricular programs which have implications for improved teaching. Composition Program faculty (including graduate Teaching Associates) work extensively with EOP to support the learning of first-generation and other underprepared or underrepresented students. In the fall of each year, a member of our graduate faculty organizes a regional conference, FESCUE (Fall English Studies Conference on Undergraduate Education), at which faculty, graduate students, secondary school teachers and community members hold panels & workshops and present original work on the continued theme of English Studies and teaching for social justice. The Redwood Writing Project (RWP) (see III.D.1., below), a site of the California and National Writing Projects (CWP & NWP), engages in professional development for teachers in K through university classrooms in developing and modeling best practices in teaching of writing and literacy. English department faculty direct the RWP and are on the boards of the NWP, the NWP Rural Sites Network, and the NWP Technology Initiatives Network. Our faculty offer seminars during International Education Week and are central in the planning of the Campus Dialogue on Race, the annual Diversity Conference/Social Justice Summit, and the Qross-Cultural Queer Film Festival (Q-Fest). One of our faculty was named 2007 Professor of the Year, and another was awarded the California Association Teachers of English Award for Classroom Excellence. As for quality assurance: every course taught by ladder faculty undergoes student evaluations until the faculty member reaches the rank of full professor, and one course per semester is evaluated thereafter.

2. Evidence of faculty engagement in scholarship/creative activities and service. (Express as a percentage of full-time or FERP faculty members **affiliated with the program**. For example, if 9 of 10 faculty affiliated with your program gave a paper at a professional meeting in 04/05, then enter $9/10 = 90\%$.) This table is to be completed by the department.

Scholarship/Creative Activities/Service	05/06	06/07	07/08
At least one peer-reviewed publication or creative product	13/20 = 65%	12/17 = 71%	11/16 = 68%
At least one funded grant or contract related to scholarship	7/20 = 35%	9/17 = 53%	7/16 = 44%
Invited participant or leader of workshops, expert panels, or task forces	15/20 = 75%	13/17 = 76%	13/16 = 81%
At least one presentation (paper, poster, exhibition, etc.) given at a professional society meeting	14/20 = 70%	10/17 = 59%	10/16 = 63%
Professional service activities at a regional or national level	12/20 = 60%	12/17 = 71%	12/16 = 75%
Service on at least one university or college-level committee (at least 1 hour/wk avg.)	8/20 = 40%	8/17 = 47%	7/16 = 44%

3. Provide explanations of the data above and/or descriptions of the patterns of faculty engagement in scholarly and/or creative activities and service as appropriate for your program.

As is to be expected, some of our faculty concentrate on departmental, college, and/or university governance, some on publications and presentations, others on service to the profession, and still others on grants, task forces, and workshops. (We should note, however, that there are relatively few sources of grant funding in the humanities, and that such grants, when they do come, are comparatively small.) For example, those who teach undergraduate courses in English Ed and/or graduate courses in the Teaching of Writing often are asked to conduct workshops and to write grants for professional development. Those who teach graduate courses in Literary Studies or the Teaching of Writing also present at conferences and publish books and articles in peer reviewed venues. And those who teach undergraduate creative writing courses along with graduate courses in the Teaching of Writing most commonly publish poems, short stories, and books of creative nonfiction. (One such faculty member's book was recently shortlisted for the MLA's annual "Best First Book" prize, the most prestigious award in our profession.) Some faculty do a bit of all three, and most members of the department also participate in either faculty governance or national service. If we can assume one third of faculty time is devoted to teaching, then the percentages in the table above indicate how our faculty spend the other two-thirds of their time. Given that no single category has under 33%, we can conclude that members of the Department are doing their fair share of service and scholarship, and that they are modeling exemplary scholarly and professional behavior for our graduate students.

4. Provide evidence for faculty mentoring of students. Include, for example, approaches to advising, directed study or research, and/or clubs or student professional chapters that involve faculty mentorship.

The Graduate Coordinator serves as academic advisor for all graduate students and emphasizes both the elevated performance expectations in graduate school and the importance of pre-professional preparation from the very first orientation meeting. Graduate faculty consistently reinforce this message in their teaching and mentoring. When students begin planning their MA projects, they choose a two-person committee that works intensively with each student through the planning, research, and execution stages of the project. (It should be pointed out that faculty effectively receive no workload credit for thesis advising; see Section V.A., below.) Several of our faculty have well-deserved reputations for their generosity with informal professional mentoring of graduate students, in addition to supervising formal directed studies and research assistantships. They and others coach students in submitting proposals to regional and national academic conferences and in placing seminar papers for publication in scholarly journals, and they accompany students whose work is accepted to those same scholarly conferences. Another faculty member has devoted countless unpaid hours to mentoring our latest CSU Pre-Doctoral Scholar. All students who wish to compete for paid positions as Teaching Associates or Graduate Assistants in the department must first complete at least one internship in an undergraduate writing or literature course, where they assist faculty in the classroom and receive wide-ranging, semester-long, one-on-one mentoring from a master teacher. Aspiring writing instructors and Writing Center consultants also receive training in Engl 450 (Tutoring Developing Writers), while first-time Composition Teaching Associates receive both advance training and ongoing developmental support through Engl 580 (Seminar in Teaching Writing).

5. Other evidence of quality indicators related to faculty that may not be listed elsewhere, including, for example, faculty diversity within the program.

The English department has numerous faculty members engaged in teaching and scholarship on the literatures of underrepresented groups, including Chicano/a, African-American, Native American, Asian American, “Queer,” postcolonial and transnational literatures. In addition, we have faculty teaching graduate writing workshops who are themselves respected published authors.

C. Curriculum (differentiate by option, if appropriate)

1. Writing and oral communication learning outcomes

Describe how written and oral communication skills are included in your program.

This question is largely inapplicable to graduate programs. Executive Order 665 established a Graduate Writing Requirement for the CSU which is satisfied in English by the completion of “designated course[work] that contains a significant writing component” (not to mention the completion of a master’s project which is expected to demonstrate a superior level of proficiency in argumentative and expository writing).

2. Assessment

[Data on program progress with assessment tasks will be provided from the Faculty Associate for Assessment]

Provide 2 examples of how you have used results of assessment of your program’s student learning outcomes to adapt, enhance, or affirm your program’s curriculum.

Again, since “Assessment” has not (yet) been mandated at the graduate level, this question is largely inapplicable. Nevertheless, English has articulated—and filed with the Office of Research and Graduate Study—a set of “learning outcomes” for its graduate programs which will serve as a point of reference in ongoing discussions about the quality of our students’ performance in seminars and master’s projects. Additionally, data from ongoing exit surveys conducted by the Graduate office will be used to assess how our programs might be improved to better meet the needs of our students and to ensure their academic and professional success.

3. Accreditation (if applicable)

If the program is accredited, describe the need for this accreditation and its impact on the quality and composition of the curriculum of the program.

N/A

4. Relevance and innovation

Provide evidence through examples that demonstrate a curriculum that is relevant, innovative, forward looking, responsive to changing trends, and equips students to function in a diverse, global context.

Because our graduate faculty is composed of active scholars, the content of our graduate courses reflects the best practices and most current research in literary, critical, and cultural theory (MA-Lit), composition and pedagogical theory (MATW), and research methods (all options). The topics of our required seminars are broad and flexible enough to accommodate both well-worn themes and current trends. That the Master's International (MI) Program "equips students to function in a...global context" should be self-evident; that the MATW increasingly focuses on the pedagogy of "developmental writing" (aimed especially at first-generation college students) and requires a seminar in Teaching ESL Writing suggests how it, too, has taken the measure of the "diverse" world that its graduates will enter.

5. Interactions between graduate and undergraduate programs (if applicable)
If this is a graduate program, what opportunities for undergraduates result (or are lost) by virtue of the graduate program.

We offer several cross-listed courses where undergraduates and graduates interact in seminars (and where graduate students effectively serve as "peer" models of elevated levels of discourse and achievement). Nearly all of our full-time, tenure-track faculty teach at one time or another in both the undergraduate and graduate programs. Both graduates and undergraduates enroll in Engl 450 ("Tutoring Developing Writers"), which prepares them to work together as peer tutors in the Writing Center. Finally, several qualified graduate students (usually 6 or more) are selected each year to teach sections of English 100, while others serve as consultants in department's Writing Lab, which primarily serves "developmental" writers.

6. Program uniqueness
If your program provides unique educational opportunities or course content that is found at few or no other CSU institutions, please describe this uniqueness.

English (International Program)-Grad

As mentioned above (Section I), the MI program is one of only two affiliated with an English department in the entire state of California. (Most other MI programs statewide and nationwide are in areas of agriculture, engineering, nursing, and so on.) The other—in TESL—is at Sacramento State, and does not offer the same grounding in basic *composition* theory & pedagogy. There is one additional TESL MI program in California, at the elite Monterey Institute of Languages.

English (Literature)-Grad

N/A.

English (Teaching of Writing)-Grad

As mentioned above (Section 1), the MATW is unique to HSU (and, in its focus on pedagogy, distinct from master's programs in Composition and Rhetoric at other CSU campuses). The availability of the College Faculty Preparation Program (CFPP)—a certificate in College Teaching which many of our MATW students pursue concurrently—is also unique to HSU. (A similar certificate program *may* still exist at one other CSU campus, but the current status of the program is not clear.)

Teaching Engl-Second Lang – MA Minor

N/A.

7. Opportunities for undergraduate scholarship/creative activities/service
Estimate the percentage of your undergraduate majors that participate in scholarship/creative activities/professionally-related service, and provide some illustrative examples of such activities. Can students receive academic credit for these activities and have them counted toward undergraduate major requirements?

Surely this question is meant to address opportunities for *graduate* scholarship/creative activities/service. Our graduate students participate in *TOYON* (the student literary magazine), and in FESCUE, an on-campus fall conference which encourages panels, workshops and presentations by faculty, as well as undergraduates and graduate students. They work as peer tutors and classroom interns at both HSU and College of the Redwoods and serve on campuswide bodies (AS, Grad Council, etc.). And as mentioned above (III.A.1.), they are extremely active professionally, publishing and presenting their research in a variety of local, regional, and national venues. Some such scholarship is facilitated by graduate student travel grants (four awards annually of up to \$500 each) which are funded by the department.

D. Affiliations/Equipment/Facilities/Environment

1. Affiliations

Some academic programs are affiliated with on-campus or off-campus centers, units or institutes that bring important benefits to programs. For any such center/unit/institute, please provide (1) the name of such center/unit/institute, and very brief descriptions of (2) the purpose of the center/unit/institute, (3) the nature of your program's affiliation with the center/unit/institute, and (4) the benefits accruing to your program/major from your affiliation with this center/unit/institute. Units/centers/institutes may be public (HSU, CSU, local, state, federal) or private.

- **The Redwood Writing Project (RWP)**, based in the English Department, is a professional development institute affiliated with the California Writing Project (CWP) and the National Writing Project (NWP), each of which contributes substantial grant money to the HSU Foundation to support the RWP at Humboldt state. The purpose of the RWP/CWP/NWP is to bring teachers from all educational levels together to improve the teaching of writing and to develop teaching effectiveness workshops and materials to model best practices. As one of the 200 sites across the United States, members of our site, which include teachers from elementary, middle, and high schools, College of the Redwoods, and HSU, serve on the NWP Rural Sites board of Directors, The Technology Board of Directors, the CWP ESL Advisory Board, and the NWP Proposal Evaluation Board. The RWP brings both money and recognition to the North Coast and HSU through the work of the teacher-consultants prepared by our site who are leaders in language arts education throughout the state. It also affords invaluable training and professional development opportunities to our graduate students.
- **English Council** is a consortium of English Departments from across the CSU. It meets twice a year, and each campus is encouraged to send four representatives: graduate coordinator; secondary education coordinator; composition director, and Chair. In addition, these four are part of a list serve that shares concerns and provides suggestions for English Departments throughout the system. Because of financial pressures, we normally send only one or at most two representatives to the fall meeting, and when we can, four to the spring meeting. We always come away from these meetings better informed of (among other things) curricular developments and best practices among graduate programs systemwide.

2. Facilities and resources

Provide a brief listing of your most important facilities, equipment and information/library resources, and describe the degree to which the current facilities, equipment and information/library resources affect program quality.

- **Personal Resources:** Our professors have extensive personal libraries of books, journals, and videos that they use in the classroom and share with students. This is especially significant given the chronic lack of funds for new library materials, which hampers our graduate students' ability to conduct current research in their fields of study. One member of our faculty has donated a full run of back issues of *ISLE: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment* and currently underwrites the institutional subscription for this premiere journal of ecocriticism and environmental writing. This same professor has secured donations from private foundations to fund Graduate Student Travel Awards and field study trips.
- **Writing Lab and Writing Center:** The English Department's Writing Lab provides individualized support and instruction to students in Engl 40, 60, and 100A striving to develop "basic" college-level writing skills. It thereby contributes crucially to the academic success and retention of underprepared, underrepresented, first-generation and "non-traditional" college students—and it simply could not function without the skilled labor of graduate students trained in tutoring and writing instruction.

The University Writing Center, housed in—and for many years funded by—the English Department, provides a wide variety of students (including underrepresented students) with an opportunity to continue to develop critical reading and writing skills, even after they have mastered "basic skills." In addition to helping students in literally hundreds of courses from dozens of disciplines across campus, Writing Center tutors provide substantial assistance with scholarship applications, resumes and job applications, and senior and graduate theses/projects. A substantial portion of the Writing Center staff comes from the ranks of English graduate students.

While these essential university resources could not operate without graduate student labor, it's also the case that our graduate *programs* would be poorer without them. Our graduate students gain a professional advantage from these unique opportunities to apply the theory that they learn in English 450 and in MATW courses. Moreover, working with

developing writers in these environments provides a valuable foundation for classroom work as teaching associates and future professors.

3. Unique local and regional environment

Describe how the program takes advantage of the unique local or regional social, cultural and/or natural environment available to students and faculty at HSU. (Do not include items listed under DI.)

Though our demographics are changing slowly, HSU is situated in an isolated, rural community where there is relatively little cultural and ethnic diversity; thus there is a strong need for students to be exposed to the ideas, concepts, languages, and cultures that may not be experienced directly on a daily basis. Required MATW and MI courses in linguistics, second language acquisition, TESL and so forth provide some such exposure, while our MA-Lit seminars are informed by (indeed, often centered around) current research in minority discourse theory, postcolonial theory, and feminist/gender/“queer” theory. These scholarly approaches provide our students with more nuanced and (we hope) more sophisticated articulations of the sometimes glib pronouncements that characterize the self-styled radicalism of Humboldt County and HSU. Finally: one of our most junior faculty has created a Literary Field Studies course (ENGL 370/570), that affords graduate students an opportunity to relate direct experience of the local natural environment to Ecocritical field study, one of the newest theoretical approaches to the study and teaching of literature. In this course and in graduate teaching internships, students also observe and practice field-based teaching methods appropriate for use in English 100.

IV. Investments, Revenues, and Efficiencies (Response Limit: 2 pages of narrative, not including tables) [20%]

A. Program Investments

1. Program Investment – Degree Requirements

Enter the total number of required course units (as listed in the catalog) for this academic program, and then the number of required course units for this academic program that are from the primary course code associated with your program. Provide a total for each option if appropriate.

Student Units

Total required Program SCUs	MA-Lit	32	Required Program SCUs in the primary Course Code	MA-Lit	32
	MATW	35		MATW	35
	MI	37		MI	33

Weighted Teaching Units (WTU's)

Total the number of WTUs required to teach 1 section of each of the required courses in the program. If there are lists of restricted electives (e.g., take 1 of the following 3 courses), then choose a representative course from the list. For required S-factor courses, estimate the typical number of WTU's assigned to a faculty member who teaches the course. Again, differentiate by option if appropriate.

Total Required Program WTUs	MA-Lit	29	Required Program WTUs in the primary Course Code	MA-Lit	29
	MATW	32		MATW	32
	MI	32.5		MI	28.5

2. Program investment – by Minimum Weighted Teaching Units required to offer coursework so students can make reasonable progress toward their degree.

Complete the table below using the definitions that follow. Include additional columns as needed for additional options.

Total WTU in Course Code	WTU for GE and service to other academic Programs	WTU for Major Option 1 (MA-Lit)	WTU for Major Option 2 (MATW)	WTU for Major Option 3 (MI)
119.5	N/A	49	90	31

Total WTU in Course Code: Sum up the total number of WTU that were used to teach courses in the primary course code associated with your academic program over the past two academic years. Exclude remedial courses.

Service to GE and other Academic Programs: Enter the total number of WTU that were used over the past 2 years to meet service demands imposed by students outside the major. (In other word, if 8 sections of Egyptology 301 have been offered over the past 2 years, but if 2 sections over the past 2 years would have been sufficient for the Egyptology majors, then count 6 sections of Egyptology, and the associated WTU, in this category.)

*WTU for Major Option (s): Sum up the non-service WTU for the set of courses in the course code associated with your program that you would need to offer **over a two year period** to accommodate progress toward degree for your program students.*

Notes: 1) In programs with multiple options, courses common to the multiple options should be included in all options. Hence the entries to the right of the “Total” entry will not sum to the total. 2) Do not pro-rate WTU’s by the percentage of students in a particular section of a course that are majors. Include the course in the count if it must be offered during a 2-year period for students to make progress toward their degree. The 4-year major plan for Freshmen may be useful.

Graduate students may enroll in a limited number of upper-division undergraduate units for graduate credit. The department also offers occasional courses with cross-listed graduate and undergraduate sections. It is not clear to us whether or how to count such courses in the above chart. Also: while WTUs for the supervision of MA theses, directed studies, and internships (.5, .3, and .3, respectively) are included in FAD reports, these courses are almost always taught as *de facto* overloads.

3. Program Investments – by staff allocations.

Estimate the percent of departmental expenditures for staff positions that can be attributed to this academic program. Provide an explanation, as appropriate.

	Major Program
Percents of Staff FTEF	~20%

Data cited in the English undergraduate report show that staffing in the English Department has gone down significantly in past five years, at the same time that workload has increased due to State, Federal, and campus mandates. The rough figure above reflects the approximate percentage of time spent by our ASA and the ASC on work related to the graduate program. Some graduate program support responsibilities formerly handled by the ASA (correspondence, forms and other paperwork, etc.) have been assumed by the Graduate Coordinator.

4. Program Investments – Other annual costs.

Provide dollar estimates for other program costs by the following categories. Annualize periodic costs (equipment purchases or facilities upgrades) as necessary. Include an explanation, if appropriate. Do not include costs for commonly used items (smart classrooms, faculty workstations, etc.).

Category	Estimated Cost
Equipment (including maintenance)	3,370
Instructional Supplies	10,931
Temporary Help (graders, lab assistants, GA's, etc.)	

The above costs are totals of both the undergraduate and graduate programs; we do not separate these programs internally when ordering supplies and maintaining equipment. There are no additional expenses attributable to the graduate program alone.

5. Program Investments – accreditation [if applicable]

If this program is accredited, describe how this accreditation effects program costs.

N/A.

B. Gross Revenues

Revenue	05/06	06/07	07/08
DEPARTMENTS COMPLETE THIS SECTION			
Fundraising/donations	\$1190	\$1222	\$2949
Extended Education	\$2803	\$1619	\$1939
Student fees	N/A	N/A	N/A
Instructionally Related Activities (IRA)	\$2780	\$2975	\$2975
Instructionally-related grants			\$2400
Grants and contracts to P.I.s	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000
Other revenues			

Provide an explanation for how these revenues support the academic program.

Again, the above figures are for all programs in English combined, as each program does not have a separate budget. The top category reflects both donations from outside benefactors and English Department contributions. We use some of this money to award prizes for intermittent student writing contests; instructional, professional development opportunities for faculty, and graduate student travel to present papers at professional conferences and/or to attend job interviews. (In AY 07-08, a \$2000 donation from a private foundation was specifically earmarked for this purpose.) All Extended Education money is required to be spent for

instructional/student benefit. We have used this money in various ways, for example, to improve technological access to students. Instructionally Related Activities money is used to publish the *Toyon* (the HSU literary magazine) which is free to the HSU community—and whose editorial staff includes both graduate and undergraduate students. The money from the Redwood Writing Project grant is used to for many things, including workshops on improving the teaching of composition. The \$2400 instructionally-related grant in 07/08 was an individual grant to maintain the Writing Center.

C. Efficiency

1. Efficiency – By SFR for course code

Academic Year Averages	Subject	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08
SFR	ENGL	17.20	17.68	16.82	15.42	17.10	19.10
FTEF	ENGL	23.15	21.38	20.43	21.39	19.97	19.44

SFR SUMMARY	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08
AHSS	20.36	22.05	21.94	20.61	21.19	22.91
CNRS	15.66	16.90	17.17	16.04	16.82	18.28
CPS	15.12	16.29	15.68	15.22	20.80	25.33
UNIVERSITY TOTALS	17.28	18.65	18.57	17.52	19.32	21.43

Explain any substantial changes in SFR. Also explain why this SFR differs from the college and/or university SFR. What efforts have been made over the past few years by the program to improve this measure of efficiency? Use the data under part IV.E. as appropriate.

The data provided by Analytical Studies does not separate SFR by program, only by discipline. Therefore, the SFR figures for English in the above table are averaged from *all* course—grad, undergrad, major, and GE. SFR in English has increased substantially in the past, owing in large part to our addition of a large-lecture section of Introduction to Literature (supported by an unpaid graduate intern or a paid Graduate Assistant, depending upon enrollment) each semester. Meanwhile FTEF has fallen. The department begun alternating courses on a semester or yearly rotation to avoid low enrolled classes required for certain options and programs, including the graduate program. Overall, our SFR is lower than other Departments and College averages because we teach a large number of writing intensive courses that have a low cap, particularly

remedial /English courses that can serve a maximum of 18 students. Our SFR is also lower because of our graduate seminars, which are smaller by nature and by design.

2. Efficiency – Other views.

The Prioritization Task Force will examine the data given under section IV.A and B in terms of the overall production (e.g. number of majors, number of graduates) in the program. Please comment if appropriate.

In the Taylorist language of widget-production, graduate programs will always appear hopelessly inefficient. They depend upon small numbers: a small student body, small seminars, one-on-one tutorials, mentorship, and supervision. This is simply the pedagogical foundation of graduate education, which operates on a guild/apprenticeship model, not an industrial one. Graduate programs “produce” other things, however: opportunities and incentives for faculty research and scholarship, firsthand exposure of undergrads to postgraduate education, and—in programs such as ours—a pool of well-trained, energetic, exploitable labor who can staff labs and first-year composition courses at astonishingly low pay. (See Section V.)

D. Budget cut impacts

Indicate how your program has been affected by recent (since 2002-2003) budget cuts that have directly affected resources for your program (faculty, staff, operating expense) and course offerings (class size, reduced course offerings or options for the major.) Refer to the data included under section IV. E. or in the departmental report as appropriate.

In the not-too-distant past, the English Department had two staff (one of them on a 12-month appointment) and one work-study student assistant. We are now down to two staff (neither of whom is 12-month) and no student assistant. (See IV.A.3.) We have lost two full-time equivalent faculty and several part-time lecturers, and like most departments we are not given funding to replace FERP and retired faculty. For the graduate program, this means fewer faculty eligible to advise MA projects and serve on MA committees. We now offer 3 fewer distinct courses and 6 fewer sections at the graduate level. Required courses are offered less frequently and electives almost not at all, making our curriculum less attractive (for purposes of recruiting) more difficult to complete in two years. At the same time, our faculty are working harder to accommodate student needs, as reflected in the independent study data, which show an increase

from 10 to 22 sections of single student enrollment per year. Finally, we struggle perennially to secure funds for the staffing and operations of the Writing Center and the Writing Lab.

E. Additional Data

Course Offerings Profile in English (AY 00/01 - AY 07/08) class_offerings_ENGL report generated: 27-JUN-08								
	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07	AY 07/08
Distinct Courses Enrolled	52	47	48	47	48	46	44	43
Sections Enrolled	107	105	105	101	96	99	96	96
Average Section Enrollment	16	17	17	17	17	16	16	18
Distinct Courses Enrolled in English by Level (AY 00/01 - AY 07/08) class_offerings_ENGL report generated: 27-JUN-08								
Course Level	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07	AY 07/08
Remedial	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Lower-div	10	10	10	10	11	11	10	11
Upper-div	29	27	27	26	26	25	24	22
Graduate	12	10	10	10	10	9	9	9
Total	52	47	48	47	48	46	44	43
Sections Enrolled in English by Level (AY 00/01 - AY 07/08) class_offerings_ENGL report generated: 27-JUN-08								
Course Level	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07	AY 07/08
Remedial	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
Lower-div	44	46	50	50	45	53	55	58
Upper-div	43	42	37	35	36	32	28	24
Graduate	17	14	15	12	12	10	10	11
Total	107	105	105	101	96	99	96	96
Avg Section Enrollment in English by Level (AY 00/01 - AY 07/08) class_offerings_ENGL report generated: 27-JUN-08								
Course Level	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07	AY 07/08
Remedial	11	14	14	14	12	12	16	16
Lower-div	19	19	19	18	20	17	18	19
Upper-div	19	18	19	19	18	17	17	21
Graduate	6	8	9	8	6	6	7	6
Total	55	58	61	59	55	52	58	61

FTES in English by Course Level (AY 00/01 - AY 07/08)								
class_offerings_ENGL report generated: 27-JUN-08								
Course Level	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07	AY 07/08
Remedial	7.1	7.4	9.8	9.8	8.2	9.0	10.5	12.3
Lower-div	168.5	176.3	191.6	191.6	178.6	183.0	199.9	228.6
Upper-div	173.1	167.4	157.8	148.9	135.4	117.3	106.9	109.8
Graduate	28.3	32.0	38.9	27.8	21.5	20.4	24.2	20.4
Total	376.9	383.2	398.1	378.0	343.6	329.8	341.6	371.1

NOTE: In the above tables all class sections have 2 or more students enrolled. This is done to minimize the influence of independent student sections.
 Distinct Courses count each distinct SUBJ/Course-number combination enrolled.
 All figures are Fall/Spring term averages. Due to the rounding of average Academic Year counts, the various breakouts may not add to the exact same amounts.

Other Class Offering Breakouts

These examine independent study sections, and sections by different modes of instruction. The Lecture-only sections have only a C1 through C6 mode. The Lab/Activity-only sections have only a C7 through C-16 mode. Other modes and combinations contain the remaining modes or combinations of lecture and lab/activity modes.

Other Special breakouts in English (AY 00/01 - AY 07/08)								
class_offerings_ENGL report generated: 27-JUN-08								
	AY 00/01	AY 01/02	AY 02/03	AY 03/04	AY 04/05	AY 05/06	AY 06/07	AY 07/08
Sections with 1 student enrolled	10	16	20	16	16	19	22	22
Lecture only sections	58	60	59	72	70	78	76	70
Lab/Activity only sections	13	13	15	13	13	14	15	19
Other modes and combinations	37	33	32	16	14	8	6	7

V. Potential (Please complete this section for each option. Limit: 2 pages per option) [15%]

A. Program capacity with existing resources:

1. What is your program's maximum capacity with current resources? Use two metrics to define "capacity": The number of graduates per year, and the number of FTES generated by courses that are unique to this option, per year.

(Completed by the department)	Graduates per year	FTES in the major option per year
Existing	12.375 (annual avg. over 8 yrs)	26.7 (annual avg. over 8 years)
Maximum capacity with existing resources	15 (?)	50 (?)

These are not actually the most helpful metrics for determining “capacity” with respect to graduate programs. An internal analysis of enrollments in 500- and 600-level courses over the past two academic years—excluding MA projects, internships, and directed studies—shows that we hover between 47% and 64% of “capacity,” based on enrollment limits and instructional mode. Filling those empty seats would of course generate more FTES. (We also lose a certain number of FTES annually to Extended Ed. via ENGL 693, the “Continuous Enrollment” option for students who have finished coursework but have not yet completed the MA project.) But just because we have this unused capacity on paper doesn’t mean that we could easily fill it. More than anything else, what determines our capacity to maintain a graduate program is the number of faculty we have available to accommodate students’ research interests, advise MA projects and serve on project committees. As anyone who has ever conscientiously advised a thesis knows, this is demanding, time-consuming work that can sometimes drag on for a year (or longer!). To advise or sit on more than three committees at once is foolhardy, particularly when such labor is not factored into faculty workload. (On paper one receives .5 WTUs for thesis advising; in practice, never.) With only 13 full-time faculty, whose areas of expertise are not always perfectly matched to the distribution of research interests among enrolled graduate students, it is already challenging to serve those students adequately. Unless and until project advising is reflected in faculty workload, then, or English decides to replace the MA project with some other, less “onerous” type of culminating project, then—a change which might be more convenient for us but would not be more beneficial for our students, we can not admit substantially more students than we do currently, and we will remain at or near “capacity.”

2. If your program is at maximum capacity, proceed to Part B. If you have capacity to grow with existing resources, what steps have been taken to increase enrollment? What have been the effects of these steps, and what results are still anticipated?

B. Opportunities for future growth or substantial curricular changes

1. What opportunity does the program have for future expansion? Provide evidence for your response.

We are in the early stages what we project will be a thorough-going revision of the MA-Lit curriculum. Our aim is to revise and repackage the curriculum in ways that more accurately reflect the demands of Ph.D programs in English nationwide, that capitalize on the scholarly strengths of our faculty, and that speak to HSU's institutional identity, particularly with respect to issues of social and environmental justice. This would make our program more attractive for recruitment purposes, distinguishing HSU from "run-of-the-mill" literature programs at sister institutions, and anchoring our approach to literary study even more firmly in the related fields of cultural studies, postcolonial studies, race and gender studies, environmental writing and ecocriticism—approaches that speak to the interests of typical Humboldt students, draw on the expertise of our faculty, and open up possibilities for interdisciplinary study at the graduate level.

The MATW curriculum is also overdue for revision, though perhaps not such radical revision as the MA-Lit. (In particular, it could usefully include more content on the pedagogy of "developmental" writers, an important "growth" field with respect to the training of junior college instructors.) But we are more keen, frankly, to expand teaching and other professional opportunities for MATW students, including creating more Teaching Associate (Engl 100) positions for qualified second-year students and/or extending appointments to one year, and creating Graduate Assistant (i.e., grader/discussion leader) positions for first-year students. Both such initiatives would require a greatly expanded GA/TA training program. The ability to offer more such opportunities—including more Writing Lab/Writing Center tutor positions—would enable us to recruit more effectively (it would enable us to recruit, *period*), expand a cheap labor pool for carrying out a core function of the university mission, and benefit our students both pedagogically and professionally.

In some respects the greatest opportunity for expansion is in the realm of TESL. HSU is experiencing a significant increase in international student enrollment, and many of those students require support services not currently in place. One member of our faculty was granted a sabbatical in Fall 2006 to develop a linked ESL/EAP course between English and Business, Engineering, and Forestry/Natural Resources for international students, with opportunities for English graduate students to work with international students in and outside of the classroom. Budget constraints sidetracked even a test launching of the course, but when we are finally able

to bring it to fruition, it should lead to substantial growth and innovation for HSU in general and for the English Department in particular. We also know—from numerous private queries, recent talks with representatives from universities in China and Latin America, and the spread of such programs at sister institutions—that there is significant unmet demand for TESL certificate programs and/or other post-baccalaureate certificates. While we have qualms about the pedagogical soundness and economic feasibility of developing such programs, we see in them a potentially lucrative “market.” *Not* having a TESL certificate arguably puts HSU at a competitive disadvantage with sister CSU campuses.

2. Describe the curricular changes and/or staffing increases required to accomplish such an expansion?

For curricular changes, see above. Even maintenance, let alone expansion, of our MATW program will require a minimum of two tenure-track hires in the very near future. We are already short-staffed in the area of Composition & Rhetoric (a core component of the curriculum in writing instruction and theory), and we anticipate the FERP or retirement of at least three full-time professors or lecturers from the graduate faculty in the next two years. We would require authorization from the College and external funding for additional Graduate Assistantships, Teaching Associateships, and/or tutors. The cost in faculty and staff time of the development and implementation of an associated GA/TA training program is not easily calculable.

As noted earlier in this report, our capacity to expand *enrollment* in our graduate programs is tied to our ability to accommodate additional MA projects. Current enrollments are achieved largely through web presence and word of mouth. If we were to undertake an actual recruitment effort in order to boost enrollment, we would first of all need a budget for materials and travel. But more important, we would simply need more faculty. Two additional faculty, for example, would enable us to form full committees for as many as six more students per year.

C. Impact of augmented resources

Suppose that your program were ranked in a category that recommended augmentation of resources. What would be the impact of augmented resources? (Answer for a 10% augmentation and a 20% augmentation.)

This is a difficult question to answer, largely because the department budget is not separated by program. Consequently we do not have a clear baseline figure for graduate programs that we can

augment by 10 or 20%. In any event, our first course of action would be to enhance professional opportunities for grad students by creating more Teaching Associate (Engl 100) positions for qualified applicants and/or extending teaching appointments to one year. (This in turn would facilitate efforts to improve Writing Across the Curriculum at HSU and/or to develop a second-semester composition requirement.) Our second priority would be to create Graduate Associate (grader/discussion leader) positions and/or fellowships and other financial incentives/recruiting tools for first-year students. Other potential uses for small budgetary augmentations: acquisition of space for use as a seminar room and/or graduate student lounge.

D. Impact of reduced resources

Suppose that your program were ranked in a category that recommended reduction of resources. What would be the impact of reduced resources? (Answer for a 10% reduction and a 20% reduction.)

Again: because the English department's budget is not separated by program, we can only answer this question in terms of what would happen to the department as a whole—and try to project what the “trickle-down” effect would be on our graduate programs. Paradoxically, if a 10% cut to the department budget resulted in the creation of more large-lecture courses at the undergraduate level, it might create opportunities for Graduate Assistant positions at the graduate level. As for a 20% reduction, I will quote from the English undergraduate report: “With such a drastic reduction, the English Department would lose the equivalent of 3 full-time, tenure-track professors. At least 18 course sections per academic year would disappear from the schedule. The Freshman Composition program, committee service, accreditation and program review work, [and] the English Education Pathway C would be crippled to the point of dysfunction.” To this litany I would add the graduate program, as well: We cannot afford the loss of any more faculty, and further reductions in course offerings or frequency of course offerings would make it impossible to complete the M.A. in two years.

E. Impact of program elimination

Suppose that your program were recommended to be discontinued. What would be the impact of program elimination?

To be blunt and somewhat cynical: because the MATW program in particular is an extremely economical source of labor for English 100/100A, the English Department Writing Lab, and the University Writing Center (not to mention a source of unpaid interns who assist in many English

undergraduate courses), the university would lose a very cheap labor pool, and the effect on the associated areas—one a core component of lower division GE, the others critical support mechanisms for underrepresented students—would be devastating. Since some of our students also take adjunct work at College of the Redwoods while they finish their degrees (and/or for one or two years after completion), CR, too, would be deprived of a source of energetic young instructors with up-to-date training.

The effect on our own faculty, meanwhile, would be demoralizing: mentoring graduate students and serving on project committees may well be arduous work, but it is also tremendously *rewarding* work. The chance to work with graduate students has been a valuable recruiting tool for the top-notch faculty we have attracted over the past fifteen years, and it is an incentive to stay conversant with the most current research in one's field(s) of expertise. Finally, there would be workload implications that aren't entirely foreseeable: several faculty on whom we regularly depend to teach graduate courses would need to be reassigned to courses that they not necessarily be qualified to teach. Given how lean our departmental course offerings have grown as a result of recent budget cuts, this would pose a significant challenge.

VI. Additional Information (Limit: 1 page) [up to 5 extra credit points may be assigned to the overall score]

Provide crucial information that is not provided under the previous categories.

Goals 4 and 6 of the “Academic Excellence” component of HSU’s most current Strategic Plan pledge, respectively, that “HSU will enhance the quality and visibility of its teacher education programs to help address one of California’s most critical needs” and that “HSU will actively encourage the growth and diversity of its graduate programs, and will seek to provide the necessary funding and curricular support to enhance the quality of those programs.” Like most graduate programs on this campus, ours have not in fact been encouraged to grow, and the necessary funding to enhance their quality has not been provided. Even so, we have delivered on many of the other strategic goals for academic excellence: through their many points of connections with undergraduate majors and non-majors, our graduate programs “promote the teaching and learning process through peer interaction” (Goal 3). The mere presence of a graduate program “encourage[s] the development of scholarship by improving opportunities for faculty, staff and students to participate in research and creative activities...[and] improve[es] the infrastructure for scholarship” (Goal 5). And our MATW and MI programs, in particular, “[enhance] the quality and visibility of [HSU’s] teacher education programs” by furnishing trained, experienced teachers for California’s Community Colleges.

APPENDIX

HSU *Vision Statement*

1. Humboldt State University will be the campus of choice for individuals who seek above all else to improve the human condition and our environment.
2. We will be the premier center for the interdisciplinary study of the environment and its natural resources.
3. We will be a regional center for the arts.
4. We will be renowned for social and environmental responsibility and action.
5. We believe the key to our common future will be the individual citizen who acts in good conscience and engages in informed action.
6. We will commit to increasing our diversity of people and perspectives.
7. We will be exemplary partners with our communities, including tribal nations.
8. We will be stewards of learning to make a positive difference.