The English Major has four options: Literature, Education, Creative Writing, and Professional Writing.

The department has been conducting assessment according to the newly established PP-PAR procedures for two years now. Lead professors from each emphasis were asked to convene the group of teachers who were most involved in offering courses or experiences within a given option. Meetings were to be held at the end of the spring 2016 semester (with an alternative meeting time of late August or early September).

The springboard of discussion at this year’s assessment meetings are the student exit surveys conducted in the 2015-2016 academic year. The meetings also examined the previous year’s assessment report. In some discussions further ideas for program improvement (those generated by the exit surveys and beyond those suggested in exit surveys) were generated.

This report summarizes—first in tabular form, further on in detail—the 2015-2016 results. Twenty action items were proposed in 2014 and four in 2015; most were accomplished or addressed. This report proposes new interventions for 2016-2017.

Results in Tabular Format
2014-2015

Each of the 2014-2015 Literature Option’s actions were implemented or otherwise satisfactorily disposed of as noted in last year’s report.

Each of the 2014-2015 Education Option’s actions were implemented or otherwise satisfactorily disposed of as noted in last year’s report with the exception of a part of #5 and #6, and more data showing success with #5 and #6 became available with the 2015-2016 Exit Surveys. Thus, Actions #5 and #6 reappear in this year’s report.

Each of the 2014-2015 Creative Writing Option’s actions were implemented or otherwise satisfactorily disposed of as noted in last year’s report with the exceptions of #10 and #11. Accordingly, #10 and #11 reappear in this year’s report. This report also discusses for the first time the results of the five action items from the 2015-2016 Creative Writing Assessment meeting.

Each of the 2014-2015 Professional Writing Option’s actions were implemented or otherwise satisfactorily disposed of as noted in last year’s report. However, Actions #16 through #20 have more information on their success and consequently reappear in this year’s report.

2014-2015 Proposals with Additional Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Creative Writ.</th>
<th>Creative Writ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action #</td>
<td>#5</td>
<td>#6</td>
<td>#10</td>
<td>#11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2014-2015 Proposals with Additional Reporting, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>Prof. Writing</th>
<th>Prof. Writing</th>
<th>Prof. Writing</th>
<th>Prof. Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action #</td>
<td>#16</td>
<td>#17</td>
<td>#18</td>
<td>#19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>Prof. Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action #</td>
<td>#20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015-2016

No new actions were proposed in the 2015-2016 cycle for the Literature Option.

No new actions were proposed in the 2015-2016 cycle for the Education Option.

Each of the 2015-2016 Creative Writing Option’s actions were implemented or otherwise satisfactorily disposed of. Results are reported here.

No new actions were proposed in the 2015-2016 cycle for the Professional Writing Option.

2015-2016 Proposals: Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action #</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>Creative Writ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action #</td>
<td>#5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished?</td>
<td>Addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016-2017 Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action #</td>
<td>#1 Lit. list</td>
<td>#2 H.S. list</td>
<td>#3 Crit. Persp.</td>
<td>#4 Crit. Persp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>Creative Writ.</th>
<th>Prof. Writ.</th>
<th>Prof. Writ.</th>
<th>Prof. Writ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action #</td>
<td>#5 Chambers</td>
<td>#6 1-cr. gram.</td>
<td>#7 266/367</td>
<td>#8 merketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>Prof. Writ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action #</td>
<td>#9 visiting professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results from Discussion in the Fall of 2016

**Literature Option Assessment Meeting**
Convened by Marshall Toman.
Present: Annette Klemp, Steve Luebke, Michelle Parkinson, Marshall Toman.
Date: August 29, 2016.

Each of the 2014-2015 Literature Option’s actions were implemented or otherwise satisfactorily disposed of and none were proposed for 2015-2016.

Discussion for 2016-2017 highlights the following.
There was expressed a desire of promoting the Literature Option as destination major rather than a default. While going to high school literature courses was examined as an intervention, the difficulties of connecting to high schools along with the need to coordinate with recruiting efforts in the Admissions Office suggested that this idea remain below the level of an action item. The TESOL program contemplated such an intervention with the Modern Language program and other departments have suggested the same; however, the imaginative fire that might have kindled the energy to carry out such a project was doused by past failed imaginative sparks’ being drowned in the bureaucratic interfaces and logistics.

One student, clearly a secondary education student who, for some substitution purpose was taking the capstone literature course (ENGL 444, Modern Authors, where the literature option survey is administered), asked that his/her college instructors teach more books that teachers will have to teach in the high schools. A portion of the discussion revolved around the philosophical question of to what degree college teachers are obligated to create lesson plans for students and to what degree professors are obligated to give students the means of creating their own lesson plans. From the phrasing of this debate alone a reader may correctly surmise that individual lesson plans are not deemed to be the goals of professors in the College of Arts and Sciences. A further question that would probably yield a wide range of answers in any survey of high school teachers, which the department is not particularly prepared to conduct, is just how free are teachers to choose their own literary works. However, finally, it was resolved that two actions steps might be taken to address the complaint voiced. One was to upload to our website a list of book that are considered important for English Literature majors to know. Such a list exists within the department. This action should be easy to accomplish; it is listed below. The second action was to attempt to establish what books are being taught at the high school level.

**Literature Option, New Proposals for 2016-2017**
See next page.
Literature Option, New Proposals for 2016-2017

15-16 #1. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: Make easily available to majors a list of books recommended for the person educated in the literature written in English to know. Such a list could serve also as list of books to read prior to applying to graduate school, had everyone but world enough and time. To a lesser degree, the list would also serve potential high school students.
PERSON RESPONSIBLE: The department chair.
TIMELINE: In the fall of 2016, the chair will post such a list to our Department website.
RESULT: TBD.

15-16 #2. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: Research a list of books frequently taught in high schools and post that list on a department website, easily available to our English Education students, to help them prepare, outside of classes, for their career.
PERSON RESPONSIBLE: The department chair.
TIMELINE: In the academic year of 2016-2017, the chair will research such a list (or lists) and post it (or them) to our Department website.
RESULT: The chair had some preliminary discussion with Librarian Cory Whipkey, Director of the Textbook Library, about ways to conduct such research.

Also, not in the English Literature discussion but in the English Education discussion, the Literature Option has the opportunity to monitor the quantitative responses to its exit survey question 2C.

16-17 #3. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: Is it possible to teach, in a more memorable manner, the analyzing of literature from different perspectives so that the quantitative results from the Literature Option’s exit survey as well as the Education Option’s exit survey regarding question 2C improve?
ACTION: First, we would like to establish that this possible area to improve warrants an intervention. We will monitor the quantitative responses to question #2C in the Literature Option exit survey.
TIMELINE: The lead professor of the Literature Option will monitor this year’s results in the Literature Option’s exit survey, question number 2C and discuss them in a comparative study to at least last year’s results at the assessment meeting for 2017-2018. He will also consult with the lead professor of the Education Option about the quantitative responses to question 2C in the Education Option’s exit survey.
RESULT: TBD.
**Education Option Assessment Meeting**
Convened by Catherine Ross-Stroud.
Present: Catherine Ross-Stroud, Marshall Toman.
Date: September 7, 2016.

No new actions were proposed for 2015-2016. Each of the 2014-2015 Education Option’s actions were implemented or otherwise satisfactorily disposed of with the exception of a part of #5 and #6 from 2014-2015, and more data showing success with #5 and #6 became available with the 2015-2016 Exit Surveys. Thus, Actions #5 and #6 reappear in this year’s report immediately below.

**14-15 #5. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT:** Students noted a need to be better prepared to teach differently abled and English Language Learners.
ACTION: (1) The instructor for TED 432, Techniques of Teaching English, increased the instruction in this area and includes in her requirements for the design of the unit plan a section that mandates attention to this area. (2) The Learning Outcomes of the program were revised to include a seventh outcome: “Differentiate among learners and choose texts and teaching methods that are accessible to all students in terms of ability, culture, and language.” The venue of assessment is to be TED 432. The artifact is the pertinent section in the required unit plan. (3) A question relating to this competency was included in the exit survey to be distributed by the department.
PERSON RESPONSIBLE: (1) Ross-Stroud is instructor for TED 432. (2 and 3) This education group crafted language of the seventh Learning Outcome and of the corresponding departmental exit survey question; the chair has inserted Learning Outcome into the course map and the question into the departmental exit survey and alumni survey.
TIMELINE (supplemented): (1) Fall semesters, 2014 and 2015, included the pedagogical interventions as will 2016 and future iterations. (2 and 3) The modifications to the course mapping of objectives and to the exit survey and alumni survey have been made and are evident in our Assessment Plan as revised previously.
RESULT (supplemented): Actions outlined were immediately put into effect by Dr. Ross-Stroud. The results discussed this fall related to the exit survey for 2015-2016 (conducted in the fall of 2015) are positive in that no written comments wishing for more instruction in this area existed. However, the additional question was accidentally omitted from the survey so that we do not yet have the statistical results of responses to the added question #7: “7. I am competent in adjusting content materials to students with different abilities, cultures, and languages/dialects.”

**14-15 #6. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT:** In the course of the discussion about teaching English Language Learners, the group noted that all English Education majors should be made aware of the possibility of taking 311, Introduction to Language and Linguistics and along with the necessity of taking 320, Structure of English, and that both would prepare them for the important elective 360, Theory and Methodology of TESOL. Taking 360 as an elective would greatly enhance their employability and 311 prepares the from 360.
ACTION: Advising students to consider taking 360, with or without 311 (as needed) will be carried out by the advisors in the Education Emphasis.
TIMELINE: This advising will begin immediately with the fall advising period and continue.

RESULT (supplemented): Advisors who needed to make changes to their advising presumably did so. The chair, who advises many Education Option students, makes such advising common practice. Although data was not collected to demonstrate the accomplishment of this action, anecdotally it appears from a lack of complaints in the 2015-2016 survey and from observations made by Dr. Ross-Stroud of students’ preparation in this area when they come into TED 432, Techniques, that students are more comfortable teaching ELLs than was the indication in 2014-2015 exit survey responses.

In further discussion, a noticeable call for block scheduling was evident in the exit survey. Eleven respondents are recorded for the exit survey administered in the Techniques course in the Fall of 2015. Of these eleven, eight believed that block scheduling would improve their preparation as teachers.

1. 12/6/15 6:39 p.m.: No comment on block scheduling.

2. 12/5/15 8:57 p.m.: No comment on block scheduling.

3. 12/5/15 2:03 p.m.: I think it would be helpful to have more time in our placement classrooms in order to practice the strategies we are learning in class. The implementation of blocks would also help with this situation.

4. 12/3/15 11:51 p.m.: I would change the fact that English Education students do not get blocks of some kind....

5. 12/3/15 1:37 p.m.: We need to have blocks! I find it very unfair that we do not receive the additional practice in a classroom.

6. 12/2/15 2:41 p.m.: Overall, I think more time could be spent showing and demonstrating how to teach a concept, which I feel is best done through classroom observations.

7. 12/2/15 12:12 p.m.: I wish we had more time in our TED classes and English ED classes to implement our learned teaching strategies in an actual classroom. We learn a lot of good concepts in our TED classes but we never actually get to experience what it is like to teach them to a class....Our field hours allow us to help the teacher with their current lessons but we do not get the chance to create our own lessons and see how the teaching process works for them in an actual classroom setting until we reach student teaching. I feel like it would be helpful if we were able to enter into the Block Program where the Campus classes end and we have the ability to focus on a “pre-student teaching” experience before we enter into our actual Student teaching semester.

8. 12/2/15 11:04 a.m.: One thing I would improve in the program is focusing more on the teaching of English rather than just learning it. I feel as though I am competent in my knowledge of all areas in English from my composition and literature classes and competent in interacting with children from my TED classes, but I have never been instructed on how to teach English to students. I also think it would be helpful to create lessons that we actually teach to classes, such as what is done in blocks. Implementing block schedules would also allow more time in the classroom that is already built around our schedules.
9. 12/1/15 4:31 p.m.: ...I would make the class [TED 432, Techniques of English] into blocks so that it can be the sole focus during the semester, I didn’t feel that I was able to put as much effort into the class as I would have liked because I was taking it with three other classes in order to retain my status as a full time student and keep my scholarship. I believe that making the class into blocks would also allow for time to work on edTPA as well as other aspects of teaching. Another aspect of the program that was I found to be excellent was the field experience hours. It was interesting and I felt I learned a lot from observing a variety of teachers, teaching styles, and grade levels.

10. 12/1/15 4:01 p.m.: If there were some things I would improve in our program, it would be to have much more experience in schools teaching our lesson plans we have created in class, as the elementary education teaching major does. It might not need to be as extensive as that, but a chance to present our lesson plans to a classroom before student teaching would be ideal in preparation.

11. 12/1/15 9:16 a.m.: No comment on block scheduling.

It was the consensus of the Education Option faculty that students believe that they want block scheduling. However, more time in the classroom does not equate to preparing teachers better. The issues with block scheduling—in addition to the one just mentioned which is essentially about its efficacy—though not discussed at this meeting but discussed before are (1) its viability within the department of scheduling required courses outside of the blocked time; (2) the time away from course preparation it takes; (3) the extra time it requires to invest in the cooperation of teaching three courses within the block (e.g., hypothetically, TED 432, Techniques, ENGL 361, Composition Theory, or ENGL 355, Literature-Based Reading Methods for Adolescents, and another required course, such as 441, International Literature).

(1) The preferred English Education major is the Broad Area. Junior and Senior courses would be best scheduled on a TR schedule if blocks were to work as they do for Elementary Education. The department has 10 FTE in tenure lines teaching English and TESOL courses when reassigned time is accounted for. Three faculty teach in the TESOL undergrad or graduate programs. Most of these faculty teach the required TESOL Education courses on a TR schedule to accommodate elementary education majors selecting this good minor. That leaves seven FTE and a crowded TR schedule. Two of these comprise the Creative Writing program, another good minor Education students, and most teach courses are on a TR schedule. We are down, then, to five FTE, and the even more crowded TR schedule—before moving any FTE to a TR schedule to accommodate a hypothetical English Secondary Education block—becomes further apparent. Approximate two FTE would also have to commit to TR schedules. Scheduling so that course do not conflict with one another over an academic year in the six slots open on TR (8:00, 9:30. 11:00, 12:30, 2:00, and 3:30) would be challenging even within the courses taught by English in the Broad Area English program let alone factoring in courses sought out by some of these same students in TESOL and Creative Writing. Such conflicts would affect not only the English Education Option students but also the English Literature Option students whose curriculum largely overlaps.

In terms of credits, 15 credits out of 63 are scheduled by other departments. Of the 48 credits within the department, 33 credits or 11 courses are upper division (300- or 400-level). Again, this analysis shows that TR scheduling would pose challenges.
Traditionally, English Education has preferred, as the course numbering indicates, that its 300-level courses—specifically 361, Composition Theory, and 355, Literature-Based Reading Methods for Adolescents—be taken before the 400-level Techniques course, yet these two courses are prime contenders to be taught together within the block. Again, though not an insuperable challenge, the change would take much thought and careful management and most probably unintended consequences would appear no matter how much thought were to be put into the project before effecting it.

(2) This issue of less time for courses is a worry. It does not escape us, however, that even if, with some instruction tailored to classroom settings, there is less time to cover other material in a given course, what might be given up through such classroom instruction time could be compensated for in other ways if one thinks of the student’s pre-service preparation in an encompassing manner.

(3) The demands of extra time are important to consider. In previous discussions, there was some conjecture that if extra time were required, there would be a way to compensate it.

In other discussion for quality improvement, we noted that all of our English Education students passed the edTPA examination. The process acts as an external reviewer and stamp of approval to our program. By contrast, it was asserted that the Elementary Education students who are placed into Block Scheduling believe that they will do very well on the edTPA process of review. However, in fact, not all do in fact perform well.

Also, the scores held steady on the belief that our students were well prepared in content knowledge.

It was asserted that the scores on their belief that they can analyze literature from different perspectives was down slightly although of the eleven responses three strongly agreed and eight agreed. In the Literature Option exit survey from 2015-2016, the same question is asked. Of eleven respondents there, five strongly agreed, four agreed, one slightly agreed, and one strongly disagreed. This question (#2C in both the Literature Option Survey and in the Education Option Survey) will be monitored. See next page.

**Education Option, New Proposals for 2016-2017**

**16-17 #4. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT:** Teaching in a more memorable manner the analyzing of literature from different perspectives.

**ACTION:** First, we would like to establish that this possible area to improve warrants an intervention. We will monitor the quantitative responses to question #2C in the Education Option exit survey.

**PERSON RESPONSIBLE:** The lead professor of the Education Option.

**TIMELINE:** The lead professor of the Education Option will monitor this year’s results in the Education exit survey question number 2C and discuss them in a comparative study to at least last year’s results at the assessment meeting for 2017-2018. She will also consult with the lead professor of the Literature Option about the quantitative responses to question 2C in the Literature Option’s exit survey.

**RESULT:** TBD.
Creative Writing Option Assessment Meeting
Convened by Joe Rein.
Present: Jenny Brantley, Steve Luebke, Joe Rein, Marshall Toman.
Date: September 6, 2016.

Each of the 2014-2015 Creative Writing Option’s actions were implemented or otherwise satisfactorily disposed of with the exceptions of #10 and #11. Accordingly, #10 and #11 reappear in this year’s report immediately below.

Each of the 2015-2016 Creative writing Option’s actions were implemented or otherwise satisfactorily disposed of. The results for each is reported on here for the first time.

14-15 #10. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: We want to maintain or increase our Creative Writing majors. Our screenwriting course is an attractive feature to prospective students. The fact that the instructor has had a screenplay turned into a film can be used as a recruitment tool.
ACTION: The instructor for our Screenwriting course will post clips or the entirety of his film “15 Minutes with Jacob” with a link to the English homepage.
PERSON RESPONSIBLE: The instructor and chair will work with the CAS webmaster.
TIMELINE: The video can be posted only after it is out of the film houses, which is likely to occur in 2014. We anticipate being able to post the film by February 15, 2015.
RESULT (supplemented): The copyright release conflicted with a crush of new work so that as of August 2016 we have not yet accomplished the proposed action. However, accomplishing this intervention should be possible now.
As a result of the fall 2016 assessment meeting, the chair learned that “15 Minutes with Jacob” is now available to view in its entirety via the Internet. The instructor emailed the link to the chair. The chair undertakes to make the link available on the department website.

14-15 #11. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: We want to maintain or increase our Creative Writing majors. Displaying the research and creative work of faculty in a virtual Scholars Gallery and Artists Gallery would allow prospective students to see the range and depth of the faculty.
ACTION: The Department Office will procure a framing device to display the front cover of a faculty member’s book or the journal published in facing the first page of the article, short story, or poem.
PERSON RESPONSIBLE: The chair will investigate how the framing and photographing can be managed. Once sufficient images to begin populating a virtual gallery are assembled, the CAS web person’s help will be enlisted to link them to our homepage.
TIMELINE (revised): The gallery site off the English Department homepage should be functioning for incremental additions by February 15, 2016.
RESULT (supplemented): The chair did conduct research on who might be the framing agent for this project. However, this goal was subsequently preempted by a similar plan for the entire college. Consequently, we have recalibrated this goal to be an appearance of work, similarly framed but in a pdf document, on the English
Department website. In order to make the opportunity available to all members of the department, the opportunity will be discussed at the first department meeting. We hope some examples can be available by that meeting time of September 14, 2016.

15-16 #1. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: In keeping with our intention of bringing in Visiting Writers, we will host J. Ryan Stradal, author of *Kitchens of the Great Midwest* in a symbiotic operation that will work with the February River Falls Reads program, which has chosen this author and novel the 2016 River Falls Reads program.

**ACTION:** Arrangements for the author to have a public reading in the Breezeway and a book signing will be made.

**PERSON RESPONSIBLE:** Marshall and the Creative Writing group.

**TIMELINE:** When the exact dates of the author’s arrival in River Falls are known (through Marshall, a member of the organizing board of River Falls Reads), Marshall will confer the group and establish the afternoon of the reading and reserve the Breezeway space.

**RESULT:** J. Ryan Stradal was hosted to good effect. He spoke at UWRF in the Davee Library Breezeway and at the River Falls Public Library. Because *Kitchens of the Great Midwest* features foods of the Midwest (the first chapter is titled “Lutefisk,” for example) and because habanero peppers play an important role in the novel and because J. Ryan’s parents met at UWRF, our dairy plant produced 100 servings of a chocolate habanero ice cream. The public library purchased the ice cream and gave it out at the reading to members of the audience. J. Ryan posted a picture of the ice cream container on his website.

15-16 #2. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: In keeping with our intention of bringing in Visiting Writers, we will host a visiting writer in the fall or spring semester chosen from a recommendation from the Creative Writing group.

**ACTION:** Arrangements for the author to have a public reading in the Breezeway and a book signing will be made.

**PERSON RESPONSIBLE:** Creative Writing group.

**TIMELINE:** When the exact dates of the author’s arrival in River Falls are known, the group will confer and establish the afternoon of the reading and reserve the Breezeway space.

**RESULT:** We did not accomplish this action. Reasons include morale (largely attributable to the current political climate as fostered by state leadership toward state higher education and its faculty and staff), illness, and energy put into other endeavors (which continue despite morale challenges).

15-16 #3. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: Revise the exit survey to include a question regarding professionalism to that list. The current questions do not ask students whether they feel prepared to enter either the writing or the job market. We want to monitor this perception.

**ACTION:** Change the Exit Survey and monitor responses looking for possible further interventions.

**PERSON RESPONSIBLE:** Marshall will change the Exit Survey for Creative Writing. Monitoring will be done by all.
TIMELINE: The Exit Survey will be modified in the fall of 2015. The new question will generate data starting in the next iteration, Spring 2016.

RESULT: The exit survey for the Creative Writing Option was revised and implemented. The Assessment Plan was accordingly updated to reflect the current exit survey.

15-16 #4. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: Revise the exit survey to include a question regarding publication to that list. The current questions do not ask students whether they feel prepared to enter either the writing or the job market. We want to monitor this perception.
ACTION: Change the Exit Survey and monitor responses looking for possible further interventions.
PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Marshall will change the Exit Survey for Creative Writing. Monitoring will be done by all.
TIMELINE: The Exit Survey will be modified in the fall of 2015. The new question will generate data starting in the next iteration, Spring 2016.
RESULT: The exit survey for the Creative Writing Option was revised and implemented. The Assessment Plan was accordingly updated to reflect the current exit survey.

15-16 #5. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: To enhance the opportunities for our creative writing students who are interested in screenwriting, we will pursue discussion with Metropolitan Community and Technical College (MCTC) on Hennepin Avenue in Minneapolis regarding the establishment of a "Midwest Film Institute." They have excellent production capacity. But they have only a two-year degree. For their students to be competitive with film schools like those in NYC and Davix, students need a four-year degree. The basic idea is that students would take courses at both institutions and after two years receive an Associate of Science from MCTC and after four years (or whatever) receive a degree from UWRF and the Midwest Film Institute.
ACTION: Monitor and assist in discussion between the faculty in SASA and faculty at MCTC.
PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Toman will remain connected to the project; Rein will participate in as the screenwriter at UWRF.
TIMELINE: The possibly unrealistic goal will be the establishment of the first class in the fall of 2016.
RESULT: Marshall, Brad Caskey, Erik Johnson, Robin Murray, and two faculty from MCTC have met in August of 2015 in River Falls to lay the preliminary groundwork. Subsequent developments suggest that this excellent idea will not be possible.

Creative Writing Option, New Proposals for 2016-2017
See next page.
Creative Writing Option, New Proposals for 2016-2017

The Creative Writing group concluded that the exit surveys basically looked good.

The instructor of ENGL 369, writing Fiction mentioned some tweaks to his course (moving a lecture about genre earlier in the course, reinforcing some of the basic elements of fiction, such as characterization and dialogue, rather than assuming familiarity as a result of the required prerequisite of ENGL 262, Introduction to Creative Writing). Given that not all advanced students here take their ENGL 262 from UWRF instructors since they might be transfer students or gifted high school students who took creative writing introductions that carried college credit and given the normal, regrettable “brain dump” that students seem to engage in the earliest possible moments but particularly at the end of semesters, the tweaks seem most reasonable and merited. The tweaks were inspired by attention to the exit survey results.

A comment or two about publishing opportunities did not create a belief that an intervention was necessary. We have addressed this desire expressed by students. To do even more risks overemphasizing the profession of a writer or, worse, of a genre writer. As one student noted in the survey, even the amount of discussion on publishing that existed was beginning to “hamper my creativity.”

In the line of bringing more visiting writers to campus, the one action contemplated by the group was to bring alum Christopher Chambers to campus. He is an editor of literary magazines. Professional Writing students might profit from his presentation as well since he is someone who works in the publishing world.

**15-16 #5. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT:** We may have an opportunity to bring a professional editor of literary magazines to campus in alum Christopher Chambers.

**PERSON RESPONSIBLE:** Creative Writing group.

**TIMELINE:** We will plan a visit for the 2016-2017 academic year.

**RESULT:** TBD.
Professional Writing Option Assessment Meeting
Convened by Mialisa Moline.
Present: Greta Gaard, Mialisa Moline, Marshall Toman.
Date: September 9, 2016.

Each of the 2014-2015 Professional Writing Option’s actions were implemented or otherwise satisfactorily disposed of. However, Actions #16 through #20 have more information on their success and consequently reappear in this year’s report.

14-15 #16. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: Students voiced a desire to gain greater familiarity with software programs in the field. To some degree, this learning can be done individually, online. And a program at a teaching institution may have difficulty keeping up with all of the innovations in the field. However, a course that teaches one or more programs (depending on the number of credits for the course) would be seen as beneficial.
ACTION: Decide on the nature of such a course (one credit, more?) and the place of such a course (in the directed electives?) in the program. Have present faculty or an ad hoc hire create such a course.
PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Moline will bring the deliberation to a conclusion. A faculty member will be identified.
TIMELINE: Moline is on sabbatical in the fall of 2014. Therefore, continued discussion and identification of a faculty member will occur in the spring semester of 2015.
RESULT (supplemented): Such a course was developed and offered in the Spring of 2015. However, due to underenrollment the course needed to be cancelled. I would characterize this quick response to a perceived need as having accomplished the action envisioned. Perhaps the intervention was based on too little data. We may attempt to offer the course again, budget permitting, with even better advertising of its availability to further test its desirability.

The desire expressed by the students continues to be addressed in individual courses. ENGL 374, Cyber Literacy, asks student to create a website and allows class time for them to develop their skills in creating such a site in class. Photoshop is used. ENGL 270, Visual Rhetoric, requires the creation of a poster. Students tend to use Photoshop, but PowerPoint, InDesign, or Illustrator are other possibilities. The instructor would prefer students to familiarize themselves with Illustrator. However, given what the course needs to cover, that preference cannot be mandated since the same amount of class time that can be devoted to software learning in ENGL 374 is not available in ENGL 270.

14-15 #17. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: Some assignments in the ENGL 387, Technical and Professional Editing course can be made more effective. However, since some assignments in that course are connected to program assessment, modification must proceed with caution.
ACTION: Implement modifications to the assignments in the next offering, and respond to any changes needed in the artifacts gathered for program assessment as a result of modifications.
PERSON RESPONSIBLE: The course's current instructor, Dr. Mialisa Moline.
TIMELINE: The next iteration of the course is in the spring of 2015. Important modifications will occur in that iteration as needed. If necessitating a change in the English Assessment Plan for the Professional Writing Emphasis, the modifications will be considered in light of the Assessment Plan and adjustments will be made to the plan in the spring of 2015.

**RESULT (supplemented):** The presumption is that the revision will take place.

Revisions did indeed take place. None required a change in the Assessment Plan. The fall 2016 Assessment Meeting for the Professional Writing Option did not note continued dissatisfaction in this area.

14-15 #18. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: Is ENGL 251, Advanced Composition, in its current one-size fits all four emphases the best course, as is, for the Professional Writing Emphasis?
ACTION: The instructors of the course (Furniss, Gaard, Ross-Stroud, and Hunzer) and the program leads (Toman, Rein, Moline) will meet to discuss.
PERSON RESPONSIBLE: The chair of the department will invite the above identified faculty to discuss the issue.
TIMELINE: Because Moline is on sabbatical in the fall of 2014, meeting will occur in the spring semester of 2015.

**RESULT (supplemented):** The discussion of modification or replacement of ENGL 251 resulted in the status quo.

The status quo can be viewed as particularly appropriate given the spring 2015 changes to the General Education writing program. The changes were caused by a budget reduction. The result, however, was that now many students take only ENGL 200 in General Education whereas formerly ENGL 100 followed by ENGL 200 was the norm. When English majors were taking their third composition course (ENGL 251) under the former dispensation, there was greater cause to wonder whether differentiation in that third course were advisable. Now, however, most English majors take only ENGL 200 as their college writing course. Following this course with ENGL 251, Advanced Writing, in its one-size-fits-all manifestation seems to us to have more justification.

14-15 #19. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: The Professional Writing Emphasis lacks a history of rhetoric course. Students need the history of Western thought on rhetoric. This course should be at the 400-level and perhaps be called “Advanced Rhetorical Studies.”
ACTION: The decision of how to add such a course to the Professional Writing Emphasis will be part of the discussion of program change that was spoken of earlier.
PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Moline will lead the group to a decision.
TIMELINE: Because Moline is on sabbatical in the fall of 2014, the discussion, as stated, will occur in the spring semester of 2015.

**RESULT (supplemented):** Not yet accomplished.

However, we now believe the action item is sufficiently addressed. See the next paragraph. This action item is correspondingly being upgraded from a “not accomplished” to “addressed.”
The history of rhetoric is rather being infused into ENGL 362, Introduction to Rhetorical Studies. Further, the exit survey discussed in the fall 2016 meeting reveals a decided dislike on the part of students for the history. Students are interested in the applications of any particular idea, not the historical context in which such an idea arose. While the department is determined to maintain the Professional Writing Option in a Liberal Arts tradition, the infusion of the history of rhetoric rather than a stand-alone course is contemplated as adequate for now.

14-15 #20. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: Further curricular change may be beneficial to the Professional Writing Emphasis. Besides the software course, exit surveys indicated a desire for grammar courses (should there be one or a series? For credit or a workshop approach? Online or not? Would ENGL 320, Structure of English [a grammar course] fill the need?). There was interest in Writing for Nonprofit Institutions.
ACTION: The decision of how to develop and add such a course(s) to the Professional Writing Emphasis will be part of the discussion of program change that was spoken of earlier.
PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Moline will lead the group to a decision.
TIMELINE: Because Moline is on sabbatical in the fall of 2014, the discussion, as stated, will occur in the spring semester of 2015.
RESULT (supplemented): Not yet accomplished.

At this juncture in time, we now believe the action item has been addressed. See the next paragraph. This action item is correspondingly being upgraded from a “No, not accomplished” to a “Yes.”

For the summer of 2016, Dr. Moline developed a one-credit grammar and mechanics course to be taught online. However, as a Special Topics course, it was decided to drop the course from the summer schedule in the fear that it would be underenrolled. This course can now be run through the regular curricular processes. Given that the shape of the course is now decided upon, which was the essence of the previous action item, we consider that action completed, but in its place we have generated a new action item, to get the course as envisioned through the curricular processes this academic year. See action 16-17 #6 below.

In further discussion during the Professional Writing Option assessment meeting, the following occurred.

More thought was spent on internships, especially the desirability of requiring them versus the lack of resources to make that requirement realistic for everyone. A worry exists that sometimes students who are too weak to be able to perform in a way that would promote the reputation of the program and of the university desire internships. We left off discussion with satisfaction at the status quo, which encourages internships for Professional Writing majors where appropriate.

One comment suggested that ENGL 253, Introduction to Literary Studies, where different critical theories are presented in the context of close readings was not relevant to the interests of Professional Writing students. The three-credit course is an elective among the nine credits or writing electives. Given the course’s emphasis on depth, connotations, denotations,
metaphor, and above all style, each of these aspects helpful for talking about rhetorical choices, the comment was deemed invalid.

As currently taught, MARC 311, Persuasion, does not focus on what is needed for Professional Writing majors. The focus is rather strictly on persuasion in advertising. The exit survey revealed praise for a different course, COMS 312, Argumentation and Decision Making. Advising: COMS 312 as good. Because of the course’s availability as well as student satisfaction, COMS 312 has been used to substitute into either the writing or the language directed electives categories. At its next meeting, the Professional Writing group will consider whether making COMS 312 a permanent part of a directed electives category.

Existing still are complaints that ENGL 266, Business Writing, and ENGL 367, Technical Writing, are too similar. To a degree, the courses’ similarity has been acknowledged and addressed in a previous action item that made only one or the other of the two courses required rather than having both required. However, students may still elect to take both, one as a required course and one as a three-credits course toward the nine credits in directed electives in writing. Therefore, distinguishing between the two courses remains important. The action decided upon is based on clarifying for the students the actual differences between the two courses, even where genres may overlap. The lead professor will meet with the group to outline language to purvey to the students about the actual differences in our attempt to counteract the seeming similarity. Meeting with Alan and Greta about distinguishing the proposal assignments in 266 and 367. See action 16-17 #7 below.

Marketing the major more was seen to be advisable. Dr. Moline will research the possibilities with Professor of Marketing Communications Dave Bonko. See action 16-17 #8 below.

It was suggested that having alums come back to speak to students and to have this occur earlier than and outside of just the (ENGL 494) Senior Seminar would be good. Two people come to 494 (a visual artist and a creative writing) already come to 494 to critique student projects. See action 16-17 #9 below.

Discussion concluded with the mention of students who have recently been successful. Both Haley and Jake Ryan had jobs before graduation (law school and a publishing company, respectively). Ben Jerry and Aurora Butler were also mentioned as working in the field and still in touch.

**Professional Writing Option, New Proposals for 2016-2017**

15-16 #6. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: Add a one-credit grammar and mechanics course to the curriculum.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Dr. Mialisa Moline, lead instructor in the field of Professional Writing.

TIMELINE: This course will be approved in time to offer it during the summer of 2017.

RESULT: TBD.
15-16 #7. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: Clarifying for students the actual differences between ENGL 266, Business Writing, and ENGL 367, Technical Writing, despite seeming similarities.
PERSON RESPONSIBLE: The lead professor of Professional Writing will meet with the instructors teaching 266 and 367 to discuss the differences and come to agreement on the vocabulary that can be used with students to assist in their seeing the differences and to get them to stop repeating the allegation that the courses are too similar.
TIMELINE: The meeting will occur before December 1, 2016.
RESULT: TBD.

15-16 #8. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: Market the Professional Writing major more.
PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Dr. Mialisa Moline, lead instructor in the field of Professional Writing.
TIMELINE: Dr. Moline will consult with Marketing Communications Professor Dave Bonko regarding how the major might be additionally marketed and report on ideas generated.
RESULT: TBD.

15-16 #9. OPPORTUNITY FOR POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT: Invite professional writers to campus.
PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Dr. Mialisa Moline, lead instructor in the field of Professional Writing, will consult with the Creative Writing group. There is already some momentum to bring Christopher Chambers, an editor now living in Madison, to UWRF to speak. See 2016-2017 action #5.
TIMELINE: Dr. Moline will consult during the academic year.
RESULT: TBD.