



January 4, 2019

Dr. Rebecca Aanerud
Interim Dean
The Graduate School

Dr. Kima Cargill
Interim Dean for Academic Affairs
The Graduate School

RE: Review of the Department of English

Dear Deans Aanerud and Cargill:

In response to your charge letter dated May 15, 2018, we submit the following review of the Department of English with our recommendations. It is based on our readings of the department's current self-study and of the previous self-study and review committee report; meetings with faculty, staff, students of the department conducted on November 5 and 6, 2018; and exit interviews held with the leadership of the department, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the University on November 6, 2018.

We are grateful to the members of the department and to you and your staff, including Chris Partridge, for making the site visit productive and giving us the help we needed.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Atkins, Professor and Chair, Department of Asian Languages and Literature, College of Arts and Sciences (Committee Chair)

Naomi Sokoloff, Professor, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilization, Department of Comparative Literature, Cinema and Media, College of Arts and Sciences

Beverly Taylor, Professor and former Chair, Department of English and Comparative Literature, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

LuMing Mao, Professor and Chair, Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies, University of Utah; former Chair, Department of English, Miami University

David Vazquez, Associate Professor and Department Head, Department of English, University of Oregon

* * * * *

We are very favorably impressed by the dedication of faculty and staff and by the quality of the experience that they are providing to students in the BA, MFA, MATESOL, and PhD

programs. The Department has been led for the past few years by former chairs Brian Reed and Gary Handwerk, and now by acting chair Anis Bawarshi, all of whom are to be commended for doing their best to preserve and enhance the department's reputation for excellence. Credit is also due to the other members of the department's elected executive committee, the heads of the various programs, other departmental officers, and the cooperative and conscientious members of the faculty, and the staff.

The Department's self-study showed admirable thoughtfulness and candor and this report presumes familiarity with it. Our specific recommendations address points brought up in the self-study as well as some that were not mentioned in it. In conducting this review we have striven to help the department; to look forward, not backward; and to make the report as useful as possible to the incoming chair, who we expect will be appointed in July, 2019.

Recommendations

These are our specific recommendations. Some relate to areas specifically mentioned in the self-study; others deal with matters that came to our attention during the meetings with members of the department.

Timing of next review

We recommend that the department's status be continued and that the next review be conducted in ten years' time, i.e., 2028.

We recommend that the department be asked to submit an interim progress report (of 5-10 pages single spaced) in five years, i.e. 2023.

Below we address the following specific topics:

1. Governance
2. Climate and Community
3. Diversity
4. Workload, Equity, and the Role of Lecturers
5. Undergraduate Education
6. Graduate Education
7. Writing Programs
8. Advancement

Each section was drafted by a single member of the committee, with input from all of us, so there may be some overlap; we have not tried to eliminate all of it, as it is suggestive of areas that require particular attention. All of us have reviewed and approved the whole report, which reflects the shared view of the committee.

1. GOVERNANCE

English is a large and complex department. It has about 60 faculty members, 400 undergraduate declared majors, and 150 graduate students. It comprises three programs in (1) literature and culture; (2) creative writing; and (3) language and rhetoric (the Expository Writing Program; the Interdisciplinary Writing Program; and the Master of Arts in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages). Faculty members perform a lot of service teaching, i.e. teaching non-majors. This is especially true in the expository and interdisciplinary writing programs, which are quite large and not easy to administer.

Central administrative roles include the department chair, associate chair, scheduler, director of graduate studies, director of undergraduate studies, and an elected executive committee. We got the sense that heavy service burdens were falling on a small number of able and willing persons. On the other hand, some faculty members fail to attend faculty meetings, to the extent that sometimes a quorum cannot be reached! This is unacceptable.

Members of the department expressed strong confidence in and appreciation of the previous chair (Brian Reed) and the current acting chair (Anis Bawarshi). We make the following suggestions:

1. Service should be included as an explicit part of the merit review. If the members of the department believe something is important and necessary, then people need to be encouraged to do it and discouraged from neglecting it.
2. Attendance should be taken at faculty meetings with a sign-in sheet and the names of attendees should be listed in the minutes. This is good governance anyway, but in order to reduce absenteeism, it is helpful first to know who is absent.
3. Faculty meetings should be scheduled at fixed times at the beginning of the academic year. This helps the department comply with the Public Meetings Act. If a meeting is not needed, it can and should be cancelled.
4. Meetings of the entire faculty are a big deal in a department of this size. They should be held only when necessary and they should deal with business that can only be handled by the faculty as a whole as opposed to a committee meeting or a program meeting.
5. The unsung but important work of rewriting bylaws should continue. Press On!

2. CLIMATE AND COMMUNITY

Distribution of administrative and leadership roles in the department: As we met with various constituencies, it quickly became apparent that a disproportionate number of departmental administrative roles are filled by junior faculty (Associate and Assistant Professors, even contingent faculty). The elected Executive Committee gives evidence of this situation, for no full professors currently serve on the committee. From one perspective, this is a promising situation, as younger faculty are obviously empowered to develop policies and practices that will keep an already strong department vibrant into the future. These untenured and recently tenured faculty members are energetically and enthusiastically building the department they want to inhabit throughout their careers, and they are perhaps more flexible and more aware of evolving cultural and professional trends and opportunities than more senior faculty might be. It is worth noting, however, that in most comparable departments which UW might consider aspirational models, senior professors with already established careers and more extensive institutional and professional experience occupy leadership roles, at least in part to enable their junior colleagues to concentrate more time and attention on their scholarship to establish prominence in their fields of specialization.

Attendance at department meetings: In this department a vacuum of leadership seems to have developed at the senior level. In multiple conversations we heard from individuals about schism(s) within the department. This lack of involvement and leadership at the top manifests itself in one particularly detrimental effect: Senior faculty members often fail to attend department meetings, sometimes making it difficult even to vote on proposals for lack of a

quorum. Over time, this situation can prove corrosive even to the most idealistic and committed junior faculty members.

On this subject we commend the department's new program organized by the Acting Chair to award grants supporting collaborative projects in teaching and research (some of the faculty members spoke poignantly about how interaction with colleagues enriches their intellectual lives).

Building on this evident desire for intellectual community: Although some of these measures have doubtless been tried in the past, we recommend implementing some of these or similar activities. The high stakes in terms of morale make redoubled efforts imperative.

- symposia, colloquia, and bag lunch presentations of faculty scholarship.
- a critical speakers series (the department may need funding to support this endeavor).
- informal social encounters: e.g., cookies and coffee in the afternoon; pizza with announced conversations on various professional topics of interest to a good many colleagues (having a central location for such events is crucial).
- book talks to celebrate colleagues' publications.
- formal mentoring roles: Assigning a full professor to mentor each junior faculty member. In discussing the mentor's role with professors, the chair should stress the importance of setting an example of engagement in department activities, especially by attending department faculty meetings.
- required attendance at department meetings, enforced by (1) noting absences (the Chair should be empowered to excuse absences based on impediments such as illness); (2) making department citizenship a prominent element in merit reviews; and (3) refusing to accept absentee ballots on topics put to a vote (including hiring decisions) if the voter has not been present for discussion. Failure to fulfill the minimal but hugely important civic responsibility of attending department meetings should have real consequences—perhaps an increase in teaching load?

A shared project: We suggest that the faculty discuss the undergraduate curriculum (on which several faculty said they are essentially in agreement--therefore a potentially unifying topic). With the nationwide decline in humanities enrollments, considering how to attract enrollments and majors through curricular change is a compelling, timely subject. In a meeting with the full professors, one individual in the area of 'literature and culture' said there was essentially no center to the department, and that virtually everyone felt like an Other on the periphery: This feeling that they have lost a center would be a potentially productive topic if considered as a strength that reflects the state of the field, in which it has been a widely accepted

objective since about 1980 to dislodge an imperial center and to focus on multiple sites of interest. Students cannot just study Shakespeare and Tennyson; they should also be reading Toni Morrison and Julia Alvarez. As one undergraduate said on the second morning of our visit, prompting a chorus of approval from her peers, “I don’t just want to read white men.” These matters should prompt the faculty to consider how they might adjust majors’ requirements, not only to attend to matters of diversity but also to honor the multiple areas of scholarly expertise represented by their own colleagues.

We note that the websites of other departments of the same size indicate that faculties have developed ‘tracks’ or ‘concentrations’ within the major that enable students and faculty to find this loss of a center to be less of a problem and more of a boon enabling students to follow their interests and achieve coherence in their course selection. Frequently mentioned concentrations include:

- Creative Writing
- Composition, rhetoric, technical writing, and digital literacy
- Latinx studies
- African American literature and/or that of other ethnicities
- Medical Humanities
- Social Justice and Literature
- World literature (some English departments include Comparative Literature)
- Film studies

The department has energetic, productive young scholars. They are committed teachers. Your students appreciate their teachers and love the discipline they have chosen. These factors represent a valuable core around which to rally department faculty.

Faculty support: In return for renewed commitment to the department, your faculty deserve some financial support for their scholarly engagement. It is shameful that there is no support for faculty travel to present papers at conferences. If the College of Arts and Sciences will not attend to this glaring need, the department must reallocate resources or raise funds specifically for this purpose. Even if you must start small, something will be better than nothing.

3. DIVERSITY

The department has made great progress toward improving issues of equity and inclusion since the last program review in 2008. They have undertaken a series of steps ranging from a recent retreat dedicated to developing a diversity plan, to making equity and inclusion a central aspect of their strategic plans for the next several years. These are strong efforts and we encourage the department to build on this foundational work.

We would like to acknowledge, however, that while the department has a strong foundation, we are concerned about ongoing climate issues as they relate to equity and inclusion in the department. While the question of equity and inclusion in higher education generally and in English departments specifically is always fraught, this department seems to have particular difficulty reckoning with institutional diversity. These struggles range from the department’s difficulty recruiting and retaining students and faculty of color (which nearly every constituency reported as an issue), to how diversity is incorporated in undergraduate and graduate curricula.

Recent departures of faculty of color to other departments and to other institutions seem to have brought these matters into relief, but it is worth noting that these departures are part of a much longer history of faculty of color leaving the department or the institution. Indeed, two senior faculty members of color reported that their departures to other units have made staying at UW more sustainable. These matters of retention are serious and concerning. We have no doubt about the department's commitment to rectifying these issues, but we do feel it is important for the department to grapple with the lingering and ongoing nature of these concerns.

Along these lines, one of the important findings that came out of our discussions is that many conversations about equity and inclusion are often coupled with high-stakes conversations about resource allocation, particularly hiring. As a number of people suggested in our conversations, it seems that it will be important for the department to decouple conversations about equity and inclusion from hiring decisions—at least temporarily. The department should instead engage in a mindful process of thinking through and planning that will build on the important work they did at their recent retreat and in their strategic planning documents. Likewise, the department may find the recent ADE report *A Changing Major: The Report of the 2016-17 ADE Ad Hoc Committee on the English Major* (<https://www.ade.mla.org/content/download/98513/2276619/A-Changing-Major.pdf>) useful, particularly the section dedicated to diversity.

To be fair, much of what the department is up against is out of their control. The university's location in Seattle, a city that is predominantly white (although diversifying rapidly), and the Pacific Northwest region, which has a long history of ethnic exclusion and white supremacy, point to systemic challenges in enacting progressive change in relation to equity and inclusion. Likewise, we did not get a sense from our short site visit about the university's interest in or support of issues of equity and inclusion. These factors will undoubtedly play into the department's course of action moving forward. The important takeaway for us is that there is a strong foundation for change, as well as a strong commitment among current department leadership to engage in mindful equity and inclusion work.

With this in mind, we recommend the department consider some or all of the following actions as they relate to equity and inclusion. These are not meant to be prescriptive; rather, this list recommends potential areas of inquiry and action that will help to build on the foundation the department has constructed as part of its strategic planning. We recommend the following:

- We use the terms equity and inclusion mindfully, as these concepts are more expansive for considering questions of justice than the idea of diversity. Diversity suggests a pluralist conception that implies additions to an already set agenda. Equity and inclusion suggest remedy and action. We think it might be helpful for the department to begin to deploy the terms equity and inclusion since they might facilitate conversations about a more just allocation of resources.
- UW English seems to have lagged behind comparators (and lesser regional universities) as it relates to more equitable and inclusive ideas about recruiting, retention, and curriculum. We recommend that the department research and develop procedures around best practices in hiring diverse faculty. In this regard, Stephanie Fryberg and Ernesto Martínez's recent book *The Truly Diverse Faculty* might be a useful resource, particularly as Fryberg is a faculty member in American Indian Studies at UW. Consulting with

Chad Allen's office at UW would also be a helpful step in proactively thinking through issues of equity and inclusion related to searches, curricular reform, and student retention.

- We strongly recommend that this department have a crucial conversation about issues of equity and inclusion in advance of their planning for hiring over the next several years. A similar conversation about curricular reform as it relates to diversity and the state of the profession would also be useful. Part of the challenge that we see is that these conversations take place largely in relation to resource allocation and hiring, which in times of scarcity are driving people into separate corners.
- To this end, we urge the College of Arts and Sciences and the UW administration to support staging discussions managed either by a trained facilitator, or by an administrator at UW who can help the department to come to shared agreements about who they are and what it means to be an English department in the 21st century. We think it is critical that the college compel all English faculty to participate in this meeting.
- We encourage the department to engage in curricular reform that will foreground issues of equity and inclusion. Undergraduates were unanimous in their desire for more offerings in the study of race, ethnicity, and inequality—areas that have become central to the discipline over the past 35 years. It is untrue that the study of race and ethnicity, empire, the Global South, or other decolonial and anti-racist formulations are peripheral to the discipline of English. Indeed, these areas of inquiry have become a center of gravity as a quick web search of English major requirements across the country, or a perusal of the MLA, ALA, WLA, ASA, or any of the other major disciplinary organizations will show.
- That there are no full-time specialists in Latinx studies, Native Studies, Asian American Studies, or the emerging field of Islamic American studies on the faculty should be a point that gives the university and the college serious pause. One colleague mentioned a potential cluster hire. If there aren't resources available for such an effort, it will be crucial for the department to think about how issues of equity and inclusion can become criteria for ALL searches. One false dichotomy that we heard reflected is that diversity hires can only occur in "diversity fields" (e.g., African American Studies, Latinx Studies). We encourage the department to think about how equity and inclusion can become another criterion in all faculty and staff searches.
- We urge the department to consult with field experts at UW (Fryberg and Allen are both on the UW faculty) or at other universities for help in crafting appropriate job ads that signal an awareness of cutting-edge trends in fields oriented around the study of race, ethnicity, empire, or other aspects of social inequality. The department might also signal an openness to intersectional approaches to more "traditional" fields through such an approach. It cannot be underscored enough that some of the best practitioners in all subfields are people of color who can and should be recruited. In the absence of field specialists at UW, faculty and administrators should leverage personal networks to write specific ads that signal serious engagements with subfields. In short, general ads seeking to hire an Asian Americanist or a Native Studies scholar will not likely generate a robust pool of potential researchers. The more specific and targeted an ad, the better.
- Another potential activity that could springboard the department into a more robust conversation about equity and inclusion could revolve around a symposium dedicated to

the Future of the English Major. Targeted outreach to regional scholars would likely result in a robust conversation at a very low cost. From Berkeley to Spokane there are numerous R1 or R2 universities with strong and diverse English departments. It is without question that many scholars would jump at the chance to engage in such a discussion. For a relatively low cost, the department could use this conversation as the basis for curricular reform and strategic planning. We urge the department to pair faculty from other institutions with current UW faculty to ensure that the department has a chance to engage the perspectives of others. Simply bringing scholars to give talks on outside perspectives won't be sufficient. This group of faculty will benefit from substantive encounters with other faculty in order to reflect on their own best practices and the best practices at other institutions. Again, the department and the college should compel faculty to participate in such a symposium; it will be crucial for faculty outside of the usual contributors to participate.

4. WORKLOAD, EQUITY, AND LECTURERS

Workload equity and distribution of teaching and service responsibility are crucial issues. The Department's self-study and its strategic plan address these matters, but plans to increase accountability have not yet been sufficiently implemented. Like the committee that submitted the 2009 review report, we recommend that the English Department articulate a clear policy to rationalize loads across units and ranks and to acknowledge and compensate the various kinds of contributions that faculty make to their academic unit and to UW as a whole. Given current budget constraints (especially in the wake of the recent announcement that direct-to-division admission has been suspended), and given the likelihood of multiple retirements in the foreseeable future, all indicators are that faculty numbers will shrink for some time to come; that circumstance will intensify the need to rethink workload and curriculum.

Currently, it is normative for professors to teach 4 courses per year. However, many faculty members in fact receive releases from teaching because of the administrative work they do. While everyone is working hard, the current situation falls short in generating SCH's – at a time when all departments in the Humanities are under pressure to increase SCH numbers. One approach that has worked for other departments is the 4+ model. That is, the expectation is for professors to teach 4 courses a year and to provide something else of added value -- such as exceptional committee work, extensive administrative service, public presentations, or community engagement and advancement. Professors whose courses yield high numbers of SCH's (such as those who teach lecture courses with 400 students) may count their heavy instructional burden as their "plus." To put this idea into perspective: in some Humanities departments at UW it is normative for tenure track professors to teach 5 courses per year; in others it is more common to teach 4 courses per year. In English, 5 would be excessive for faculty members who have demanding administrative roles. The 4+ model, though, could provide formal recognition for their work while also distributing workload more evenly amongst the members of the faculty as a whole. By way of increasing and formalizing acknowledgment and accountability, annual merit reviews should take into account the varied forms of value added. We encourage the Department to articulate what it defines as "service" and to consider not just traditional committee work, but a wide variety of roles, including participation in public Humanities and in community engagement which directly benefits the Department, as well as

(as they put it in their Strategic Plan: Entailments) weigh “teaching and mentoring outside of traditional venues.”

Similar considerations should apply for Lecturers. Currently, it is normative for Lecturers to teach 6 courses per year. Again, however, many receive releases from teaching because of administrative responsibilities and other work: mentoring of graduate students; leadership roles with the Robinson Center, UWHS, and EWP; study abroad; and more. Since it is imperative to raise SCH's, and since lecturers in other departments often teach more than 6 courses, it will be a priority for the Department to more clearly define and communicate the duties of lecturers as well as the compensation for those duties., a workload of 6+ makes sense in that context. For lecturers whose primary responsibility is teaching, a norm of 7 courses (or 6 high enrollment courses) per year would be appropriate; for lecturers with a heavier administrative load, the service work would count as the “plus” in the “6+” model. Furthermore, at present it is unclear how the many non-teaching activities tie in with the duties stipulated in the official job descriptions for lecturers and how much weight those activities carry in consideration for promotion. While the lecturers welcome more leadership opportunities, they are concerned about “credential creep” – they need more clarity about what does and does not count for promotion, and job security is an issue of concern. Since there is a connection between length of appointment and SCH's (a decision made at the provost level), it is in the interest of the lecturers as well as in the interest of the department to rethink curriculum as an integral part of rethinking workload. Might this mean creating large undergraduate courses in TESOL? Reimagining the current model of MFA training, in which each faculty member closely mentors a small number of students? Teaching fewer courses that require intensive writing assignments? All of the above?

Everyone is working hard, but rethinking the curriculum would allow them to work more in unison and more efficiently. An outside facilitator (a good one! someone who knows about English departments and the Humanities!!) could possibly be quite effective in helping everyone focus on specific tasks related to curriculum revision and workload.

All the faculty, at professorial ranks and among the lecturers, merit more support for travel and professional development. Such support could help faculty further their research and their ongoing education, forge new ideas concerning their fields, feel acknowledged, and invest new energy into their teaching and service.

5. UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Undergraduate education is in crisis, from a quantitative point of view. In the past 10 years, the department has experienced a 36% decline in majors, a 62% decline in degrees granted, and a 32% decline in upper-division enrollments. Lower division enrollments are flat.

Our first recommendation is to change the metrics that are used. In the world of activity based-budgeting (ABB), it is degrees granted that counts, not the number of declared majors. Likewise, it is not the fill rate of courses that matters, but the number of student credit hours (SCH) that is generated by those courses.

Second, we read and heard about a view expressed by some members of the department that direct-to-division admission (DTDA) to the College of Arts and Sciences was going to save the department. The theory was that the University would identify and admit more students interested in majors offered by the humanities division (mainly composed of language and literature departments, including English), and this would lead to a dramatic rise in the number

of English majors, perhaps to the extent that it would induce a new crisis on the other end of the quantitative spectrum. This outlook seemed to us at the time *excessively sanguine*. Indeed, since our site visit, we learned that the implementation of DTDA has been postponed indefinitely by the president and provost. English needs to identify and develop its own strategies to adapt and survive and not pray to be rescued.

Although minors don't "count" in ABB, they make sense for many students, and the recent introduction of a minor in English was an excellent idea and probably overdue. Minors are a good way to increase enrollments overall and may lead to more majors. In increasing the number of majors, we should think not just about finding new people, but encouraging current students, especially minors, to "upgrade" their experience with the department. The department might want to take concerted action to promote among STEM majors the idea of adding an English major. Studies indicate that professional schools (medicine, law, etc.) are especially pleased to admit students with an English major. Finding ways to let students know how much an English major may add value to their 'primary' major may produce important results for the department.

Besides upgrades, one should also pay attention to retention; it should be easier and less costly to keep a declared major than to attract a new one. That begins with tracking declared majors. What percent of them drop the English major and graduate with a different one? What percent don't graduate at all? The advising staff will know how to make these numbers go down, given proper direction.

Events for undergraduates will help retain current majors as well as attract new ones. An open house for the department, and mixers for majors at which students can socialize with one another as well as faculty, are good examples. One member of the review committee reports that in her department undergraduate majors have developed a vibrant association through which they create a popular series of professional and social events, including peer advising sessions prior to registration periods, when students share information on courses and teachers; sessions providing information about applying to graduate programs; sessions devoted to supporting job searches (sometimes they invite alums with interesting experiences to share); as well as meetings when students read favorite poems; screenings of films for which students invite faculty members to lead discussions following the films; a Halloween party; afternoon coffee with faculty; and just student parties. The association is run by the students themselves, so cost to the department is minimal—a faculty advisor, and some pizzas for various events.

We spoke to a group of undergraduate students who seemed satisfied in absolute terms, but especially so relative to the graduate students. Some were unhappy with the size of lower-division courses; they had to suffer through these before they got to the smaller, more advanced courses. English still has a lot of majors. Should majors still have to hack their way through the large survey courses to complete a BA, or could they have their own set of introductory courses? Something to think about. Language and literature majors, including English, are becoming "boutique" majors, and we need to give students a personalized experience in order to survive and thrive.

The curriculum has been updated and streamlined recently, and these efforts should continue; they really never end because the times change, the students change, and faculty come and go in the long term. Faculty might think about new tracks for the major to appeal to students.

The relationship with students should not end at graduation. We all need to do a better job of tracking what students are doing after they leave. Recent graduates are a great resources for current students, as are not-so-recent graduates. The department has a vested interest in the success of its graduates, and if good networking leads to better employment prospects for graduates, then it should help maintain the levels of majors. Moreover, this kind of interaction across cohorts and generations is beneficial for fundraising, which should be a high priority, as the department is strapped for travel and research funds.

6. GRADUATE EDUCATION

Like many English departments in public institutions, the UW English Department has experienced a number of structural changes over the past several years. Among these challenges are the decreasing size of graduate student cohorts at both the masters and PhD levels, the decreasing availability of resources (especially the recent reduction in TAs), and the challenges to recruiting and retaining a diverse graduate student body. In this area as well, the department has been forward thinking and has engaged in initiatives that will serve it well over the course of the next decade.

We commend the department for one major innovation: reducing the size of incoming graduate student cohorts. It is without question that the number of jobs in the field (both tenure track and non-tenure track) has radically decreased over the past two decades. Unlike many similar departments across the nation, the UW English department has reduced the size of its incoming cohorts, despite the pressures to staff first-year writing courses. This is ultimately a more sustainable strategy for both the department and the profession, and we encourage the department to continue with its efforts to “right size” its graduate program.

Another major innovation is the department’s efforts to create pathways to alternative academic careers. In particular, the department’s outreach efforts to local corporations (among them are Microsoft and Amazon), a course dedicated to exploring alternative careers, and ongoing efforts to work with alumni make the department a national leader in developing careers beyond academia. We applaud the department for these efforts and encourage them to continue to innovate how they explore alternative career paths for UW graduate students.

In order for the department to continue with its innovation in graduate education, we do have several recommendations:

- Continue to engage in mindful analysis of an ideal graduate cohort size. One possibility would be for the Director of Graduate Studies to participate in strategic planning conversations so that the department can set targeted goals for sustainable graduate enrollments on a year-to-year basis. Planning mindfully would also enable the department to marshal graduate funding resources in order to recruit the best students.
- Continue supporting alt academic professionalization opportunities. One vector the department could explore is leveraging the local non-profits and NGOs. This area would provide yet another path to employment outside of academia, and would expand the department’s current efforts beyond the high-tech sector.
- The publication seminar has been successful for graduate students who highlight it as a major professionalization opportunity. The department might consider building on this strength by offering other courses that focus on career and professional development, ranging from anti-racist pedagogy (which the writing programs employ) to grant writing workshops.

- We encourage the department to take an inventory of who they are in order to identify areas of research strength and project areas they would like to nurture. These strategic planning goals could be useful in guiding graduate admissions. In a practical sense, it would be better to recruit the best available graduate students working in an area of strength (Rhetoric and Composition is one clear area where the department excels), rather than recruit weaker students in areas where there is little or no current expertise. We recognize that this will mean more difficult conversations around admissions, but we encourage the department to think about graduate recruitment as another area where they will need to exercise wise resource management.
- As the graduate program retracts, reducing the number of available MA, MFA, and PhD students to staff the writing program(s), the department should think about opening up TAs in writing to graduate students in other units appropriate for writing instruction. East Asian Languages and Literatures, Romance Languages, Classics, Philosophy, and History are but a few of the units on campus where graduate students will be interested in and capable of teaching first-year writing. Allowing students from outside of English to teach in first-year writing will also expose more UW graduate students to the innovations in anti-racist pedagogy within the writing program(s) and potentially diversify the cohort of teachers charged with first-year writing instruction. We see such a move as a win/win for the department.
- The department may wish to consider some of the milestone structures within the graduate program to help streamline student progress and to reduce the administrative burden on faculty to staff committees. At a minimum, the Director of Graduate Studies in coordination with the Department Head should review faculty assignments to ensure that the work of mentoring graduate students is more evenly shared across the department.
- The current DGS's efforts to create benchmarks and accountability structures for graduate students is a welcome effort. While it will require some cultural shifts among the current graduate cohort, we encourage the department to continue to create benchmark and accountability structures to help students to make steady progress. We were surprised to learn that the department has not in recent memory placed students on academic probation. While we are sensitive to the circumstances of individual students, we encourage the department to use probation as a means to move students through the program in a timely manner.
- We encourage the Graduate School to consider providing support and training for the DGS and graduate committees in English and in other units at the university. It should not be the case that each new DGS has to reinvent their processes and procedures. Providing centralized training would help to ensure continuity and evenness in relation to graduate education across the university.
- Students need professional development support, especially travel support. In order to be nationally competitive, PhD students must travel to and present work at conferences in their field. Even a modest amount would do a lot to increase morale and provide professional development opportunities for graduate students.
- Ali Dahmer is an outstanding staff person who has helped to move the graduate program forward. All efforts should be made to retain and empower her.

7. WRITING PROGRAMS

The department has two large and robust writing programs: the Expository Writing Program (EWP) and the Interdisciplinary Writing Program (IWP). These two programs are

responsible for delivering well over 90% of composition instruction to UW students seeking to fulfill the UW's composition requirement. The review committee commends them for the pivotal role they have played not only in promoting a culture of writing across the entire campus but also in developing innovative and forward-looking pedagogy and mentoring, advancing disciplinary and interdisciplinary work, and building strong and productive partnerships both in and outside the UW.

Expository Writing Program (EWP)

The EWP teaches approximately 5,000 undergraduate students every year who represent about 80% of any given freshman class at the UW. Partnering with the UWHS program, the EWP also works with high school teachers throughout the state who teach college-credit eligible versions of EWP's English 111 and 131 "C" courses. In 2017-2018, for example, the EWP, through UWHS, offered courses at 33 high schools taught by 46 teachers with over 1,500 students enrolled for UW credit. In addition, the EWP houses the Computer-Integrated Courses Program (CIC), which complements both the EWP and IWP, as well as the department, by providing support, including computer lab space, for writing courses along with a small number of undergraduate and graduate courses in literary, cultural, and cinema studies.

The review committee is impressed by the EWP's long-standing commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion and to enacting antiracist and critical pedagogies and curricula. For example, since 2009, it has provided courses to support multilingual and international students. In 2016, it redesigned the TA orientation and the graduate writing pedagogy seminar (English 567) for new TAs in order to foreground issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion. In the same year, it created a "Race and Equity" sub-committee to put diversity, equity, and inclusion central to its practices and policies, culminating in the development of antiracist and critical pedagogy workshops and the drafting in 2018 of an antiracist pedagogical framework and values statement. It must also be noted that the enrollment for the EWP courses is healthy. Since last program review, it has seen an increase of 15% in sections offered and 20% in students enrolled. The EWP has also played a significant role in training writing teachers, supporting a staff of 72-80 TAs in any given year and offering extensive and ongoing mentoring programs and opportunities. The committee believes that together they have contributed to a strong and vibrant intellectual community where professional development, research, and collaboration are valued, promoted, and embraced.

Interdisciplinary Writing Program (IWP)

Like the EWP, the Interdisciplinary Writing Program (IWP), housed in the English Department since 1983, has also served students and the institution well in spite of recent budgetary and other external constraints. The IWP offers discipline-linked courses that promote small-size intellectual communities for students; provides excellent and ongoing training and mentoring for graduate TAs and other part-time instructors both from English and outside English; and develops and promotes a wide range of partnerships across and beyond campus. Based on the data provided and the conversations we had with the its faculty during the onsite visit, the review committee wishes to applaud the IWP for honoring a steadfast commitment to helping students use writing to learn and cultivate discipline-specific knowledge within larger socio-cultural milieu through dedication, innovation, and collaboration.

The review committee believes that colleagues in the IWP should be commended for

their commitment to diversity, inclusion, and antiracist pedagogies as a way forward for institutional transformation. We concur with the rationale informing the reconceptualization of ENGL 592 as a micro-seminar focused on diversity and inclusion to carry out and further energize the implementation of anti-racist pedagogies both in the writing classroom and for teacher training. The review committee is equally impressed by the IWP's extensive teaching partnerships across the College of Arts and Sciences, and its recently-developed linkages with units in the College of the Environment and the School of Public Health. These partnerships have made possible a diverse range of learning opportunities for students as they learn to acquire knowledge in well-defined disciplinary and interdisciplinary contexts through various writing genres and modes. The seven "core" IWP faculty collaborate with faculty and other instructors across campus while providing intensive as well as ongoing mentoring for graduate teaching assistants.

Going forward, we endorse the directions outlined by both programs as well as acknowledging the challenges they face as they continue to put their respective visions to work. Toward that end, we suggest the following:

1. For both programs to continue their work on sustaining and further strengthening a strong and vibrant intellectual community, they both will need some discretionary funds separate from the English Department budget.
2. In the likelihood that the department will continue to face the pressure of downsizing due to retirements, its graduate program will have to enroll fewer graduate students in its various concentrations. Consequently, it would be prudent for the EWP to begin exploring the possibility of inviting graduate students from other humanities departments to apply for teaching opportunities in the EWP. Doing so would not only compensate for the expected shortage of graduate students from English but also provide an invaluable professional opportunity for graduate students in the College.
3. The seven "core" lecturers in the IWP are the program's corner stone. We therefore recommend that the College and the Administration continue providing the necessary security and stability for them to the extent possible, given the importance of the work they do and the contributions they make. Should there be any contract modifications affecting them, we urge consultation, transparency, and due process for the sake of fairness, morale and cohesion.
4. We strongly encourage both EWP and IWP faculty to apply for external funds, including, for example, CCCC Research Initiative and/or its Emergent Research Awards.
5. We urge both the College and the Administration to provide and, better still, institutionalize travel and research support for both EWP and IWP faculty so that they know such support is there for them and so that they don't have to look/apply for it every year without knowing if they will receive it.
6. Given the synergy that exists between the two programs and given that collaboration and partnership are central to what both do day in and day out, not to mention that many

graduate TAs for the IWP have taught for the EWP, we believe that more thought and energy be given to closer collaboration and partnership between the two programs, including, for example, co-hosting workshops on pedagogy and mentoring, co-sponsoring annual symposia or conferences for undergraduate student research, and co-organizing the speaker series on teaching across/in the disciplines.

8. ADVANCEMENT

Fundraising should not be left to the chair, who has enough to do. The department should have an advancement committee. Inviting selected alumni (presumably successful in divergent professional fields) to participate in a department board of visitors might be a good starting point for involving alumni in fundraising efforts.

The department has excellent potential for advancement, since many of the faculty are engaged in the community and practicing public scholarship. The creative writing program has enjoyed a fair amount of success in fundraising and should be emulated and encouraged to continue developing its donor base. (One of the external reviewers reports that her department's creative writing program produces a major event each semester that welcomes the public to readings by major writers. These events attract huge audiences and much celebration; they also attract donors!)