English, Department of

Professional Activities And Service

Goal Description:

The faculty will engage in professional activities and service at a level appropriate for the individual faculty member's rank.

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

To Provide Professional Service

Performance Objective Description:

English faculty will take part in service activities at local, state, regional, national, and/or international levels.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Professional Service Activities

KPI Description:

The number of professional service activities--local, state, regional, national, and/or international--by the Department's tenure-track faculty will indicate engagement in professional service.

Results Description:

Professional Service Activities

Department of English faculty are highly engaged in fulfilling a variety of service commitments, as the following list of service activities attests:

Department = 67 (21 faculty)
College = 17 (13 faculty)
University = 72 (18 faculty)
Community = 18 (10 faculty)
Editorships = 4 (3 faculty)
Associate Editorships/Editorial Boards= 5 (5 faculty)
Other = 23 (10 faculty)

These activities represent substantive professional service on the part of our faculty, and every faculty member was active in terms of service. Thus, we met our goal of 100% of the faculty participating in service activities.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

No immediate actions

Action Description:

The department has met all goals related to this item. Although we will discuss whether we should raise expectations, our focus will remain on actions relating to departmental matters that need more attention.

Quality Instruction

Goal Description:

Faculty in the Department of English will demonstrate quality in the instruction of their classes.

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

To Teach Effectively

Performance Objective Description:

The Department's faculty will maintain a level of instruction at or above the average for all departments at SHSU.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Demonstration Of Teaching Effectiveness

KPI Description:

Successful teaching will be demonstrated by faculty performance on the Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) Class Evaluation System. The IDEA survey is a nationally-normed, university-adopted evaluation instrument which measures student perception of instructor teaching. The faculty of the Department of English will average at least 4.2 (the university's average) on the IDEA student evaluations of teaching. Part of quality instruction is also adherence to stringent student evaluation; courses need to be interesting yet not too easy.

Results Description:

Teaching Effectiveness, IDEA Scores

The faculty of the Department of English averaged better than the university's average of 4.2. The averages are as follows:

Tenured/tenure-track faculty: 4.3 (N = 47)
Lecturers (adjunct faculty):   4.2 (N = 54)
Graduate Assistants: 4.1 (N = 8)

Average for all teachers: 4.24

Discussion: The average of 4.24 IDEA summary score reflects the good instruction that the Department of English provides.This average is slightly lower than last year'saverage of 4.3, so it is fair to say that while the difference is not very large, we need to consider how we may raise our scores as a faculty. Much of the teaching in English consists of service to other departments, aswe offerthe core freshman and sophomore courses. Full faculty scores are slightly higher (4.3) than adjunct and TA scores (4.2 and 4.1, respectively), which reflects the fact that adjuncts and TAs teach mostly freshman composition—courses that are required of all students as part of the core.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

No immediate actions

Action Description:

The department has met all goals related to this item. Although we will discuss whether we should raise expectations, our focus will remain on actions relating to departmental matters that need more attention.

Research And Creative Activities Productivity

Goal Description:

The Department's tenured and tenure-track faculty will engage in research and publication.

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS –

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

To Engage Actively In Research And Publication

Performance Objective Description:

The number of peer-reviewed publications, conference presentations, and grant proposals by the Department's tenured and tenure-track faculty will serve as indicators of active research agendas.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Number And Quality Of Publications

KPI Description:

The number of faculty publications will be noted; however, it is important for the faculty and administrators to understand that quality is much more important than quantity. Quality is defined as publication in peer-reviewed print journals or presentation to peer-reviewed conferences. The expectation is the publication of one peer-reviewed article (or equivalent) per faculty member per year.

Results Description:

Research Productivity

Faculty in the Department of English saw the following number of pieces published, accepted for publication, or submitted for publication:

Published = 46 (11 faculty)
Accepted for publication = 26 (10 faculty)
Submitted for publication = 131 (7 faculty)

In sum, 16 faculty members either published, saw accepted for publication, or submitted for publication a piece of scholarship. This represents 67% percent of the department's faculty (N = 24).

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Enhancing Research

Action Description:

The department was very successful in the area of research this cycle, based on the criteria of success stated in the previous PCI. As a new chair, I am happy with the activity of the department in this category; however, currently our goal is only the *number* of publications, grants, etc. I would like to have a new emphasis on the *quality* and impact of publication (i.e. venue) as well as

identifying the research that is most impactful in the field. I will have our research faculty discuss and try to identify ways to qualify the level of research productivity, rather than simply quantify.

Research Agenda

KPI Description:

The number of peer-reviewed publications, conference presentations, and grant proposals by the Department's tenured and tenure-track faculty will serve as indicators of active research agendas. Presenting a paper at a meeting of a professional association and/or publication of one article will certify research productivity. For 2015, we expect that research productivity will increase when compared to 2014.

Results Description:

Research Productivity

The following listing provides a summary of faculty research and publication productivity. The numbers listed follow this format: # published/# accepted for publication/#submitted to a publisher for consideration or in progress

1. Publications
Books 0/2/20
Chapbooks 0/0/4
Edited books 0/1/0

Textbooks 0/0/0 (Note: 3 textbooks are still in print)
Peer reviewed articles 3/5/11
Book chapters 3/8/6
Dictionary/Encyclopedia 0/1/0
Non-peer reviewed articles15/0/0
Conference proceedings1/1/0
Poems 11/6/75
Short stories 3/3/9

Creative Nonfiction 2/0/0
Book reviews 8/0/6
Other 69/0/0

Totals
Peer reviewed published pieces = 46
Accepted = 26
Submitted or in progress = 131

Textbooks published in previous years, still in print = 3

Non-peer reviewed published pieces = 69

Total faculty with a piece either published or accepted for publication = 20 (80%) (N = 25)

2. Conference Presentations = 31

3. Grant Activity
12 grants submitted—6 funded. Total funding = $251K + €500

4. Student Research (under faculty supervision)
Thesis Completion = 6
Graduate Student Publications = 9
Graduate Student Conference Presentations = 6
Undergraduate Research = 24
Undergraduate Publications =
Undergraduate Conference Presentations = 9

Discussion: These figures indicate that, in the aggregate, English faculty are engaged in research and publication. Further, English faculty work with both graduate and undergraduate students to mentor these students and help them prepare papers for publication and presentations to conferences.

In the Plan for Continuous Improvement from the 2014-15 report, we projected the number of publications would be 45, that the number of presentations would be at least 27, and that 100% of faculty would either publish or present at least one piece of scholarship. We met the first two of these. Faculty published 46 individual pieces of peer reviewed scholarship or creative writing and made 31 conference

presentations. We fell short, however, with the third—our goal was 100% of faculty either publishing or presenting, but of the25 faculty in the department, 24 (96%) met this goal. The one who did not had published an edited collection of essays in 2014 and reported three book projects in progress; thus, this does not seem an area of concern.

Enhancing Research
Action Description:
The department was very successful in the area of research this cycle, based on the criteria of success stated in the previous PCI. As a new chair, I am happy with the activity of the department in this category; however, currently our goal is only the *number* of publications, grants, etc. I would like to have a new emphasis on the *quality* and impact of publication (i.e. venue) as well as identifying the research that is most impactful in the field. I will have our research faculty discuss and try to identify ways to qualify the level of research productivity, rather than simply quantify.

Update to Previous Cycle's Plan for Continuous Improvement

Previous Cycle's Plan For Continuous Improvement (Do Not Modify):

Teaching: English faculty teach well, as our average IDEA scores indicate. Should scores for individual teachers fall below the university's average, I will schedule an informal conference with each teacher to offer help, including offering to observe their teaching—if they invite me to visit their classes—and to consider particular responses to specific questions on the IDEA form.

Research: We exceeded the previous PCI's list of expectations in terms of research in all but one category, namely, that 100% of the faculty would either publish a piece of scholarship or present a paper at a professional conference. As for the various aspects to encourage faculty to publish, we completed each of those activities, with the exception of publication in *Nuntii Evansensis*. We did, however, publish faculty research achievement by circulating a list of faculty research and creative activities as reported on the 2014 FES.

Service: We achieved our goal that 100% of the faculty would provide service to the department, college, university, profession, and/or community. We will maintain this as a continuing goal.

Update of Progress to the Previous Cycle's PCI:

1) Faculty members were met with to review IDEA scores and to explore ways to enhance classroom instructions.

2) Faculty resources were allocated in a way to enhance our research profile and to give faculty an opportunity to showcase departmental research projects.

3) Our service goals were met, but we continue to make service equitable among faculty members.

PCI

Closing Summary:

Being a new Chair in the English department, my sense is currently that the faculty seems to be doing a fine job in the areas of research, service, and teaching. While we can strive to continue and even improve these areas, faculty members are, for the most, part on task, allowing us to reach our departmental goals. However, the department as a whole still has large issues to address beyond just faculty productivity. The following issues and actions need to be part of our planning going forward in all our curricula at the undergraduate and graduate levels, as well as in our faculty development:

1) Determining ways to increase numbers in our programs.

2) Determining explicitly what role online learning has in our department and how we could adjust our course offerings in a way that protects and builds our brick and mortar presence while still offering more online options to students.

3) Working to make our curricula more flexible and attractive to potential students; this includes having more emphasis on diversity and multiculturalism.

4) Finding more resources for professional development and research, especially for untenured Assistant Professors (perhaps by better utilizing DL funds).

5) Providing more faculty mentorship for new tenure-track faculty (something I hope will help improve upon our current teaching, research, and service accomplishments).

6) Using upcoming internal and external program reviews to make substantial changes to our various programs

7) Completing the process for a graduate certificate in Technical Writing, a growing area for which there is a great regional need (this is possibly an opportunity for online growth).

All of these things will build on our strengths and allow us to identify shortcomings in our departmental activity, which will ultimately allow us to make strategic changes in a number of areas.

RELATED ITEMS