



UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
Seattle, Washington 98195

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

February 26, 2019

To: Graduate School Council

From: Anis Bawarshi, Acting Chair, for the UW English Department

RE: English Department Response to Department Review Report

We would like to begin by acknowledging our appreciation for the time devoted to our department review by the members of the Review Committee (Professors Paul Atkins [chair], LuMing Mao, Naomi Sokoloff, Beverly Taylor, and David Vazquez) and by Chris Partridge, Becky Corriell, and Kima Cargill in the Graduate School. We are grateful for the attention the Review Committee gave to our self-study and the care they put into both the site visit and subsequent report, including their recognition of the considerable time and effort that we as a department devoted to this review process. We are gratified that the committee was “very favorably impressed by the dedication of faculty and staff and by the quality of the experience that [we] are providing to students in the BA, MFA, MATESOL, and PhD programs” and by their recognition of the work we have done to “preserve and enhance the department’s reputation for excellence.” We are proud of our core intellectual and artistic mission and the vital role it plays in the tradition of humanistic inquiry: making visible the workings of the English language in myriad genres, media, contexts, and global settings, and exploring its usage and teaching ethically and creatively. As researchers, educators, and writers, our work in creating knowledge, developing critical and creative thinking, strengthening analytical reading and writing skills, and supporting communication across difference offer unique contributions to problem solving and responding to complex, urgent public issues.

Among the areas the report found to praise, some that will be especially useful to build on are the department’s commitment to supporting undergraduates who “appreciate their teachers and love the discipline they have chosen;” a core group of energetic, productive young scholars; our graduate program efforts to create pathways to alternative academic careers that “make the department a national leader in developing careers beyond academia;” and robust writing programs that play a “pivotal role” in promoting writing across the entire campus while building strong partnerships both in and outside the UW. We are pleased to hear that the committee recommends that the department’s status be continued, with the next review to be conducted in ten years’ time. Most of all, we appreciate the committee’s forward-looking recommendations, which will help us as we move ahead. We welcome the opportunity to submit an interim progress report in five years, which aligns well with our five-year strategic plan and the term of the next department chair.

The department has taken seriously the opportunity the ten-year review has provided for reflection, self-assessment, and future planning, both leading up to and since the committee report. In Spring 2018, we held, with support of an Equity and Inclusion grant from the Office of Minority Affairs &

Diversity, a series of three workshops to define what we do, what we value, and what we want to prioritize going forward. This collective effort resulted in the creation of two important documents that we can build on as we address the Review Committee's recommendations: first, a merit heuristic to assist faculty in writing their annual activity reports in ways that are more inclusive of and accountable to the range of work we do across teaching/mentoring, research, service, and equity, inclusion, and diversity (see self-study), and second, a preliminary draft of a department strategic plan that articulates the goals that will guide our priorities and decision-making through the next five years. Our work revising the strategic plan over the last five months has given us an opportunity to approach the Review Committee recommendations in light of our goals.

After we received the Review Committee's report in January, we held a well-attended faculty meeting during which we solicited faculty feedback about the report recommendations and worked to put the most recent draft of the strategic plan in dialogue with the report recommendations. Faculty responded to specific report recommendations by examining which ones we had already begun to address, which ones we had already identified as part of our strategic plan, and which ones that we had not accounted for in our strategic plan that we should add. Groups also discussed report recommendations that we don't think are feasible within our specific context or that may undermine or conflict with our strategic planning. The EC, acting chair, and associate chair have since integrated this faculty feedback into further revisions of the strategic plan, a final draft of which will be brought to a faculty discussion and vote by the end of this Winter or early Spring quarter.

The department has also begun the process of drafting a diversity plan, which would extend goal 2 of the strategic plan (to promote inclusion, diversity, and equity, especially racial equity, by recruiting, retaining, and supporting a diverse population of faculty, students, and staff in a way that counters ongoing legacies of systemic inequity) into more specific strategies. In order to develop a one-, three-, and five-year hiring plan by the end of this Spring as requested by the College of Arts and Sciences, we will distribute the strategic plan along with the call for hiring proposals in Spring so faculty can craft and then later discuss and rank hiring proposals that advance this plan.

Because it emerges from this ten-year review process and is informed in valuable ways by the Review Committee's recommendations, we are attaching the latest draft of the strategic plan as an appendix to this response. We will also be referring to specific elements of it throughout as we respond to the committee's recommendations regarding governance; climate and community; diversity; workload, equity, and the role of lecturers; undergraduate education; graduate education, writing programs; and advancement.

As we understand them, some of the Review Committee's recommendations are ones that, if we approach them deliberately and strategically, will enable us to address multiple areas of need. For example, the recommendation to consider a 4+ teaching load can become an occasion for us not just to increase student credit hours (SCHs) but also to think carefully about and address workload inequity, while also helping us to inventory and make visible the wide range of work our faculty do (work that is sometimes invisible, uncounted, and uncompensated) as part of defining what constitutes a "plus."

Governance

In addition to the service required to manage a large and complex department with its various degree programs and multiple areas of research, we appreciate the Review Committee's recognition of the extensive service the department provides to the College of Arts and Sciences and UW,

especially in terms of teaching non-majors who complete the UW composition (“C”) or writing (“W”) requirements through our Expository Writing Program, Interdisciplinary Writing Program, and general education courses, as well as those fulfilling university distribution requirements such as VLPA and DIV. We would also count among this work our successful partnerships with high schools through our long standing partnership with UW in the High School (which has enrolled 6,826 students for UW credit in high schools across the state since 2013); our faculty and graduate student participation in University Beyond Bars (UBB); our study abroad programs; and the multiple community-oriented teaching and training programs we offer through department service-learning courses and the Community Literacy Program (over the last ten years, undergraduate students provided nearly 75,000 hours of community service with local organizations and as tutors in area schools). As the report notes, these and other programs and partnerships place heavy service burdens on a number of faculty members and create a complex system of governance, but we see this work, along with our research and artistic activity, as a critical part of the Humanities division’s and the CAS’s efforts to extend the reach and relevance of the humanities.

Given their place within departmental governance and their importance to the work of the department at large, we think it is worth noting that the Expository Writing Program (EWP) and Interdisciplinary Writing Program (IWP) are not sub-programs of language and rhetoric, as the committee report describes. While some of the faculty involved in these two programs identify with language and rhetoric as an area of study and teaching, these two programs are structurally and administratively separate from language and rhetoric, and are part of the department as a whole. And given the role they play for the department, college, and university, we regret that the Directors of the EWP and IWP are not listed among the central administrative roles in the department. The same applies to the directors of the Creative Writing Program and MATESOL program, whose vibrant and successful programs we wish had received more specific attention.

We raise this point in terms of governance because a department as large and programmatically diverse as English (with expertise, research, leadership, and pedagogical influence that extend throughout the CAS, the university, and its local communities) relies on the administrative leadership of many faculty and staff: not just those defined as “central” but also those who perform more occluded but no less critical leadership, such as the London study abroad director, Computer Integrated Classrooms director, UWHS director, English 108 (Early Fall Start Writing Ready) course director, Community Literacy Program coordinator, graduate program manager, director of advising, along with associate directors and staff who help coordinate parts of the writing programs. Each of these programs is innovative, research-informed, and highly successful. And some of them are themselves larger than entire departments in the College.

We share the committee’s concerns about poor attendance at faculty meetings. This is both demoralizing and a challenge to departmental governance. While the department has continued to function successfully through the use of pre-circulated proposals and follow-up mail ballots after non-quorate meetings (inquorate meetings have not undermined votes), this is an issue we need to address. To begin, we need to examine the reasons for faculty absenteeism, which, to be fair, cannot be blamed on the absence of senior faculty alone. Having only necessary meetings, continuing the trend of scheduling meetings at which actual work happens (rather than places to report on work that could as easily have been reported on by email), being more inclusive, noting outcomes and action items with clarity and a timeline for action, clarifying where meeting notes and decisions reached might be found, and announcing the schedule and purpose of each meeting

at the beginning of the quarter (which we have been doing this year) all seem worthwhile efforts and preferable to punitive measures. However, we also agree that attendance should be taken at all faculty meetings (indeed, it already is at meetings when faculty vote so we know who to include in the mail ballot). We also agree that service and citizenship must be included as an explicit part of merit review. Our EC procedures for reviewing pre-emptive and counter offers already includes service as an explicit part. Our recently created merit heuristic and plans to develop merit criteria and rubric (we began work on criteria and rubric several years ago) will assist us in this process (see strategic plan goal 4.2).

As part of its ongoing efforts to reassess the role of departmental standing committees, especially in light of our strategic plan (for example, consulting with the Library and Technology committee about reconstituting it as the Communication Committee, considering the creation of a personnel committee to review merit, etc.), the EC will be working on bylaws revisions next year (see strategic plan 4.3 and 4.6). This includes considering the selection and constitution of the EC so that it consistently represents the diversity of voices and programs within the department (see SP goal 3.6).

Climate and Community

When we began work on the department strategic plan last Spring, faculty identified as one of their top priorities the desire for more intellectual community, something that was also reflected in the climate survey we conducted two years ago (see self-study). Goal 2 of the strategic plan commits us to creating a departmental culture that supports intellectual community, encourages collaboration, and nurtures professional growth. The entailments that follow from this goal include some of the suggestions offered in the committee's recommendations. As the committee suspects, a number of these measures have been tried in the past, but we agree that efforts need to be redoubled. This Spring, with donor support, we will be hosting an end of year recognition and appreciation event. Other efforts as part of this strategic goal are already under way, such as adding a new section to our weekly news announcements called "Faculty Highlights," which invites faculty to submit brief descriptions of any work they are engaged in (news of creative or scholarly work in progress, innovations in teaching, volunteer work or board positions related to research and/or teaching, administrative initiatives, community partnerships).

Also successful have been our efforts to provide support through small grants for faculty collaborations (Strategic Plan 2.3) and to identify and find ways to support already existing sites of collaboration to showcase connections (SP 2.4). These Collaboration Grants, funded through donor support, aim to cultivate intellectual community by bringing together colleagues from different areas of the department to explore a topic of shared interest, especially one that relates in some way to our department's strategic planning. In this first year of the grants, we received ten grant proposals, involving nearly half our faculty, and were able to fund five: a group that brings together colleagues in various areas of the department to expand our capacity for public engagement and community-based teaching and research; a co-facilitated reading group that brings together colleagues to read and discuss selected writings of this year's Scheingold series lecturers; a working group to address assessment and proposed revision of English 506, the gateway course to Graduate Study, in ways that reflect our shared disciplinary identity (the group will present a proposal and sample syllabus in late spring quarter); a working group to convene faculty interested in collaborative course design and development of best practices to support International students in our courses; and a group of faculty with experience developing and teaching online courses to explore ways to use a successful online introduction to the humanities course developed by Frances

McCue and Mike Shapiro as a model for piloting English online courses. The funded groups will share their work with the department in Spring. We are working with advancement to raise funding to sustain these grants in the future. We have also begun conversations in the EC about creating brown bag conversations around teaching.

The enthusiasm around these collaboration grants motivates us to continue these and other community building efforts recommended by the Review Committee. We agree that having a shared project in which we explore our interconnectivity without the need to claim an imperial center is well worth undertaking. Indeed, our work to date on the strategic plan is one such shared project! However, it is also crucial that these suggestions for building a supportive climate need to be placed within the context of climate around equity and inclusion. Also, as we work to cultivate community in the department, it is important to acknowledge the long-standing community-building work our faculty already engage in beyond the department, such as Red Badge Writers, Phoenix Project, English 121, partnership with Hugo House, University Beyond Bars, and the Community Literacy Program, which daily enact community, equity, and inclusion.

While it is not quite accurate to say that there is no support for faculty travel (through endowments we have been able to provide \$500 annual travel support per faculty), we absolutely agree that this funding is shamefully low and not enough to sustain professional engagement. We are seeking to raise funds for research and travel (an area of priority we identify in SP 1.2) but we join with the Review Committee in asking the College to help support this glaring need. External support for travel would allow us to allocate scarce department resources to fostering intra-department community and collaboration, such as symposia, critical speakers series, social encounters, etc.

In regard to the distribution of administrative and leadership roles in the department, we agree that a disproportionate number of administrative roles are filled by tenure-line Associate Professors and lecturer-line Senior and Principal Lecturers (with notable exceptions in the case of Full Professor leadership as Director of Graduate Studies and, until recently, in the MATESOL program and Creative Writing Program) and we agree that we have not taken as much advantage of what senior faculty leadership can provide. (It is worth noting that the EC was anomalous this year in not including Full Professors [this is not typical], and we have not appointed assistant professor rank faculty to administrative positions.) That said, we plan to hold rank-specific meetings to discuss expectations for each rank, including what leadership entails for this department and ranks within it. We will begin these conversations at a meeting of Full Professors this Winter quarter. We will also explore ways to develop a more formal system of mentoring assistant and associate (something we have done in the past) as well as lecturer and senior lecturer faculty about their movement up the ranks, a system designed to create a clarity of expectations.

As we address administrative and leadership roles, we also need to critically examine the conditions that have led to a vacuum of leadership at the senior level. In terms of chair-level administrative leadership, which has historically been held by a full professor, some more senior faculty who have indicated an interest in that level of leadership have not been offered the opportunity. Importantly, while we should not separate opportunities for administrative leadership from intellectual leadership, some of our senior faculty have taken intellectual leadership roles nonetheless, for example with their work on the 2016 Diversity Committee report about restructuring the department. And there's the often invisible but crucial junior faculty mentoring work done by senior faculty, not just in terms of serving on promotion committees. It is also worth noting our senior faculty's contributions to campus-wide leadership (such as serving as Divisional Dean, Director of

the Simpson Center, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement, and Chair of American Ethnic Studies). That said, while we agree that more senior faculty should occupy leadership roles, we also need to do a better job of creating a home for this leadership in the department. In short, we need to have nuanced conversations about what we expect from senior faculty leadership, create space for that leadership, and hold senior faculty responsible for it.

Diversity

As we work to address issues of equity, inclusion, and diversity in the department, especially as we work to understand these in relation to ongoing legacies of systemic inequity and exclusion, we appreciate the Review Committee's acknowledgement of the progress we have made since the last program review in 2008, and the series of steps we have taken to establish "a strong foundation for change, as well as [the] strong commitment among current department leadership to engage in mindful equity and inclusion work."

Our efforts over the last ten years to engage in conversations about how inequity and exclusion manifest structurally, curricularly, and pedagogically have typically taken place as isolated events and actions (ie, as workshops, retreats, Diversity Committee (DC) led student panels, reports, department statements on equity and inclusion, syllabus statement of department values, DC-developed best practices for hiring, DC and EC procedures for partner hires, etc.) Each of these events, actions, and recommended practices has been invaluable in bringing awareness to and helping us develop strategies for promoting diversity, in ways we increasingly understand as inseparable from equity and inclusion. We take to heart and agree with the committee that conversations about diversity need to occur alongside and in relation to equity and inclusion. Otherwise we risk engaging in what Sara Ahmed has called "the smile of diversity," a celebration of plurality that leaves the conditions and practices of exclusion and inequity unchanged. To this end, the department's EC has already begun, in conversation with the department's DC and guided by resources from other institutions, to define the terms equity, inclusion, and diversity, and consider how diversity is an ongoing accomplishment of equity and inclusion. This understanding also becomes a baseline for addressing challenges of recruiting and retaining faculty and students of color.

The effort to center discussions about diversity, equity, and inclusion can be seen in the second goal of the department's strategic plan (To promote inclusion, diversity, and equity, especially racial equity, by recruiting, retaining, and supporting a diverse population of faculty, students, and staff in ways that counter ongoing legacies of systemic inequity), which has been extensively revised by the EC with feedback from the DC, and which was shared with faculty at a meeting last month when we put this and other strategic plan goals in dialogue with the Review Committee's helpful recommendations. Please see the strategic plan at the end of the response for a list of the entailments that follow from this goal (2.1-2.11) as these provide a blueprint for actions we plan to take and which dovetail with committee recommendations. This goal and its entailments will also form the basis of our department's diversity plan, which a subcommittee of the EC and DC will draft and share with the department by the end of Spring.

As the Review Committee notes, staging these conversations and taking these actions toward our strategic plan goal will be challenging and will require care, generosity, and a willingness to listen to understand (see strategic plan goals 2.1 and 2.2). We feel like we need to do some of this work ourselves, but we also would be interested in utilizing a trained facilitator, which might be most helpful in thinking about who we are as an English Department.

Some of these conversations have already begun in the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and among Creative Writing faculty in relation to pedagogy and curriculum. A focus on equity and inclusion must be part of undergraduate program reform, and we agree that the undergraduate curriculum might be a place where debates that have been heated when raised in relation to hiring might be more productively handled. The director of undergraduate studies and the Undergraduate Studies Committee are in the process of re-evaluating how we understand our curriculum and its organizing principles (see Undergraduate Education section below). That said, how we plan to go about revising our undergraduate curriculum needs to happen alongside discussion of how we will staff it, so structural, pedagogical, and curricular discussions of equity, inclusion, and diversity require us to develop strategic goals in relation to a hiring plan. While we understand the caution to decouple the two temporarily, we cannot separate conversations about hiring from our conversations about equity and inclusion (see strategic plan goals 2.7. 2.8. 2.9. 2.10).

The CAS has requested from each department a one-, three-, and five-year hiring plan by the end of this Spring quarter. As per CAS instructions, the hiring plan needs to be aligned with a strategic plan and a diversity plan. While we wish we had more time to stage conversations, this Spring we plan to distribute the by-then endorsed strategic plan along with the call for hiring proposals (we have department procedures for this), inviting colleagues to craft proposals that further the strategic plan, including at the pedagogical and curricular levels. And then when we rank proposals, we are going to use the strategic plan as our guide. Our hope is that this process will allow us to tie conversations about equity and inclusion to hiring planning (see SP goals 2.7 and 2.8). We will follow the Review Committee's recommendations and suggested resources for crafting job ads and best practices in hiring. At the same time, it deserves mention that our last five searches have, indeed, been guided by best practices outlined by the department's Diversity Committee as well as the UW Office of Faculty Advancement's valuable toolkit, including their recruitment strategies as well as strategies for drafting job ads, developing criteria and rubrics, interview strategies, and deliberate practices to reduce bias. Our current search committee met with Chad Allen at the start of its work. While these best practices have been passed on between recent search committees, it is important that we more formally compile them into our own departmental toolkit, something we plan to do in addition to incorporating recommendations from the Review Committee (see SP goal 2.9).

It is important to acknowledge that the concerns expressed by the committee about dislodging an imperial center are central to the work of some of our existing units, such as the MATESOL program, which charges itself with English teacher education with an awareness that the spread of English exacerbates political, economic, and racial global inequities. In their teaching and research, a number of our faculty across the department draw on intersectional frameworks as well as the work of scholars who represent a range of national, linguistic, sexual, and racial identities (while we need more specialists in American ethnic literature, we would like to clarify that we do have one specialist in Latinx studies). A number of our recent hires work intersectionally.

The Review Committee also praised the department's Expository Writing Program and the Interdisciplinary Writing Program for their long-standing commitment to equity, inclusion, and diversity, and to enacting antiracist and critical pedagogies and curricula. We agree that these programs have been sites of innovation and praxis. That their work is praised in the review report under "Writing Programs" but not under "Diversity" is revealing (for us as a department) and worth noting. It suggests that while we have made strides in seeing EWP and IWP as part of the department's *administrative* core, we have more work to do in seeing them (and having others see them) as part of

our *intellectual* core. This is something we should continue to work towards. These programs know equity and inclusion are the better way for thinking about pedagogy, including assessment. They look for the unintended consequences of what we see as equity-based decisions, and they wrestle with the complexity of terms like “inclusion.” They engage this in the context of scholarly work, engaged praxis, teacher training, continual program development, individual problem-solving, creating and sustaining partnerships, and UW’s own research on retention and resilience. The significant and transformative work done in support of equity and inclusion in the writing programs should be acknowledged and claimed (and learned from) as central contributions in this area for the department.

Workload, Equity, and the Role of Lecturers

Along with the Review Committee, we acknowledge that “workload equity and distribution of teaching and service responsibility are crucial issues.” While our efforts to increase transparency and accountability have been ongoing since the last review in 2009 (such as more consistent program director appointment terms and consistency in course release associated with service and administration work), we have more work to do to rationalize loads across programs and ranks and to acknowledge and compensate the various kinds of contributions that faculty make to the department, College, UW, and various publics. We are mindful, following Karen Barad, that what comes to matter (ie have substance) depends on how it is made to matter (ie have significance). We need to be more deliberate about making the full range of our work matter and then be accountable to it in our system of reward, merit, and promotion. Over the last two years, we have begun this work through the creation of faculty guidelines for annual merit review as well as through carefully, collectively developed guidelines for promotion to Full Professor. We need to continue these efforts by creating similar guidelines for Lecturer and Assistant Professor promotion. And we need to develop more rank specific expectations for teaching, research, and service.

As we continue our efforts to increase SCHs (see our self-study for detailed descriptions of what we have done over the last ten years), it is crucial that we do so in ways that value our research and sustain our core programs and all that those bring to the humanities, the university, and its publics (see strategic plan 1.1). At a time when we are working so hard to define (and defend) the value of the humanities, we need to be careful when increasing SCHs not to compromise the core practices and labor that make humanistic work possible. Research and artistic creation are a significant part of our tenure-line faculty workload, and we value the contributions this work makes to the mission of a research university. In terms of teaching, that our courses center writing (students’ own and others’) as a critical, intensive site of learning allows students to slow down their thinking, hold it up for scrutiny, examine assumptions and sources of ideas. Writing (in the various genres and modalities we encourage) also provides a space for students to encounter challenging ideas and to bring diverse knowledges, experiences, and perspectives to bear on and enrich these encounters. This is highly student-centered, recursive, revision- and feedback-driven, and labor intensive teaching. And it makes a difference in promoting diversity, inclusion, and student retention.

As described in our self-study, the department’s faculty engage in other labor intensive, often unquantified, work outside of traditional classroom time such as graduate student mentoring, teacher training, thesis committee work in Creative Writing, and independent studies, which involve many hours of teaching. A number of faculty engage in transformative public humanities work. EWP and IWP have a long history of offering community-engaged (“service-learning”). These partnerships, along with the UW in the High Schools program, are successful efforts to increase and enact equity and inclusion through community partnerships, metacognitive learning, and engaged

praxis. English department faculty have likewise been among the most important campus leaders in developing international student support.

All of which is to say that, in addition to research, the teaching, service, and administrative work our faculty perform are central to the core mission of the department and its contributions to UW and its local communities. We agree wholeheartedly with the Review Committee that annual merit reviews (and promotions) should take into account the various forms of value added by this range of work. Our recently developed merit heuristic positions us well to do this, and we plan to build on it in creating merit criteria and rubrics that ensure faculty work with respect to these activities (including public engagement, advocacy, and outreach) is valued for merit and promotion discussions (see SP goals 6.1 and 4.2).

In terms of increasing SCHs while also addressing workload equity, we take seriously the need to work towards and clearly define the work which would constitute a 4+ teaching load. We have already begun department wide conversations about this. The fact is, we already have a defacto 4+ load for *some* faculty. Moving towards a 4+ teaching load in a way that addresses workload equity and also acknowledges, makes visible, and accounts for the various kinds of labor faculty perform is a step we would welcome taking. But we need to take it deliberately in order to develop qualitative measures, not just quantitative, for what constitutes a "+". We plan to spend next year defining what would constitute a "+". Once we define the range of "+" activities, we can take the next steps of aligning them with the merit heuristic and building this into annual activity reports and regular meetings with the chair. In some cases, service and administrative work that is currently compensated with a course release will comprise that faculty member's "+."

As we address SCH issues by moving towards a "+" model, we need to be careful to do so without exacerbating existing divides and workload inequities between tenure and lecturer track faculty. Currently, some lecturers have a five-course teaching load, the most recent Senior Lecturer appointed has a six course load, and IWP lecturers have a five course load plus graduate student TA mentoring. We believe strongly that a 6+ teaching load for lecturer rank faculty would intensify workload inequities and would undermine the uniquely valuable contributions lecturer faculty make to the mission of the department (see strategic plan goal 1.7). In the local context of our department, lecturer-line faculty are intellectual partners who take leadership positions on committees and as program directors and coordinators. The IWP program and the faculty who make up its "corner stone" are strongly lauded in the committee report for their unique collaboration and innovation in "helping students use writing to learn and cultivate discipline-specific knowledge within larger socio-cultural milieu." Lecturer colleagues have been leaders in the long tradition of service learning in the department as well as in curriculum development and innovation. Their experience and success as teachers (at the 100, 200, 300, and 400 levels) enriches students' encounters with our department at critical thresholds by cultivating the kinds of meaningful connections with and among students that contribute directly to students' senses of institutional belonging and their academic success.

That said, we agree that it is time to reexamine lecturer teaching loads, moving to a 5+ load. In the same way that we plan to define the 4+ teaching load for tenure line faculty, we also need to define what a "+" involves for lecturer line faculty in ways that allow the range of their work to be acknowledged, made visible, and accounted for. This work needs to happen alongside efforts to define lecturer expectations for workload, merit, and promotion, as the Review Committee suggests, so as to increase lecturer rank faculty security, stability, and transparency (see strategic

plan goal 4.4). For IWP faculty, currently, the “plus” in their 5+ load refers to the training and mentoring of graduate students from across the College who teach in the program. In the face of decreasing numbers of TAs, IWP faculty have begun to consider ways to consolidate graduate mentoring so it becomes one faculty’s “+” while generating other possibilities for what counts as a “plus” for those who perform that work.

As we move toward a “+” teaching load model, we are strongly opposed to the idea that the “+” should include all administrative work. As noted in our self-study, some of our programs are larger than some departments or units in the humanities and college. It would be unreasonable and iniquitous to count some of the program directing in our department as a “+”. While directing our major programs needs to come with course release, other service and administrative labor that is currently compensated through course release or summer salary could fall within the “+”. We recognize, with the Review Committee, that relying too much on course release leaves the department in a vulnerable position in a SCH and ABB system. We continue to take steps to reduce reliance on course release as well as improve the system of tracking it among the department scheduler, administrator, and acting chair. At the same time, part of the reason we rely on course releases as compensation is due to the significant reduction of recapture money we receive when faculty go on paid leave, which we use to cover summer pay. With only a fraction of the recapture money returning to the department, we are limited in being able to compensate extra service and administrative labor through summer salary. Moving to a “+” will help with some of this, but there is administrative work that cannot be covered by the “+”. In those cases, having more recapture money would allow us to rely less on course release. It is also worth reiterating here what we note in the self-study: that of the nearly 10% English faculty FTEs in 2017-18 that were used to cover administrative roles, approximately 50% of these were related to administrative roles and teaching *outside* of English (see Appendices C.2: Faculty and Faculty FTEs and C.1: Faculty Roster).

Finally, in the context of what the committee report suggests is a connection between length of lecturer appointments and SCHs, we are very concerned about putting lecturers in the unacceptable position of taking on department leadership roles that reduce their SCHs (if compensated via course release) in ways that then risk their job security. One of our exceptional Principal Lecturers who also directs a program had her reappointment term reduced from five to three years during the last reappointment cycle. We will do our best internally not to put lecturer-rank colleagues in this position, but given the indispensable contributions to department leadership and outreach our lecturer colleagues make, we also urge that English department lecturer appointments be considered against the broader context of their contributions than SCHs alone reveal. As we did in the 2009 department response, we advocate strongly for five-year reappointment lengths for these meritorious colleagues whose work is essential to the department.

Undergraduate Education

We agree with the report that curricular revisions are an unending process. Some of the revisions we have made over the last few years have helped increase our number of majors, which should begin to yield an increase in the number of degrees granted. But as with English departments (and humanities programs in general) nationally we have much more work to do. We recognize that the time of “if we build it they will come” is past. Making our major more inclusive; developing pathways for students through the major, with clear entry and exit paths; exploring the idea of tracks in the major; promoting our English minors; continuing our efforts to draw STEM students into our courses either via the writing minor or via collaborations with engineering (last year we

began conversations about offering technical and professional writing courses, and we are in the process of developing two such courses). To the efforts already under way, we look forward to adding recommendations offered by the Review Committee.

Some of our efforts, such as meetings between English advisors and advisors in the school of medicine to build a path for completing the English major while completing pre-med requirements, were put on hold when we were asked by the College to prepare for direct to division (D2D). Up to that point, we were focused on strategies to increase SCHs while working to build up our major. Contrary to the report's observation that we were looking to be saved by D2D, in fact, D2D paused some of our efforts as we projected where our resources would have to be allocated if we had a 50% uptick in majors as a result of D2D. What is presented as wishful thinking was actually motivated by a pragmatic desire to be prepared for an eventuality that we had been asked to prepare for. Prior to being asked to prepare for D2D, we had been (and now continue to be post-D2D) focused on building out our two minors, reaching out to computer science and engineering with lists of "literature and technology" courses, developing new courses (Intro to Social Difference, Intro to Environmental Humanities, Intro to Queer Studies, etc.) specifically designed to appeal to a broad range of students and to fulfill the new DIV requirement. We are working to make our course more welcoming to international students. We also continue our efforts to recover double majors by encouraging them, helping students figure out how to complete a double major/degree efficiently. We have done some pretty strong recruiting with the STEM fields. And of course, our Interdisciplinary Writing Program links writing courses with departments across campus.

The department's Undergraduate Education Committee (UEC) has begun conversations to re-assess the status of our distribution requirements, adding optional thematic "concentrations" (among other things, this speaks directly to the report's call for pathways through the major), and adding a diversity requirement. Guided by the strategic plan, the UEC has been thinking about the curriculum in relation to issues of race, gender, identity, and equity, and also how social media, digital texts (all electronic and image media) have become part of our current students' many literacies. We will look at other English departments at our peer institutions to see how they have built their majors. Holding small focus groups with students, getting their ideas about what they would like to see in a new and changing major, would also be an important place to start.

The Review Committee makes several other very good suggestions. First among these is the creation of an alumni network. This could make visible the range of careers our graduates pursue; establish mentoring relationships with current students; and help with fundraising. Such a network would both be useful for the internship/interview portion of our planned "professionalization and public life" seminar, which could become a venue to help establish it, since we are planning to have students interview former English majors about their careers and/or community engagement work. We already have a robust alumni list that we send our department newsletter out to twice a year. Through that list we might be also able to set up alumni panels for our majors. We also used to invite an alum (often on a quarterly basis) to a lunch with English majors. Those lunches were very successful, and we will look to see about funding for these again.

We agree that both our minors can and should be a way of boosting enrollments. Both seem obvious venues for the kind of engagement with STEM. One factor that has limited this engagement is the lack of predictable course offerings from year to year, something we may want to discuss moving forward. Students in many STEM departments have to plan their schedules years in advance, and thus will only be able to complete our minors if we can promise them certain courses years in advance.

The idea of teaching more large lecture courses is something that has been raised in numerous meetings within the department, and bears revisiting, especially in terms of what obstacles prevent us from offering more of those courses. At the same time, the report also notes that English majors object to having to take large lower-division courses before getting to the smaller upper-division courses. Currently we have only one large “survey course” that students need to complete for the major (ENGL 202). All the other required courses have a 30-40 student cap. The challenge for us is to balance offering small, “boutique” courses for majors, offering larger courses for non-majors, and maintaining our 200 level courses that are mostly “Ws,” which, along with the VLPA, is part of why they fill. One additional option we have discussed would be to open more of our graduate seminars to advanced undergraduates. That endeavor could be linked to re-instating the terminal MA degree as a “5th year” option available to UW English majors.

We agree it is worth pursuing more student social events, including events for students and faculty to interact. The closest activities that we have to the student associations the Review Committee suggests are students run publishing efforts—*Bricolage*, *AU*, and the writing group, “Write Away.”

Graduate Education

We appreciate the Review Committee’s encouragement concerning the reforms we are in the process of making to the MA/PhD program: the “right sizing” of our cohort, the implementation of benchmarks, and the development of policies to respond to students who do not meet those benchmarks. As we continue to revise our program, we will heed the committee’s suggestions to be mindful of the size of our incoming cohorts and to offer more opportunities for graduate students to learn and practice professional skills such as grant-writing and to explore careers beyond the professoriate. We feel strongly that these opportunities need to be integrated formally into the curriculum. As long as they remain “add-ons,” put together on an ad hoc basis by willing faculty, then they are constantly in danger of disappearing.

We also appreciate suggestions made by the Review Committee during the site visit concerning the recruitment and retention of graduate students of color. We will organize our first prospective student visit day this spring, and we will draw on local resources, including GO-MAP, to support these efforts.

It makes sense, as the committee advises, that we should admit more graduate students in our areas of strength (Language and Rhetoric and American Studies, for instance). This suggestion risks being at odds with the advice that we “ensure that the work of mentoring graduate students is distributed more evenly across the department.” If we admit more students in those areas, then faculty in those areas will have to do more mentoring. This also risks creating a two-tier department in which some faculty are excluded from working with graduate students because of their field of expertise. We need to be mindful of these issues as we proceed. Some ideas include the creation of concentrations or tracks that might allow faculty in under-represented fields to continue to contribute to graduate education. We might also build on the tags we have created for coursework so that graduate students can look to a wider range of courses for developing skills and capacities. In terms of holding students accountable for meeting benchmarks, we continue to make progress, with recently voted on procedures. (For more on graduate program plans, please see strategic plan goal 7.)

Graduate students receive modest travel support from the department, but as with faculty support, this is woefully little. We continue to seek external funding and would welcome College and Graduate School support.

While the Review Committee report focused on the PhD program, our two other graduate programs, MFA and MATESOL, continue to thrive, even as they face TA funding needs, with the MATESOL program facing additional staffing concerns with the pending retirement of one of its three core faculty. The department is currently renegotiating an MOU with the International and English Language Programs to continue providing TA support for MATESOL students. How to provide staffing and TA funding support for this unique and highly successful program in this time of transition is one of the challenges the department faces. While the committee commended the department for reducing the size of incoming graduate student cohorts in recognition that the number of jobs in the field has decreased over the past two decades, an examination of MATESOL's placement record demonstrates that this trend does not hold true for graduates with MATESOL degrees (nor PhDs who specialize in TESOL). Likewise, the committee expressed concern about our department's difficulty recruiting and retaining students and faculty of color. The MATESOL program's statistics reflect positively on the department.

In terms of the MFA, we do not see a need to further reduce the size of the graduate program. An optimal program would include full funding for a graduating class of 15 or so per year and a minimum of 10. There is much work to do in an environment of reduced resources, but we are currently working to build connectivity to the two "arms" of the creative writing program (graduate and undergraduate) with some good success. Going forward, we need to discuss the relationship between creative writing and the rest of the department as a whole, and to consider what it means to have an arts program as part of the department.

Writing Programs

We appreciate the Review Committee's recognition of the "pivotal role" our two writing programs play 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." The faculty and staff responsible for these programs are indeed to be commended for their work in nurturing this culture of writing and student learning, along with teacher training that is focused around equity and inclusion. As noted earlier, one continuing challenge has to do with the positionality of the writing programs within the department, especially in terms of how we envision the work they do and the (intellectual, not simply service) contributions these programs make to the department, to graduate and undergraduate education, and public engagement.

In terms of the committee's recommendations, we strongly agree that the EWP and IWP be granted a discretionary budget, separate from the department budget, to strengthen a "strong and vibrant intellectual community."

We are also open to exploring the opportunities for working with graduate students from other humanities departments. We are working with the Humanities Dean to pilot such an effort next year, based on additional TA funding from the College. Long term, because there is a significant investment of time, preparation, and mentoring in the first year, it is really important that TAs from outside English be offered multiyear teaching offers from English. We would also welcome exploring opportunities for creating well compensated post docs or stable lecture positions in EWP as a way to bring more experienced instructors with writing expertise into the program, which could enhance our ability to develop the writing minor and our disciplinary/specialized writing courses, among other things.

We wholeheartedly agree with the Review Committee's recommendation that the core IWP lecturers are the program's corner stone and deserve job security and stability. When reappointment modifications are made, we agree that there be consultation, transparency, and due process.

We agree that the writing programs should apply for external funds. EWP has already applied to various external funds at different times and intends on applying for the CCC Research Initiative funds to support work it is doing to revise the stretch composition courses and other projects underway.

We also agree that travel and research support should be institutionalized for the EWP and IWP Directors. Given the scope, importance, and challenges of holding these positions, ongoing opportunities for professional development should be supported. It also bodes well for UW and English to have a writing program with a national presence. And as related to EWP, most especially, the past two directors have served immediately after and right before receiving tenure. The administrative responsibilities, even if tethered to the directors' intellectual work and scholarship, are such that maintaining a research record is simply more challenging. A research fund from the College would go a long way in supporting the research agendas of people holding these positions.

Finally, we welcome more collaboration between IWP and EWP. The Humanities Dean-appointed College Writing Task force is ideally one site to explore ways to increase this synergy and provide space for exploring the possibilities for collaboration that might require deeper structural changes.

Advancement

The English department has enjoyed a great deal of fund raising success over the last decade in growing the endowment base, not only within the creative writing program. (Creative Writing is showcased as having a "fair amount of success" which we think is an understatement.) While we agree that fundraising should not be left only to the chair, we have also seen over the years the difference it makes to have an interested and invested chair involved. The chair needs to be front and center because they know the department's most pressing needs and can communicate them. At the same time, we do think it is worthwhile to imagine an advisory committee to the chair that can help with fundraising. This can be a subcommittee of the EC or a standing committee that the chair leads. It would help to have other voices involved in annual planning. And it would allow faculty members to learn more about the process.

The Reviewer Committee suggests a fund raising committee be formed consisting of alumni. In 2005, the department tried such a committee consisting of some interested alumni volunteers and a few faculty appointees. We had some good meetings for about a year and a half with no tangible result. In general, our advancement partners warn that "boards" and advisory committees do not work particularly well as fund raising bodies in Arts and Sciences despite our efforts to build them.

Regarding events in the department, we have had an eclectic series of events designed to attract people to campus, from celebrating Shakespeare's birthday, small, intimate gatherings with readings by creative writers, and large gatherings in a downtown theater with a central popular writer as the theme. In general, Advancement at the UW has concluded that large events are not worth the expense and staff time. In particular, through the many iterations we have tried, the small gatherings seem to be the most effective and we think it would be helpful to explore this avenue of reaching audiences without enormous expense. This is a place where we could circle back to some of the events we have put on that were highly regarded and deemed effective.

Appendix

English Department Strategic Plan (Draft in Progress—to be voted on at end of Winter Quarter 2019)

(1) To sustain our core mission in research, teaching, and service.

1. Sustain our core programs with all that those bring to the humanities, the university, and its publics.
2. Through advancement and other funding sources, secure faculty travel and support for research reflecting our status as an R-1 department.
3. Create a hiring plan for a smaller, leaner department, welcoming faculty who can add value to multiple areas of undergraduate and graduate education in ways that further the department's strategic and diversity plans.
4. Reassess the undergraduate curriculum to realign with existing personnel and changing student interests, including exploring ways of being more imaginative in how we staff the full range and diversity of classes.
5. Explore ways to increase student credit hours without compromising educational value, such as considering large lecture classes with no TAs or teaching in alternative formats.
6. Continue playing a campus leadership role in the teaching of writing.
7. Proactively recognize contingent faculty's range of contributions and address job security as central to the department.

(2) To promote inclusion, diversity, and equity, especially racial equity, by recruiting, retaining, and supporting a diverse population of faculty, students, and staff in ways that counter ongoing legacies of systemic inequity.

1. Stage serious capacious conversations that articulate how a commitment to countering ongoing legacies of systemic inequity transforms our discipline in intellectual and pedagogical contexts. These conversations should include mandatory workshops and other events. Within these conversations, it is essential that we are self-reflexive about the historical presumptions about the discipline.
2. Build capacity to listen to and work with each other across differences/communities through collaborations across programs, sharing committee work across areas.
3. Develop a speaker series on issues of diversity.
4. Further our commitment to diversity and equity through the development of best practices and conversations about the difficult pragmatics and experiences of pedagogy: teaching better, teaching differently, and failing forward. (This might

include a mandatory workshop addressing issues of cultural literacy around the topic of not doing harm such as recognizing and addressing issues of micro-aggressions, cultural or unconscious exclusions, tokenization of authors of color, and insensitivity to differences in language use).

5. Continue to work towards a coherent and collective curriculum that is responsive to the questions that are transforming our disciplines (this might include considering the place of 202, 302, and the capstones, course development grants, etc).
6. Support opportunities for students who are underrepresented in our major to gather and be heard.
7. Create a culture of hiring to actively recruit underrepresented faculty. This cannot occur in isolation. In part, this pursuit should occur in relationship to our understanding of how a commitment to countering ongoing legacies of systemic inequity transforms our disciplines.
8. In terms of active retention of underrepresented faculty, stage departmental discussion of how faculty might more readily enter the intellectual and cultural frameworks of colleagues' work rather than primarily honoring an expectation that colleagues should somehow meet existing frameworks.
9. Share best and required practice documents concerning hiring. These documents have been created by our department and Chad Allen's office. They ought to be systematically incorporated into every search.
10. As part of all our hiring, we want to support our commitment to countering ongoing legacies of systemic inequity.
11. Be aware of the journey that students take prior to admission. With the goal of cultivating students who might otherwise be excluded or discouraged due to ongoing legacies of systemic inequity, work with existing programs at UW (UW in the High Schools, Summer Bridge, College Spark Grant, Alternative Spring Break, Access UW, Community Literacy Program, Running Start, Access UW) that reach out to students before they are admitted. These programs may be engaged directly or serve as a launching point for new programs.

(3) To create a departmental culture committed to building intellectual community, encouraging collaboration, and nurturing professional growth.

1. Host appreciation and celebration events to recognize faculty, staff, and student achievements.
2. Include a wider range of announcements in the weekly department news.
3. Provide support, including small grants, for faculty collaborations, including cross-disciplinary events within the department such as colloquia, study groups, brown bags, and faculty teaching presentations.

4. Identify and find ways to support already existing sites of collaboration to showcase connections (e.g. the honors program faculty theme, peer teaching reviews).
5. Encourage co-teaching: develop suggested models and invite faculty proposals.
6. Consider ways that the selection and constitution of the EC consistently represents the diversity of voices and programs within the department.

(4) To increase transparency, accountability, and workload equity.

1. Institute process wherein department committees submit beginning-of-year goals and end-of-year reports to create accountability and continuity.
2. Create and pilot annual review rubric based on the merit heuristic.
3. Restructure and/or downsize department committees to better reflect current and future size of department.
4. Make visible the roles of lecturers within the department with an eye to articulating faculty promotion and reappointment practices.
5. Make annual activity reports visible within the department.
6. Consider the creation of a Personnel Committee to review merit materials. Also, include colleagues from other units of the department in faculty review (reappointment, promotion, and peer teaching review).

(5) To communicate effectively our mission, values, and accomplishments to ourselves, the university, and the wider public.

1. Perform more outreach to local high schools, including expanding course offerings in UW in the High School program (beyond Eng. 131 and 111).
2. Increase social media presence, including PR to news media. Identify a coordinator for communication.
3. Emphasize interdisciplinary outreach with the goal of reaching students outside of traditional humanities orientation, for example: team teaching with other departments, promoting the writing minor in other disciplines, publicizing collaborations with faculty in other units.
4. Rethink focus and audience of department newsletter, *English Matters*.
5. Communicate department statement of values to wider public.
6. Host more lightning talks as public outreach; podcasts.

(6) To enable and support public engagement, advocacy, and outreach.

1. Ensure that faculty work with respect to these activities is valued for merit and promotion discussions; share more about what we do in the community with each other.

2. Pursue job searches and incorporate into job descriptions language that values public engagement, advocacy, and outreach.
3. Add curricular and capstone options to enable undergraduate and graduate students to engage with diverse publics.
4. Invite members in the community to the department.
5. Provide workshops for faculty on how to use social media for advocacy, including risks.
6. Make and post videos on our website of faculty and student work in the community (work with student internships to do this).

(7) To continue our efforts to reinvent our graduate programs in light of ongoing, fundamental changes to the profession and to higher education.

1. Building on the practicum in multiple career paths being offered in 2019, the DGS and GSC could make recommendations for routinizing the event and/or solidifying pathways to potential internships.
2. Support and extend the placement committee symposium inviting recent graduates with alt ac careers to share their experiences.
3. Consider ways to increase graduate seminar enrollments, such as: exploring overlaps with undergraduate honors courses, allowing strong undergraduates into grad seminars, publicizing our graduate seminars to other departments, team teaching graduate seminars.
4. Assess the effectiveness of the portfolios being piloted in 506 in Fall 2018, and discuss they can play a role in progress through the program and professional preparation.
5. Assess the role of 506 as an introduction to graduate study and revise the course in line with ongoing discussions about our changing graduate program.
6. Survey other programs with a terminal MA and consider a proposal to offer a either or both of a terminal MA or a combined BA/MA.
7. Encourage departmental conversations around alternate and complementary assignments to the seminar paper in grad courses.
8. Seek to further integrate the successful teacher training and professional development we provide for graduate student teachers into other parts of their graduate education.