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Preface

This strategic plan, covering the period 2011-2016, replaces the former strategic plan which covered the period 2007-10, and which was itself a replacement of the 2004 plan.

The plan is divided into two parts. **Part I** is entitled “Departmental Goals 2011-2016” and offers a short account of English Department goals over the planning period, based around our **Key Activities**. This part covers A) undergraduate programs, B) graduate programs, C) the work of faculty, and D) other associated areas of our work. This section ends with E) a set of targets we should set ourselves over the period 2011-2016. **Part I** represents the core of the plan.

**Part II** entitled “Achieving the Goals” suggests ways in which we might implement the plan. It is divided into six sections covering 1) our research culture, 2) the undergraduate program, 3) the graduate program, 4) internationalization, 5) associated strategic issues, 6) hiring priorities, 7) future actions. The detailed implementation strategies contained in **Part II** are anchored (alpha-numerically) to the goals set forth in **Part I**. Each section in **Part II** is prefaced with short headline items, which set out the chief aims of that section.

The Department as a whole will review and revise the plan annually, to reflect shifting circumstances and new opportunities which may present themselves. It is not, and should not, be regarded as a text engraved in stone.

The Strategic Planning Group

Vince Casaregola
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Part I Departmental Goals 2011-16

The key activities of the English Department are research and the provision of undergraduate and graduate programs of study in English. All three of these activities are undertaken at the highest standards of achievement. Every undertaking, initiative, or proposal that we pursue is to be judged on the extent to which it contributes to the strengthening of these key activities.

Fostering intellectual excellence in an atmosphere which is also collegial, collaborative, supportive, and humane, remains one of the highest priorities of the Department. Equally important is the commitment to social justice and the University’s wider Jesuit mission of educating the “whole person”.

English Department goals for the period 2011 – 2016 are as follows:

A. Undergraduate

1. To offer a comprehensive and coherent undergraduate program in English studies.
2. To deliver a curriculum in which a student encounters the diversity of approaches current in twenty-first century English studies. This curriculum will welcome innovative approaches to the subject, while it will also reflect the established values and materials of the study of English at the University level and be fully engaged with the Department’s research culture.
3. To review the level and form of the Department’s contribution to the College of A&S ‘Core’ and the 1818 program, ensuring that this engagement is not in conflict with the Department’s delivery of its key activities.
4. To spread the responsibility for delivering the undergraduate program as widely as possible among tenured and tenure-track Faculty.
5. To cultivate among our students a sense of belonging to a Department that places their intellectual development at the center of its activities, while also recognizing our role in ensuring their employability after they have left SLU.
6. To review the shape, delivery, and assessment of the current undergraduate curriculum, ensuring that it helps us to grow the major and minor, and matches student expectations and needs with the resources, skills, and expertise of the faculty.

B. Graduate

1. To provide a comprehensive, coherent, and fully-funded graduate program in English studies, based on our defined areas of graduate study (see the Doctoral Examination Lists).
2. To prepare students to undertake research and teaching in the discipline at the highest level, while also helping them to secure appropriate professional positions.
3. To make the Department a primary-choice destination for highly qualified students from the region, the nation, and overseas.
4. To ensure that the Department’s reputation and ranking continue to grow, with the aim of placing the program within (or close to) the ‘Top 50’ national graduate programs by 2016.
5. To assist and encourage our graduate students in fostering a vibrant intellectual community.
6. To review the program and delivery of graduate courses in line with anticipated shifts in graduate recruitment, and the expertise and aptitudes of our faculty.

C. Faculty

1. To encourage high-level research and publication in our discipline on the part of all tenured and tenure-track faculty.
2. To assist faculty in their intellectual and professional development as researchers and teachers, and in the gaining of external funding to support their research.
3. To identify those areas of research excellence where we are achieving (or are capable of achieving) a national and international reputation.
4. To maintain a teaching load commensurate with providing excellent instruction, within the context of an ambitious and productive research-oriented Department.
5. To minimize the administrative burden on faculty, particularly where this burden might hinder us from undertaking our key activities.
6. To attract to the Department (and to retain) the best scholars and teachers in our discipline.
7. To ensure that the flow of information between and among administrative colleagues, faculty, students, and the University is accessible, transparent, accurate, and timely.

D. All Areas

1. To monitor the provision of specialized certificate, service, and interdisciplinary programs, ensuring that these contribute to the strengthening of our key activities.
2. To support the development of Research Centers where these offer the chance of raising the Department’s national and international profile.
3. To encourage inter-disciplinary initiatives and collaborations, whether internal or external to SLU, but only where these can be shown to benefit the Department’s key activities.
4. To modify, adjust, or abandon any initiative or program that is shown to detract from our key activities.
E. Targets

In order to realize the Department’s goals, we must continue to reflect on our performance and set meaningful targets.

By 2016 we will:

1. Stabilize the annual intake of declared majors and minors in English, aiming for an annual target figure of at least 225 declared majors and minors. This would represent a 12.5% increase on our current “high point” of 200 major, 2\textsuperscript{nd} major, and minor students achieved in spring 2010.
2. Admit approximately 10 fully-funded full-time students to the MA and PhD program annually.
3. Maintain an annual completion rate of at least 5 PhDs, on average.
4. Achieve a 20% increase in external research funding over the planning period.
5. Increase our provision for Internships among our UG students by 70%.
6. Establish procedures for tracking the subsequent placement of our students after they have left the Department, with the intention (for our graduate students) of ensuring that our placement rates reflect national trends.

Achieving these targets will also involve us in monitoring our progress on a regular basis. We address this issue in Section 7 below.

Each of the detailed sections of the plan which follow is anchored to this Part I statement of our overarching goals and targets for the period 2011-2016.

Part II: Achieving the Goals

Section 1: Research Culture

- Evolve our research culture
- Develop our research identity
- Establish research colloquia
- Promote collaborative research
- Explore research funding opportunities
- Increase research funding
- Institute a research forum
- Appoint a Research Convener
A. A Home for Research

Undertaking high quality research is not only one of our **key activities**, but it underlies every other aspect of our professional lives [C1, C2]. Research of high quality is also integral to the intellectual challenge, rigor, and education of the “whole person” promoted by SLU’s Jesuit mission. In the English Department, research embraces faculty scholarship and publication, conference participation on the part of faculty and graduate students, faculty involvement as office holders in national and international research-based organizations, the graduate program’s training of scholar-teachers, and the provision of cutting-edge undergraduate teaching sensitive to a complex and changing field and student goals [A1, A2, B1, B2, B3].

Recent years have seen a steady growth in the quality and quantity of faculty publications in the form of monographs, editions, translations, anthologies, essays and articles, and in fiction and poetry. Our faculty have won national prizes and international recognition for their work. They are invited to give lectures and participate in conferences all over the world.

For this pattern of achievement to continue to improve, much will depend on a steadily evolving Departmental culture of research, equipped to support and retain the current faculty and to attract top-flight new faculty. [B3, B4, C4, C5, C6]. This research culture is essential for us to attract engaged, highly qualified graduates and undergraduates to our programs. [A1, A2].

B. Research Events

The Department currently hosts numerous **ad hoc** research events, as well as more sustained programs such as the Sheila Nolan Whalen Reading Series in creative writing. A new Research Colloquium, featuring external speakers, met with great success in 2010-11. Faculty also undertake collaborative research with other departments, and other institutions in St. Louis and elsewhere.

Currently, however, we lack an internal research forum for faculty members and graduate students. We reserve Tuesdays, 2.15PM to 4:30 PM for Departmental and committee meetings. We can use this time as available for the arguably more important exercise of listening to, and commenting upon, one another’s research.

To address these opportunities, we propose two immediate courses of action. One is the appointment of a **Departmental Research Convener**, chosen annually from among senior faculty, whose job would be to oversee, encourage, organize, and introduce a research forum, embracing faculty and graduate students each semester. This rewarding task would support and enhance our research culture. [B3, B5, C1, C2, C6]
Secondly, we propose that the Tuesday 2.15PM slot become a recognized, and
timetabled “research period” reserved for presentations, papers, speakers,
roundtables, or guest lectures. We should strive to keep this period free of
commitments, other than Departmental meetings, and encourage faculty, graduate
students, and undergraduates to attend and contribute their expertise, knowledge,
and views on the topic or theme in hand. We should work to secure external funding
to support these activities. [B3, B5, C1, C2, C6].

C. Developing our identity: the Textual Revolution

We recognize that the Department is in need of a more distinctive research identity
[C3, C6]. One approach to refining our identity would be to take the current twelve
doctoral list areas (see section 3 below), and select from these four or five
“Research Clusters” in areas which seem the most visible, and the most productive
[C3], emending or adding to our selection as circumstances shift. A different
approach would be to try to anticipate new disciplinary shifts where we have
potential to expand, such as (for example) eco-criticism, or medical narrative.

An alternative approach, which we recommend, would be to root our identity more
securely in the Department’s unique intellectual history. Just as St. Andrews
University claims to have invented the systematic study of English Literature in the
mid-eighteenth century, or University College London can boast that it initiated the
degree-level study of English in the late 1820s, or Yale University can maintain that it
was the home of the “philological study” of English in the 1880s and the “new
criticism” in the 1960s, so the Department of English at Saint Louis University can
justifiably claim that it helped to initiate the “Textual Revolution” of the twentieth and
twenty-first centuries with which we are now learning to live.

We can make this claim since we housed two visionary theorists and critics of the
“Textual Revolution”: Marshall McLuhan and Walter Ong, both of whom were
committed to more traditional approaches towards English literature before
developing their ideas and theories to chart much wider intellectual landscapes. The
former presence of McLuhan and Ong in the Department is probably the strongest
“brand identity” or “USP” that a modern Department of English could possess. We
need to capitalize on it at every level, since it will help us to sell our programs in
adjacent areas to potential faculty, funders, and students. [A2, A6, B2, B3, B4, B5,
C1, C2, C3, C6 D2, D3, E4].

The “Textual Revolution” embraces the production, dissemination, reception, and
interpretation of texts (written, visual, interactive) which we approach in a traditional
fashion, using the printed word and image, but also via the more fluid media of film,
the web and the internet. This shift is, potentially, as all encompassing as the
changes created by the invention of the alphabet and the printing press. The
“Textual Revolution” has prompted new approaches towards the use of technology in
the humanities, the diffusion of new databases, and the re-circulation and remediation of the objects of our study. This energy has called into question the nature of textual space, the book, the page, and even the individual word and letter form, while the distinction between word and image (either static or dynamic) is being re-forged.

Whether or not we prepare them for it, all of our students (undergraduates and graduates) will be operating in this new environment. Helping students to understand this environment represents an enormous educative opportunity [A2]. Certainly, the faculty should consider developing new courses for the English major in the history of the book, and the history of writing, which might become major requirements, and be team-taught. These initiatives, stemming from the past, might (paradoxically) help our students to understand the possible future of writing. A writing track, sponsored by faculty working in Rhetoric and Composition, should, equally, contain courses in new media writing. A multi-disciplinary doctoral track in this area, sponsored by the Ong Center might also be attractive [A2, B2, B3, B5].

Recent faculty appointments at senior and junior level, combined with existing distinguished faculty working on all aspects of “textuality” (which includes the history of interpretation and production, as well as contemporary approaches to film, together with critical and creative writing), provide a sound basis for positioning the Department along these lines.

The emphasis on “textuality” does not, of course, preclude supporting the many and varied research pathways which colleagues are developing in the Department. Work on (for example) disability studies, medical narrative, ecocriticism, women’s studies, queer studies, life writing, religion and literature, biopolitics, science and technology, political theology, digital literacy, and rhetoric and public discourse will (we hope) continue to flourish and command support. These areas cut across traditional sub-boundaries and chronologies within our discipline, and we need to find ways of accommodating them within our teaching practices, as well as our research. But we should be open to the possibility of aligning these fields, wherever possible, within the larger sphere of “textuality” to promote the Department’s research identity.

The Ong Center has a potentially leading role to play in helping faculty and students analyze and understand this “textual revolution.” The Center, which now reports directly to the Office of the Vice President (Frost Campus), is currently exploring new directions and possibilities. The Department should aim to foster a close and mutually supportive relationship with the Center.

In order to flourish, the Center has to grow beyond the English Department, and forge connections across the College and the University, a project which Medical Humanities, for example, is already pursuing with some success. Work in Digital Humanities, taking place in other Departments, as well as our use of the Computer
Assisted Instruction (CAI) laboratories, and the resources of the Communication Department, will inevitably have a part to play in these new directions, and will buttress our commitment to developing research centers and contributing to interdisciplinary initiatives elsewhere in the University [D1, D2].

Expanding the existing annual Ong Lecture into a series of lectures and readings on the theme of the “Textual Revolution” might prove attractive. Setting a research agenda based around three or four key questions associated with “Textuality” would, equally, provide a focus for the Center’s and the Department’s funding efforts and grant writing, which also has the possible advantage of tying the Center to some of the research elements of the Writing Program.

D. Research Funding

We have set ourselves the target of increasing research funding by 20% over the period 2011-16 [E4]. Whether this increase should be related to the number of grants we gain, or whether it should be related to the amount of dollars we earn, is a matter that we still need to determine. In our discipline, numerous smaller grants (in comparison to larger, single-project awards) can make a very large difference to our work.

The President's Research Fund last year (2010) received very few applications from humanities projects, and none from the Department of English. In 2011, one application from the Department (jointly with Health Care Ethics and Philosophy) was submitted. We need to make every effort to encourage high-quality collaborative or solo funding applications. [C2, D3]. We should therefore aim to submit at least one such application to the President’s Fund per year. We also need to retain a strong presence on the funding-decision making bodies at College and University level, which will require continuing commitment, particularly from senior colleagues [C1, C2].

In order to increase this revenue stream, two distinct possibilities suggest themselves for future funding efforts. The recently compiled doctoral lists are the result of collaborative effort among faculty. Consideration should be given, among colleagues who have worked together in compiling these lists, to developing a collaborative pilot project, arising out of their discussions in compiling the lists, which might suggest possibilities for external funding [C1, C2, C3].

Secondly, hosting a new or on-going research project (whether editorial, bibliographic, or technological), a new or existing journal, a learned society, or annual conference, all offer potential. Housing African American Review is, for example, a source of considerable prestige for the Department. Bringing to the Department (for example) “The New Chaucer Society” (which supports a biennial
international conference, and which publishes the highly respected *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*) is the kind of enterprise which we should encourage [E4].

### Section 2: The Undergraduate English Program

- Review the Major in English
- Encourage a culture of research among majors
- Cultivate our alumni
- Re-submit the IES Grant for the Writing Program
- Encourage greater faculty input to the Writing Program
- Explore new certificate programs in STS and Humanities / Business
- Assess involvement in A&S core
- Integrate service teaching / learning into the curriculum
- Explore longer term contracts for Creative Writing adjuncts

#### A. The Major in English

Our goal for the undergraduate major is to continue to do what we already do well, namely, providing comprehensive and coherent programs of study in our discipline. Our target for the planning period is stabilizing the program at an average of 225 enrollments (major, 2nd major, minor) per semester, which represents a 12.5% growth on our spring 2010 enrollment, or a 15% growth on our average enrollments (2008-11) [E1].

Increasing the number of majors in the program was a priority highlighted by the 2009 External Review. However, our ability to attract students as declared majors in English seems to fluctuate significantly. During the period 2001-10, fall enrollments to the English major oscillated by approximately 33% from the average (119 enrollments), reaching a peak (142 enrollments) in 2005-6, and a secondary peak (137) in 2009-10, which also represented the high point of enrollment of majors, 2nd majors, and minors (200 enrollments). The low point in recruitment to the major was reached in 2007-8 (106 enrollments).

More recently, while enrollments in the College of Arts and Sciences have grown by approximately 2.6% over the period 2007-9, the Department’s enrollment of declared majors and minors for 2010-11 experienced a decline of 7.5%. The overall trend of recruitment of majors over the longer period 2001-10 is, however, steadily upwards, rising by approximately 9% over the ten-year period. Though, this is, perhaps, a rather modest growth rate compared to the University’s overall increase in freshmen enrollments over the same period, it suggests grounds for optimism.

The reasons for this fluctuation are multifactorial. They might include the “flight” of potential majors to other subjects (particularly Psychology, Communication,
Business, and Biology), demographic shifts, and a widespread assumption (which we need to challenge) that the study of English offers limited post-University career opportunities: an assumption that has been termed “the new vocationalism.”

Just as the reasons for fluctuations in the uptake of the major may be due to a number of factors, so ways to address this problem may involve addressing a number of inter-related issues. In terms of the “new vocationalism,” for example, promoting the “employability” dimension of the subject might be important.

But over-reliance on non-full-time faculty for delivering key undergraduate courses may also be an important issue. The 2003 ADE Report on the undergraduate English major observed that engaging students with faculty at earlier stages of the undergraduate curriculum was important in fostering the major, as was a refined advising program. The 2007 MLA / ADE Report on the Academic Workforce in English recommended that, for doctoral institutions, 60% of undergraduate course sections should be taught by full-time faculty, and that, overall, the “percentage of course sections taught by full-time faculty members should never drop below the majority of the course sections a department offers in any given semester.” The Department needs to maintain this balance, particularly when it is recalled that 56% of its 200- and 300-level courses were offered by non-full-time faculty in fall 2011.

Certainly, as a Department we need to re-commit ourselves to the undergraduate program, ensuring that our faculty’s expertise and aptitudes are fully deployed in the delivery of the program to our students.

To this end, the Department, led by the Undergraduate Committee, should examine the structure of the major, its continuing assessment, and its various requirements, analyzing whether it reflects the ways in which English as a discipline is evolving. Given that, by 2012, more than 40% of our faculty will have been appointed in the past 5 years, the extent to which it also continues to reflect the interests of faculty needs to be examined [A2, C2, C4]. We should identify any overlaps between major and certificate requirements as well as clarify the distinctions between our upper- and lower-level major courses, both in terms of the kinds of assignments we require as well as their theoretical and/or historical emphases [C7]. We should explore the possibility of creating additional tracks and specialties within the major, especially those involving colleagues engaged in professional and technical writing [A2]. Such tracks might include (e.g.): Writing Studies (mirroring the “textuality” research strand we have identified), American Literature, Global English, Contemporary Culture, as well as the current “standard” major, and the Creative Writing emphasis.

In thinking about stabilizing the major, the Department should also consider the 1818 program, treating our Departmental supervision of these courses as recruitment
opportunities as well a chance to build community contacts \([A1, A3, E1]\). We need to distribute the responsibility for contact and on-site visitations to these campuses equitably \([A3, B5, C7]\). We also need to understand the role played by these dual-credit courses in the placement of incoming students \(\text{vis-à-vis}\) their orientation to the English major \([A1, E1]\).

Encouraging a culture of research among our majors is a priority, since this will not only enhance their employment prospects on leaving University, but also help underpin the overall research culture of the Department \([A2, A5, A6, C1, C2]\). There are various ways in which this might be achieved: e.g., requiring a formal senior project/thesis which connects faculty research expertise with undergraduate interests; creating an honors track within the major for those who wish to pursue graduate degrees in English; instituting academically oriented discussion groups (formal and informal) around periods or subject areas; inviting outstanding undergraduates to attend the proposed Departmental research forum. Connecting library and classroom-based study to real-world situations, by (e.g.) providing relevant field trips and access to scholarly readings and talks in the St. Louis area will also help to promote the visibility and attractiveness of the major \([A2, A5, E1]\).

We aim to provide our majors with a strong sense of belonging to the Department \([A5]\). Refining the advising and mentoring process, to ensure that majors are getting the information they need to graduate in a timely manner, is a priority \([E7]\). The Department should also assist more fully those undergraduate majors and minors who wish to transition directly to the workplace after graduation. The Department might, for example, engage in more comprehensive, individualized career mentoring and professionalization workshops. Additionally, the Department should integrate internships more fully into the undergraduate program, with the goal that every student who wishes to pursue an internship may do so, and that all students may be more fully informed about these opportunities. We recommend that the number of students with access to internships increases by 70% by 2016 \([E6]\).

Supporting the activities of \(\text{Kiln}\) and The English Club (which could become the hub for students who wish to undertake advanced English/professional degrees) presents further opportunities \([A5]\).

Relationships with our alumni need to be cultivated. To this end, the Department should consider organizing an “open-day,” which might be combined with Homecoming celebrations, when former alumni are invited back to the Department, to meet old and new faculty, and to talk with current students about their lives and careers. Strengthened relationships with alumni may have benefits on both sides.

The burden placed on the \textbf{Director of Undergraduate Studies} in leading this task of revision and enhancement will be considerable. Hence, we urge the hiring of a
professional administrative assistant, who will also support activities detailed here and elsewhere in this plan.

B. The Writing Program in English

As with the Undergraduate Program in general, the Writing Program should continue to do what it has been doing successfully for many years: providing a high-quality first-year and professional writing curriculum for all sectors of the University, as well as for declared English majors and potential majors in support of the overall goals of the Undergraduate Program [A1, A2, A3, A4]. In order to accomplish this, we need to improve the Program in accord with the best practices current in leading writing programs across the country.

The Writing Program should strive to maintain a small class size, enhancing quality and helping to recruit possible majors [A1, A2, A3, E1]. It should continue to incorporate state-of-the-art instructional technology in as many aspects of the program as possible, upgrading that technology as needed to maintain excellence. To this end, the Program should resubmit the IES Grant for the next round of competition [E4].

The Program should also develop a class format that is more in the workshop mode than in the traditional lecture/discussion mode [A1, A2, A3]. The Program should offer ENGL 190 sections geared more toward specific Colleges and Departments on the model of the ENGL 192 course designed for Parks College and, in addition, design more advanced courses in these areas [A1, A2, A3, E1]. It should design and offer additional writing courses at the 300-level in fields and areas of interest to majors within the University whose programs could support such courses with enough students to fill a 15-20 cap classroom [A1, A2, A3, E1].

The Program should encourage a rotation involving regular faculty in teaching at the 100 level (perhaps with English 194).

The Program should expand its support of the graduate track in rhetorical studies and composition studies by enhancing the study and practice of writing pedagogy, as well as by supporting courses in rhetorical theory, writing pedagogy, and related areas at the advanced undergraduate and graduate levels [B2, B3, C1, C2, C3]. Finally, it is worth noting the way in which our research culture inhabits the English Writing program, where the ongoing importance of Ong’s rhetorical work is especially evident in the revisions designed to integrate in new ways the oral and electronic modes of expression in the service of more effective writing.
C. The English Education Program

English majors who are pursuing certification in Secondary Education in English (and who are therefore primary majors in Education) make up approximately 10% of our current majors. The Department should make a significant effort to maintain this area [A1, A2, E1]. To this end, the Department should build on the current relationship with Educational Studies, enhancing communication and collaboration between the two Departments [C7]. It should monitor and refine the requirements list for undergraduate Secondary Education majors who seek certification in English, and encourage these students to declare as majors [A5, D1, E1].

D. The English Certificate Programs

In considering the undergraduate curriculum, we should be alert to the interface between the Certificate Programs and the English major, particularly in the ways they might impact upon the Departmental emphasis on “fields” and “periods.”

We should identify and support certificate programs that add substantially to the appeal, variety, professionalism and interdisciplinary emphases of the Department. Film Studies, Medical Humanities, and Women’s Studies have experienced growth, engage a significant number of faculty, contribute to Departmental cross-listing, and carry the promise of internships and the professionalizing of the Department [A1, A2, D1, D3].

Additionally, we should explore possible new areas for certificate programs, including Science/Technology Studies and Humanities/Business [A1, A2, C6, D1, D3, E1].

E. Contributing to the Core Curriculum

Currently, the English Department contributes one writing course and two literature courses to the Core. Because of our strong involvement in the program, we need to review the curricular content of all our courses in this area, keeping in mind the needs of the students and faculty expertise [A3]. We should also improve the processes that ensure that the right number and level of core courses are being offered each year [A3]. We should analyze the distinctions between core and major courses, making those distinctions clearer to all undergraduate students [A3]. In addition, we should clarify the relationship between the rhetorical and literary core courses and why and in what order students should take them [A3]. We should also distinguish between lower- and upper-level literature courses, and indicate the order students should take them [A3]. Finally, we should discuss how and when to assess student achievement in these courses [A3].
F. English Service Learning/Teaching

Service is a key element in the University’s Jesuit mission, and helps to identify, positively, the SLU “brand.” English courses, at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, as well as English Department activities, are highly suited to service activity. We can expand our definitions of “service” [C7] not only to include English courses/experiences that involve social welfare (e.g., Studio STL or the College in Prison Program), but also those which utilize “action research/learning” such as in-class and out-of-class activities that engage our students in social change (through reading, writing, reflection and activism). Hence we should encourage faculty and graduate assistants to include course content that connects with real-world issues such as (e.g.) social injustice and racial, gender, and disability inequalities. This aspect of our service mission will also impact upon student employability, and hence the attractiveness of our major [A5, E1].

To this end, we need to investigate further the resources and activities involving service learning which already exist on campus, such as the Micah Program, Atlas Week, and the Departmental Task Force on Social Justice [C7]. We should also help English faculty and graduate assistants to integrate service learning into their teaching and research without adding undue burdens on them, such as by organizing field trips for their students to area museums and points of interest [C6, D3]. Finally, we should encourage more faculty to get involved in supporting the activities of the English Club and the Bonne Terre Prison Project, either by actually teaching/participating themselves or by helping other faculty that are already teaching/participating [D 3].

G. Creative Writing

Creative Writing is a vital component in our undergraduate program, which will help us to attract students to the Department and help us to grow our undergraduate program [A2, A5, E1]. Identifying creative writing students early in their undergraduate careers is important. Creative writing courses need to be sequentially organized, and offered on a predictable basis, while they also need to be integrated more fully into the English major [A1]. Instituting a series of higher-level ‘craft’ courses (e.g., the craft of dialogue, or the craft of constructing fictional time), which might be delivered in collaboration with local writers / MFA students is an opportunity that should be explored.

The Creative Writing program is an area where teachers are also practitioners. Establishing one- or two-year teaching fellowships in this area, which would attract well-qualified MFA graduates / practitioners, might also raise the profile of this area of our activity [A1, C4, C6].
The program has been successful in securing funding for the Whalen Series and the Drahmann residency, which has allowed distinguished visiting speakers to visit the Department, with a substantial impact on our overall intellectual life and research culture [C1, C2]. The highly prestigious Library Associates award, which has brought world-renowned authors to the campus, and in which the Department plays a leading role, has had important benefits for the Department’s visibility. Since creative writing is eminently attractive to outside funders, existing and future efforts to secure funding in this area should be encouraged and supported.

Section 3: The Graduate Program

- Raise the Graduate Program “score” by between 0.4 - 0.6 by 2016.
- Admit fewer students, but these to be fully funded
- Monitor PhD completion rates
- Emphasize areas of doctoral specialization
- Promote the program more effectively
- Review graduate courses

A. Improving our Ranking

The University’s ambition to see all its graduate programs ranked within or close to the “top 50” mirrors our own ambition for the graduate program in English. The Department’s graduate program is currently (2011) ranked 94th in the country with a US News and World Report “score” of 2.5 which places us midway between the categories “adequate” and “good.” This is not a position to which we aspire. We recognize that rankings of this sort are a very blunt instrument with which to assess the standing of a program, particularly in the case of English where the USNWR survey, based entirely on peer assessment for our discipline, reported a response rate of just 31%. Nevertheless, increasing our peer-assessed score by 0.4 would place us in the low 60s (above Fordham, George Washington, and Purdue Universities). Increasing the score by 0.5 would place us in the high 50s, alongside (e.g.) Boston College and Arizona State University [B4].

Our strategic task is to improve the reputation of the program. The Department already has a number of key advantages that make this possible. We are already attracting lively, committed, and ambitious graduate students; we have a research-oriented, nationally visible, and productive graduate faculty; we offer an array of interdisciplinary graduate credentials (certificates in Medieval Studies, Rhetoric and Composition, and Women’s Studies); we now possess a clear statement of our doctoral specializations; we enjoy significant financial support from the University administration [B1].
But, in order to increase our ranking we must attend to our visibility and profile. The external reputation of our faculty and program and the placement record of our graduates (see below) are crucial. Equally important, in the future, will be the quality of applicants we are able to attract to the program from the region and from further afield [B3, C1, C3].

As with the undergraduate major, the graduate program needs to ensure that it is continually engaged with the Department’s research culture and identity. A doctoral track in the area of “Textuality” (as suggested in section 1 above), promoted by the Ong Center, might attract a new constituency of students to the Department [B3].

Our chief areas of expertise are now apparent via the published doctoral lists. Currently these comprise the following twelve areas:

- Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Literature
- Medieval and early Sixteenth-Century British Literature
- Early Modern British Literature
- The British Long Nineteenth Century
- 19th-Century American Literature
- Modern Irish Literature
- 20th-Century British Literature and Cultural Contexts
- 20th/21st-Century American Literature
- Transatlantic Modernisms
- Contemporary Postcolonial/Non-Western Literatures and Cultures
- Rhetorical studies / Composition Studies
- Life Writing

At the graduate level, the Department should promote some of these areas as recognized “fields of excellence,” which will be a key element in graduate recruitment [C3, C6]. Faculty publications, funding, and research activity in all the above areas, need to be continually promoted via the Department’s website [C1, C2, C3].

B. Funding and Selectivity in the Graduate Program.

The most recent (2010) MLA Survey of Earned Doctorates reported that, after a high point in the mid 1970s, followed by a period of steep decline, and then partial recovery in the late 1990s, the number of doctorates in English fell by 25% in the period 1997-2009.

But during the period 2001-2009, judged on our enrollment figures, we have steadily increased the size of our graduate program. We had 57 students enrolled on our graduate program in 2001. In 2009 (when the award of doctorates in English nationally was approaching the 1987 nadir) we had 86 graduate enrollments: a growth of some 65% over the period 2001-9. Clearly, we have been expanding while the overall trend in graduate study in the US has been one of contraction.
Given these national trends, it is not surprising that the hallmarks of the top ten national graduate programs in our discipline are as follows:

- They are relatively small compared to the large numbers of faculty available and the breadth of faculty interests, admitting (on average) no more than 8 - 12 students per year.
- They are highly selective, admitting between 3% and 8% of applicants per year.
- They aim to achieve completion of the doctoral program within 5-6 years.
- Despite low admission rates, they have a sufficient cohort of students to promote a genuinely coherent intellectual community, with graduate programs geared to both faculty expertise and student needs.
- They engage in a degree of collaborative delivery of the program, offered both from within and outside the English Department.
- They achieve high placement rates at prestigious institutions.

In 2010 we received 54 applications from potential graduate students, of whom we admitted 26. This admit rate (54%) is a vast improvement on the 80% admit rate which concerned the 2009 External Reviewers, but it still leaves room for improvement. Of those 26 admits, 16 eventually enrolled with us (7 M.A. and 9 PhD). We are confident in the abilities of the students we have admitted. But we are admitting at a much higher rate than the top programs. It is also noteworthy that out of the 15 applicants that we admitted to the PhD program in 2010, 6 applicants eventually chose to go elsewhere: to Baylor, Case Western Reserve, Notre Dame, Purdue, SIU Carbondale, and University of Mississippi.

To address this situation, we would encourage the Graduate Committee to consider carefully their entry criteria when scrutinizing applications, keeping in mind the goal of promoting a greater measure of selectivity. Aiming for an admit rate, for example, of 25-30% within the planning period, rather than the current 54% would, we believe, be more appropriate given the Department’s ambitions and the increasingly capable pool of applicants [B3].

The intellectual status and prestige of our faculty is, of course, the best recruiting tool available to the graduate program. But the efforts of faculty are wasted in the absence of commensurate funding support for the program at the level of high-quality programs offered elsewhere. A fully funded graduate program, with admissions determined by the number of assistantships we can offer, is, we believe, the key to improving the quality of our applicants, and, just as importantly, promoting the Department as a primary destination for these applicants [B1]. For these
reasons, we should continue to press the University to provide an appropriate level of support for the program.

However, we would also strongly recommend that the Graduate Committee restructure our graduate funding packages to make the Department a primary destination for our best applicants. This will necessitate a much greater degree of selectivity in graduate admissions since, with the exception of a small number of highly qualified fully self-funded or externally funded students, we propose that we should, over the planning period, admit only the students we can support fully [B3]. The Department's financial resources should allow us, by 2016, to admit 5 master’s candidates a year with 2 years of full funding, and 5 doctoral candidates a year with 4 years of full funding. The result would be no more than 10 admitted full-time, fully funded students per year [E2].

These recommendations depend on increasing the duration of the department's doctoral assistantships from 3 to 4 years. This change will promote timely completion of the doctorate, and the overall attractiveness of the program, since the current system of 3-year doctoral TA rotations removes a student’s financial support at precisely the time when she/he is beginning to write the dissertation.

Along with the newly implemented doctoral program, which will provide a higher degree of focus, this policy will (we believe) result in more highly qualified applicants, shorter time-to-degree, and better quality dissertations. The proposed admissions rate (25-30%) would also be more in line with the top-tier programs in our discipline, reflecting national trends, while also providing a sufficient cohort of students to sustain an intellectually viable program of graduate courses.

C. Completion and Placement Rates

In the period 2006-9 we graduated 25 PhDs, in an average time to degree of 5.9 years. This is well below the subject average of 7.9 years. These completion rates are a testimony to the diligence of our students and to the importance that faculty place on this aspect of their work. But during this period, nearly 25% of our students graduated after a period of 9-10 years. This underlines the importance of continuing to monitor, as closely as we can, progress towards the PhD [E3].

Graduate placement success is an important measure of the overall reputation of the program. The term “placement” (according to the 2004 MLA Survey on PhD Placement Rates) covers 13 distinct categories of post-doctoral employment, not all of which may be relevant in calculating a defined “placement rate.” During the period 2002-11, we graduated some seventy students, the vast majority being awarded a PhD. Predominantly, these former students went on to take academic positions (tenure-track and non-tenure-track professorships, directors of writing programs, visiting professorships, postdoctoral fellowships, etc.) in a wide variety of institutions.
This pattern of employment is in line with the 2010 MLA Report on the Survey of Earned Doctorates.

We believe that our placement rates are as good as those of comparable universities. However, it has not always been easy to calculate accurately our placement rate (understood as a measure of relevant postdoctoral appointments against the number of new enrollments and / or degrees awarded, over a given time period). The Department, led by the Graduate Committee and the Placement Officer, needs to agree on what constitutes appropriate placement data, so that we are able to better monitor our performance, and adjust (if necessary) the kind of support we are offering our students [E6]. We would then be in a better position to more accurately track our progress against the reported tenure-track placement rates of other English Departments such as (e.g.) Rutgers (75%), Notre Dame (72%), or Marquette (60%).

D. Graduate Courses and Curriculum

Irrespective of the proposed shift in policy on admissions, graduate course offerings would benefit significantly from better coordination within and among the various faculty area-based planning groups (e.g. Medieval, Early Modern, post-1800 British, American, and Rhetoric/Composition). For example, the provisions of the revised doctoral program tie the declaration of a student’s minor field to coursework. Faculty course planning should take into account such considerations. At the master’s level, the Department should consider requiring both ENGL 500 (Research Methods) and ENGL 511 (Literary Theory), where as now master’s candidates may take one or the other. More than one literary theory course at the graduate level is probably also needed, with our introductory course in theory (511) being regularly supplemented by advanced offerings in various theoretical and interdisciplinary paradigms [B1, B2]. Reviewing the range and mode of delivery of graduate courses, particularly as they may be impacted upon by a policy of greater selectivity in admissions, will be a matter for The Graduate Committee in the near future [B6].

E. Overseas Applicants

In 2009, the majority of US doctorates in the physical sciences and engineering were awarded to temporary visa holders (i.e., non-US citizens). The award of doctorates to overseas students in all broad subject fields is much larger today than it was 20 years ago.

Although we face strong competition for international graduate students from abroad, we need to attract well-qualified international graduate applications, in keeping with the University’s global ambitions, and in order to diversify and internationalize our student body (see below, Section 4). We should be alert to the prospect of recruiting highly-qualified applicants from Europe, but also from other regions where “English”
is culturally and linguistically embedded, such as (for example) India or the Anglophone countries of Africa. This strategy might also lend itself to the possibility of approaching local funders and donors, with a view to endowing scholarships [B3, E4]. In this respect, working with the relevant University officers, the Department should also explore further domestic foundation grants to fund additional scholarships and stipends for exceptionally well-qualified international students.

F. Public Image

The current methodology for assessing graduate programs in our discipline relies, overwhelmingly, on peer assessment rather than metrics. This means that the public face of our program is a vital element in computing our ranking. Our web site is a primary means of delivering important administrative information to faculty, graduates, and undergraduates. But it is also the means by which we advertise ourselves to the wider world, and it functions as a key recruitment tool to all our programs [B3, B4, C2, C7, E1, E2]. Working with existing faculty, graduate students, and office staff to deliver a more dynamic public image of the Department via the website is a very high priority.

The Graduate Program has a strong regional identity, attracting good students from the Midwest and elsewhere, and placing them in regional institutions, as well as institutions located further afield. We should not neglect our regional identity which represents a significant “market niche” for recruitment to the program and eventual placement. But in seeking to raise our national profile and ranking, we need to ensure that we are also able to attract applicants and enrollments on a national basis. Just as undergraduate recruitment of students from beyond 50 miles of the SLU campus has grown dramatically since 2000, the Department needs to intensify its efforts to recruit graduate students from outside the region, since one benchmark by which we might measure progress towards a more high-quality graduate program is the extent to which we are able to attract (and enroll) students from beyond the immediate environs of St. Louis.

This aspiration will involve investment in bringing potential students to SLU who may not be familiar with the University and the City. We should, therefore, seek funding from the University to help in our recruitment efforts of the best applicants, bringing them to campus wherever possible.

Finally, while acknowledging that, according to the 2010 NSF Survey of Earned Doctorates, humanities graduate programs represent one of the least attractive subject fields for doctoral study on behalf of minority US citizens and permanent residents, we would also recommend to the Graduate Committee that promoting a more diverse graduate student body is a very high priority.
G. Administering the Program

The burden on the Graduate Director in administering the program, dealing with applications, negotiating with possible candidates, and in addressing funding issues is now intense. To support the Graduate Director (alongside supporting the Director of Undergraduate Studies, and the Chair of the Department) the hiring of a professional administrative staff person to support this area of activity is essential.

H. Supporting our Post-doctoral Students

We recommend that the Department apply for Two Postdoctoral Teaching Fellowships. These hires would provide experienced classroom instructors, and thus help to support or goal to retain a teaching load commensurate with faculty research efforts. As the number of graduate students available to teach is reduced, Postdoctoral Teaching Fellows will reduce reliance on part-time adjunct instructors. These positions will also offer recent SLU doctoral recipients one-year appointments as they enter the academic job market \[A1, A2, A5, B2, C1, C2, C4\].

Section 4: Internationalization

- Establishing an “internal outreach” program
- Nurture the Madrid connection
- Review the Madrid MA
- Explore overseas links

A. Global English

For significant proportions of the world’s population, English is now the language of diplomacy, commerce, science and technology, and the worldwide web. For many millions of people, it is also the international language of intellectual debate, recreation and leisure (which include film, theatre, music, and computer games as much as texts).

Since our trade is in the writing, interpretation, and study of the circulation of words, texts, and ideas which draw on English as a vernacular and vehicular medium of transmission, our subject should lie at the very heart of the University’s global mission. Yet, paradoxically, the work of the Department is often poorly understood or even misunderstood in wide areas of the University. We need to constantly press the point that, in order to be truly international, University initiatives such as STEM+ or Sustainability need to incorporate the study of English at their core. In this context, we need to convey the message that “English” is much more than a mechanical medium of communication (as might be suggested by EFL or ESL programs), but a
complex, shifting, dynamic, subtle, and nuanced oral, cultural, visual, and written landscape.

In order to place itself closer to the center of the University’s globalization mission, the Department needs to embark on an “internal-outreach” program, to ensure that this message is conveyed throughout the University into areas such as science, technology, and medicine. The Medical Humanities program has a key role to play in this respect. An “Internal-Outreach” program, however, might involve events / discussions / open days in which the Department invites specific constituencies from the University (Business, Science, Technology, and Medicine) to discuss the role of “English” in their own fields of study.

Interrogating our undergraduate programs (the major, the Certificate programs, the writing program, the English Education program, and the Core Curriculum) as well as graduate programs along the lines suggested in Sections 2 and 3 (above), we should also continually pose the question of the extent to which we are addressing these larger issues of globalization, in which the object of our study is playing a leading role.

B. English in Madrid (including the Madrid M.A.)

The English Department’s connection with the SLU Madrid campus offers unique opportunities to “internationalize” our subject, since it already offers a bridge between the two largest communities of world language speakers: the Anglosphere and the Hispanosphere.

The undergraduate association with Madrid is well-established at the University level, but there is room for considerable development at the Departmental one. We should explore ways to capitalize on our links to Spain by fostering more connections between the English curricula and the faculty at the two campuses [D1]. Faculty exchanges at the undergraduate level, for example, might benefit us all. Research interactions with our colleagues in Madrid are currently very nebulous, but there is an opportunity, here, to develop a joint research culture.

At the graduate level, the Department sponsors a full-time master’s program in Spain that culminates in a dual degree with the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. Given that the SLU Madrid master’s was implemented a decade ago, it now seems appropriate to conduct a review of the program’s progress, seeking input from faculty on the Madrid Campus as well as from Frost Campus faculty who have taught in Madrid [B1, B2, B3, B4, B5]. Such an assessment will necessitate developing criteria by which to judge the Madrid program’s successes and areas for improvement, a procedure that may have implications for the Frost Campus master’s program as well. Taking stock of the Madrid master’s degree in terms of our
Department’s overall objectives will enable us to determine how successful that program has been and what we think its future should be [D4].

C. Beyond Madrid

As well as University-wide study abroad options which many of our students take advantage of, some Colleges and Departments at SLU have also forged their own relationships with overseas Departments in their respective disciplines. Examples include the John Cook School of Business, Physical Therapy, and American Studies. Leading US English Departments elsewhere have developed successful links with overseas English Departments based in the UK and in the EU more generally, at both undergraduate and graduate levels. This is an area of development that we should explore.

We should not, however, think of an overseas link as being based necessarily in Western Europe. Joining, for example, the well-established "Missouri in Ghana" program, based at the University of Missouri-St Louis, run by the Missouri Africa Program Consortium, and whose participating institutions include Truman State University, University of Central Missouri, Lincoln University, and the University of Missouri-St. Louis, might be a route worth exploring.

In order to promote the attractiveness of our programs to prospective students (undergraduates and graduates), and to promote the intellectual culture of the Department, it may be worth investigating the extent to which a Departmental link with an overseas English Department (whether based in Europe, Asia, Africa, or elsewhere), operating at undergraduate, graduate, and faculty levels may be in our long-term interests [A1, A2, A5, B2, B3, C1, C2].

Section 5: Associated Strategic Issues

- Provide stronger spatial identity for the Department
- Address space issues for Creative Writing and the Ong Center
- Add a Professional Administrative Assistant to the English Department staff
- Maintain effective communication, recording, and decision making
- Consider alternative governance and maintenance structures
- Encourage greater student representation

A. Space

Existing provision of space for the Department is generally reasonable. However, there are marked instances where it is felt that space provision falls far short of what a leading English Department requires and actually hampers our efforts.
Firstly, there is a view that the existing “vertical” arrangement of faculty over three floors in Adorjan Hall inhibits communication between and among faculty, the graduate students, and the Departmental office. In addition, the present configuration is time-consuming, and works against the promotion of a Departmental identity since the Department has, at present, no clear “front door” [A5, C1, C5, C7].

Secondly, there is a real and pressing need for better performance space for creative writing activities. Existing space where events such as (e.g.) poetry and fiction readings from visiting practitioners, student readings and discussions, and writing groups can be housed is not within easy range of the Department, is not easily accessible to those from beyond our campus, and has poor sound quality, an unwelcoming ambience, and less than ample seating. The Department’s creative writers have attempted to identify space that might become a “creative writing house” (on the model of the Kelly Writers House at the University of Pennsylvania) and that would include performance space, a seminar room, a reading room, and areas for other activities such as Kiln (the Department’s creative writing publication). We need to assist them in this endeavor since this might benefit all faculty and students [A1, A5, C1, C2, C6, C3].

A further space issue is associated with the housing of the Ong Center, which will, in the near future, need to be addressed [C1, C5, C7, D2]. Currently the Ong Center has no space of its own. If the Center is to flourish, it will need to be suitably housed.

Taken together, these space issues suggest that sustaining a strong sense of Departmental identity is important to faculty, staff, and students, particularly graduate students, for whom current provision of space is probably the weakest among the Department’s constituencies [B3, B4, B5].

B. Governance and Communication

As the Department has grown, so have the many and varied demands made on the Chair’s time and energy also increased. Supporting a Chair’s own research efforts is important at a personal and Departmental level, as it is for all faculty who undertake service work on behalf of the Department [C1, C2]. At the same time, enacting this plan will call for a proactive Departmental administration, facing increasing demands in the areas of (e.g.) recording data, website development, and day-to-day administration. It is for these reasons that we recommend that the Department should, as a matter of urgent priority, consider the hiring of a professional administrative assistant.

Because we have made so many new faculty appointments in the past few years, many Departmental procedures, regulations, and customs may not be fully understood by a sizeable proportion of our colleagues. Hence, lines of responsibility need to continue to be clearly mapped, decisions continue to be recorded and
(where appropriate) made publicly available, regulations and procedures clearly stated in the Department's by-laws, which should also be publicly available via the website [C7].

The website is the key communicative and administrative “tool” of the Department, while it also has to fulfill other publicity functions. The website needs to be maintained on a systematic basis so that it can be used more effectively by faculty, graduate, and undergraduate students, as well as supporting our recruitment efforts [C7].

The Department may wish to review its governance patterns. Are there, for example, other ways in which day-to-day decision making could be devolved, using the skills of a professional administrative assistant? The Department’s efforts at the undergraduate level now encompass no fewer than seven distinct areas, many of which (e.g., certificate programs, the 1818 program) themselves represent distinct and time consuming areas of responsibility. These various activities need to be effectively coordinated and supported, and the administrative burden on program directors minimized [C2, C5, C7].

One striking element in current Departmental governance procedures is that the “sovereign body” of the Department, the Departmental meeting, has no representatives from the undergraduate or graduate student body. The Department might consider seeking student representatives to attend Departmental meetings as non-voting members, reserving confidential items as “Reserved Business” when student representatives are asked to leave the meeting. An alternative would be to institute a faculty-student liaison committee. Soliciting student input at various levels of our activity (which has proved successful in recent job hires) may have the advantage of promoting the flow of information, while also solidifying a student sense of “belonging” to the Department, and inculcating a sense of professionalism among our students [A5, B2, B5, C7].

Section 6: Hiring Priorities

- Principles governing hiring decisions
- Non-tenure-track hiring priorities
- Tenure-track hiring possibilities

A. Principles Governing Hiring Decisions.

Hiring a new faculty or staff member presents exciting opportunities for the Department. But it also represents a costly and time-consuming process for individuals within the Department and a major investment on the part of the College and University. So, while the ambition to “grow” the Department, both in size and in
scope, is always laudable and attractive, we need to be clear that a hiring bid contains some element of cost beyond the simple calculation of resources expended after a successful appointment is made.

The Dean has indicated that any bid for new hires must be tied into the Department’s strategic plan. This approach strongly implies that new hires are not strategic ends in themselves. Rather they represent ways in which strategic goals may be fulfilled, when other possibilities of achieving those goals have been examined and dismissed.

The first question, then, to be asked prior to embarking on a bid to secure resources for a new hire is to ask: do we need this position in order to realize our strategic ambitions? Secondly, are there other ways (e.g., organizational, distributive, a realignment of existing responsibilities) by which we might achieve our goals? Thirdly, how is this new faculty or staff member to be tied into our key activities, and how will s/he help us achieve our goals and targets?

Only when these questions have been answered to the best of our ability should we embark on a bid to secure a new hire. Ideally, a new hire (even a replacement hire) should help us to achieve a range of our Departmental goals. That hire should not be regarded as simply “filling a gap.”

B. Non Tenure-track Hiring Priorities

For reasons detailed elsewhere in this plan, we recommend that the Department press for three non-tenure-track hires: a professional administrative assistant and two postdoctoral teaching fellowships.

C. Future Tenure-track Hiring Priorities

A list of possible tenure-track hiring priorities, which we recommend that the Department as a whole consider at the earliest opportunity, will be attached to the plan. These possible priorities do not form part of the plan, but should be considered in the light of the plan’s recommendations, the Department’s goals, and its key activities.

Section 7: Future Actions

In seeking to transfer our strategic plan from paper into action, we must ensure that we are not cousins to Glendower, Hotspur, and Mortimer, in Shakespeare’s 1 Henry IV, who indulge in fantastic plans for the re-routing of England’s river systems, and neglect to prepare for the forthcoming battle with the King—in which they are resoundingly defeated.
More prosaically, the Department needs to be self-aware in formulating concrete “benchmarks” to help us to chart our progress towards realizing the plan’s goals. These will, inevitably, be primarily numerical, and will include a range of statistical data, much of which is currently available from a variety of sources, but which is not (as the 2009 External Reviewers indicated) always widely understood, communicated, or acted upon. Such data might include (for example): undergraduate recruitment figures; course enrollments (by level, area, and delivery mode); graduate applications (quantity and quality), enrollments, progress towards degree, and placements. At the faculty level, we need to continue to record and publicize our research efforts (grants written and awarded, publications, conference involvement, professional service, etc.). We would suggest that the Chair of the Department, together with the appropriate Directors of programs, draw up a list of the relevant benchmarks, with the intention that this data should be communicated and discussed on a regular basis by the entire Department.

Responsibility for delivering this plan will devolve, primarily, to the Chair, but also on to the Directors of programs, and (in the end) individual faculty members. We would urge the Department to review the plan annually and collectively, measuring progress towards our Departmental Goals [A1-D4], and paying particular attention to our Targets [E1-6]. Neither should we hesitate to alter or amend the provisions of the plan as circumstances shift, or as new opportunities present themselves.