



**SOUTH DAKOTA BOARD OF REGENTS
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS FORMS**

**Institutional Program Review
Report to the Board of Regents**

Use this form to submit a program review report to the system Chief Academic Officer. Complete this form for all units/programs undergoing an accreditation review, nationally recognized review process, or institutional program review. The report is due 30 days following receipt of the external and internal review reports.

UNIVERSITY:	NSU
DEPARTMENT OR SCHOOL:	College or Arts and Sciences / Department of Languages, Literature, and Communication Studies
PROGRAM REVIEWED:	English B.A. and B.S.Ed.
DATE OF REVIEW:	4/1/2022
TYPE OF REVIEW:	Institutional Program Review

University Approval

To the Board of Regents and the Executive Director: I certify that I have read this report, that I believe it to be accurate, and that it has been evaluated and approved as provided by university policy.

Neal H. Schnoor

President of the University

5/9/2022

Date

1. Identify the program reviewers and any external accrediting body:

Michelle Sauer, PhD
Distinguished Professor of English & Gender Studies
University of North Dakota
michelle.m.sauer@und.edu

- No external accrediting body.

2. Items A & B should address the following issues: mission centrality, program quality, cost, program productivity, plans for the future, and assessment of progress.

2(A). Describe the strengths and weaknesses identified by the reviewers

Strengths

1. The external reviewer states that “Overall, the program sets a standard of excellence. The faculty serve as role models and are dedicated teachers, productive scholars, and engaged community members. Furthermore, all areas of English studies are equally valued—no one area is neglected or overlooked” (p. 4).

2. The faculty are the program's "strongest asset. I want to emphasize this above everything else, because the overwhelming success of the English major and the widespread appeal of the minor and the teaching option, and the relative ease of internship placements, speaks highly of every individual involved. Moreover, the *curricula vitae* of the faculty members demonstrate impressive and visible commitment to all three areas of professorship—teaching, research, and service. I would welcome any of them as a colleague in my R1 school without question" (p. 8).
3. The external reviewer comments that the program has "undertaken assessment in a meaningful, self-determining manner, using mandated reviews to help it gain greater clarity for its own strategic planning while inviting university administrators to support its many student-centered initiatives" (p. 2). The external reviewer also indicated that "both the report and the review process reveal a [program] that works as a cohesive unit, while still giving room to individual ideas, voices, and processes" (p. 2).
4. The English program reflects upon prior and ongoing assessments to make changes within the curriculum. It was noted that the program review "clearly documents careful reflection on the last external program review in the context of the many changes that have taken place within the disciplinary strands (literary analysis, linguistics, creative writing) brought together within the department, as well as their responsiveness to the findings of their year-by-year internal assessments" (p. 2). Additionally, the reviewer noted that "historically, the [program] has proven that it will respond appropriately and with alacrity to areas in need of improvement, and continual improvement has been noted across the board in the last seven years' worth of assessment reports" (p. 3).
5. The curriculum supports all learning outcomes provided, fully integrates the university's general education requirements, provides practical and professional learning experiences, and is based upon "a solid core of knowledge that supports the entire learning experience for students" (p. 2).
6. The curriculum clearly reflects and supports "contemporary trends in the discipline and engages students in an intensive experience with language systems, literature and literary analysis, writing and oral expression, research, and self-reflection" (p. 2).
7. The established annual portfolio review is an area of assessment that "fosters greater metacognition among the students and gives faculty many more opportunities to monitor student learning" (p. 2).
8. The external reviewer noted that the English program "works assiduously to ensure that the programmatic learning outcomes are consistently transparent at all levels: handbook/advising sheets/website, course syllabi, portfolio assessment program is of high quality with engaged students and faculty" (p. 3).
9. The required internship provides practical experience for all English majors.

10. Courses within the major are current and reflective of discipline standards.
11. The tenure-track faculty actively engage in research. The reviewer notes that “Faculty research is innovative and showcases traditional research-based writing, creative endeavors, grant writing, presentations, and other forms of scholarly activity” (p. 5).
12. Regarding the program’s ability to integrate classroom learning with practical experience, including our Writer Reads series, the public readings included in each creative writing course, and our previous hosting of the Northern Plains Conference on Early British Literature, the reviewer notes “The visiting lecture/artists series has provided a standard of excellence that benefits both faculty and students as well as others on the campus. The department hosts conferences and engages in public readings and events, demonstrating integration of education and practical experience” (p. 5).
13. All faculty maintain regular service commitments.
14. A blending of a dedicated academic advisor with a faculty advisor for each student further engages students within the major.
15. The program continues to make significant strides in remaining relevant and making innovative curricular changes.

Weaknesses

1. Faculty have a heavy teaching load while maintaining significant service contributions.
2. Lack of a program-specific strategic plan and a program-specific mission statement. These would help form a clear collective identity of the program.
3. Lack of more well-developed areas of diversity within class curriculum.

2(B). Briefly summarize the review recommendations

1. Add a tenure line or a full-time instructor line: “I would urge the senior administrators to reward the efforts of the department, who have consistently maintained at least the third largest degree program in the College of Arts and Sciences. There are multiple areas in which the faculty could use additional support; I leave it up to them to choose the area in most need. If a full tenure line cannot be added, then a full-time instructor position might be considered instead” (p. 8).
2. Add regular part-time instructors/lecturers to cover composition classes to allow for more class offerings in each faculty member’s specialty area: “the popularity of the English major, coupled with the general education classes supported by the department, results in tenured and tenure-track faculty devoting 75% of their load to composition. This deprives the students, and the NSU campus community, of more courses in each faculty member’s specialty area” (p. 8).

3. Free up the current faculty so that they can devote more time to research, which will, in turn, benefit their teaching performance and job satisfaction: “I strongly encourage the administration to consider creating opportunities for single course reductions available on a rotating basis, perhaps with additional opportunities being made available on a competitive basis” (p. 8).
4. Adjust course enrollment caps for online composition and remedial courses: “The Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), which is the leading organization on the teaching of college writing, states that no more than 20 students be permitted in any writing class (remedial being limited to 15 students). Current cap numbers [for online composition and remedial courses] at NSU have risen substantially above this number to 24-25” (p. 8).
5. Centralization by establishing a point person within the English program faculty for B.S.Ed. majors: “Requirements for teaching certification change regularly, and course substitutions, while possible, are also always in flux. . . A point person would be knowledgeable in this area, advise teaching education majors, sit on relevant education and pedagogy committees, and serve as a liaison to the School of Education” (p. 9).
 - NOTE: the external reviewer also indicated that there should be a centralized point person within the English program faculty for internships. The English program faculty have considered this in the past but have all agreed that it is best for individual faculty to work closely with their advisees on internships rather than having one point person. Additionally, all of the rationale provided by the reviewer for assuring consistency in having a point person for internships are tasks that are already all firmly established (i.e. a centralized digitized system for internships, a set number of reflections, a weekly assessment, etc.). Because this was noted by the reviewer, even though these are items already in place, the English program faculty will revisit and further discuss the viability of this possibility.
6. In future program reviews and possibly annual assessments, consider inquiring of the most recent alumni how their internship experience directly affected their chosen career path and/or established career field.
7. An identity building program retreat to clarify and design program strategic plan and mission statement wherein program faculty would “spend time away from campus (two days should be sufficient) and distractions, devoted solely to such discussions, [which] would help get faculty in the proper mindset for creating such a fundamental document” (p. 6)
8. There need to be consistency among certain sections of each syllabi: “For instance, there are inconsistencies in standard information as it appears in the appendix to the report I received. Some syllabi include an ADA paragraph; some do not. Some syllabi include a Land Acknowledgement statement; most do not. Most syllabi include a plagiarism statement; some do not. . . . As well, it seems as though the South Dakota Board of Regents has specific policies about academic freedom and freedom of learning that more than half the department includes in syllabi, so a uniform adoption seems in order. Additional sections might include one on academic success support/Starfish and one on the writing center” (p. 6).

9. Using inclusive language on all syllabi: “the department might consider taking a stand on using inclusive language in all syllabi and any other forward-facing document. In other words, if all official departmental correspondence uses inclusive language (e.g., humanity or humankind instead of ‘mankind’), there is a cohesive identity presented. This would also aid with diversity goals” (p. 6).
10. The reviewer noted a need for more PR of the English program: “the public relations unit of NSU might be encouraged to promote the department within the immediate community more effectively thereby allowing a collective identity to develop through additional exposure and interaction. Considering the success they have had in recruiting students, and specifically English majors, to campus, it seems out of place that this promotion has not already been undertaken. Perhaps closer ties with the public library and local newspaper would also assist in this promotion? I am uncertain of the department’s role in boosting PR, and it seems to me the faculty have enough responsibilities already; however, I thought this deficit should be highlighted.
11. Fine-tuning the curriculum through adapting the emphasis areas within the major into transcriptable certificates “This will not only allow your current majors to formally claim their area of interest, but also it will allow you to capture more non-major/non-minor students” (p. 7).
12. Expand our emphasis areas by at least on in adding a Linguistics emphasis/transcriptable certificate separate from the TESL emphasis.
13. Incorporate a science writing class into the curriculum: “Since team-teaching and collaboration are relatively easy to incorporate at NSU . . . the [program] might consider partnering with a science to offer a science-writing course. Such classes are growing in scope and popularity in science and engineering schools” (p. 7).
14. Change our Media Studies emphasis to a Digital Humanities emphasis to keep up with current trends in the field.
15. More diversity within each course: “I recommend faculty take a close look at their course materials, including syllabi, to review them for diversity opportunities. There are a number of syllabi in the report I received that feature only white male authors (mostly upper class), or perhaps have a single person of color or solitary female author on them. Think outside the canon. Strive for at least 33% of the syllabus to be non-white male dominated and strive to include non-Christian authors and texts as appropriate” (p. 10). Additionally, “An integrated curriculum that places the same value on diverse literature as British or American Literature could feature a rotating selection as a requirement. Or these could be found under the “social contexts” area. Indigenous Literature taught by your incoming faculty member will be a boon. But LGBTQIA literature, Black Literature, Asian Literature, and Latino/a Literature would also be good choices” (p. 11).
16. Incorporate more direct public speaking opportunities into the major courses: “One possibility could be to make it a consistent requirement that students prepare a

presentation (poster, PowerPoint, shortened version of their paper, etc.) for public presentation (outside of class) during the Senior Seminar course. This might have the potential to enhance students' sense of completion of the program while also offering a visible, public showcase for student research and creativity, sort of a 'mini conference' experience" (p. 11).

2(C). Indicate the present and continuous actions to be taken by the college or department to address the issues raised by the review. What outcomes are anticipated as a result of these actions?

1. Update the program section of the departmental website to make it more informative and engaging and work with the NSU Office of Communications and Marketing to better market the major and minors. **Anticipated outcome:** recruitment tool to increase enrollment within the major or minor
2. Establish a strategic plan specific to the English program and develop a more clearly defined mission statement that sets us apart from any other generalized mission of a standard English program. **Anticipated outcome:** identity building of the program.
3. Establish transcriptable certification of emphasis areas. **Anticipated outcome:** opening up certification within the program to non-English majors and provide opportunity for majors to have identifiable certification on their transcripts.
4. Continue to update curriculum and establish more diversity within course curriculum. **Anticipated outcome:** a more diverse set of course offerings.
5. Establish more visibility for undergraduate research within the major. **Anticipated outcomes:** recruitment, celebration of current majors/minors and alumni, highlighting faculty research and specializations, highlighting student research and public speaking abilities.
6. Offer a departmental student research day (perhaps during an annual Communication Studies Week) to highlight top papers in a conference-like format. **Anticipated outcomes:** students would submit their work for consideration at NSU's Undergraduate Research and Scholarship Forum with potential to present at the National Conference on Undergraduate Research or at the COPLAC Regional Undergraduate Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities Conference; highlighting student achievements would lead to program visibility and further enrollments within the major/minor.
7. Consider outreach to programs within the social and physical sciences. **Anticipated outcomes:** highlighting the beneficial aspects of specific English literature and writing courses on these programs, particularly in developing cohesive work teams.

3. Starting in Fall 2019 reporting year, campuses will identify the undergraduate cross-curricular skill requirements as part of programmatic student learning outcomes and

identify assessment methods for cross-curricular skill requirements as outlined in Board Policy 2:11. Program review completed prior to Fall 2019 need not include cross curricular skills.

Student Learning Outcomes and corresponding BOR Cross-Curricular Skill in bold italics:

1. Students will demonstrate a knowledge of Anglophone, regional, and world literature across a breadth of literary periods, to make connections between those works and the historical/cultural context within which they were produced and make connections between a literary work and the students' own cultural/personal context. Cross-curricular skill: Intercultural Knowledge.
2. Students will demonstrate the ability to use literary terms accurately and appropriately. Cross-curricular skill: Inquiry and Analysis.
3. Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze literary texts critically and deeply. Cross-curricular skill: Inquiry and Analysis.
4. The student demonstrates his/her knowledge of the range and influence of print and non-print media and technology in contemporary culture. Cross-curricular skill: Information Literacy.
5. Students will be able to write coherent essays that employ the appropriate and responsible use of secondary sources, as well as employ a range of rhetorical conventions appropriate for expository prose, creative writing, or journalism. Cross-curricular skill: Critical and Creative Thinking.
6. Students will demonstrate a professionally appropriate understanding of the structure of language, including usage patterns of standard American grammar. Cross-curricular skill: Foundational Lifelong Learning Skills.
7. Students will demonstrate growth in language usage and sophistication as a reader, as well as demonstrate self-efficacy in his/her ability to identify areas for improvement or potential growth. Cross-curricular skill: Foundational Lifelong Learning Skills.