

**UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-SUPERIOR**

**WRITING AND LIBRARY SCIENCE  
DEPARTMENT**

**Academic Program Review  
Self-Study**

**Submitted on October 1, 2014**

**Writing and Library Science Department:**

Program	<i>Check all that apply :</i>					<i>Degree (e.g., BA, BS, BM, BFA, MA, MSE)</i>
	<i>Compre- hensive Major</i>	<i>Major</i>	<i>Minor</i>	<i>Certificate</i>	<i>Graduate</i>	
Writing		(x)*	x			BA
Library Science			x		x	MSE
ESL						n/a

\*Major was approved by BOR in October 2013 and became officially available in Fall 2014, outside the time period of this Program Review. It is mentioned here because the work toward receiving the entitlement and plans regarding the Writing Major are referred to often in this review.

*Date Submitted:* October 1, 2014

*Signature of Department Chair:* Deborah Schlacks

*Approval of the APRC Chair:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Approval of Provost/Dean of Faculties:* \_\_\_\_\_

# Table of Contents

## Departmental Summary

I.	Executive Summary	1
II.	Department Mission and Alignment	2
III.	Department Planning for Continuous Improvement	4

## Academic Program Review

### Writing Program

<del>I.</del>	<del>Program Mission and Alignment</del>	
II.	Student Learning Outcome Assessment (Helping Students Learn)	8
III.	Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives	10
IV.	Understanding Students and Other Stakeholders Needs	11
V.	Valuing People	15
VI.	Program Planning for Continuous Improvement	21
	Writing Program Attachment 1: Learning Goals	23

### Library Science Program

<del>I.</del>	<del>Program Mission and Alignment</del>	
II.	Student Learning Outcome Assessment (Helping Students Learn)	25
III.	Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives	26
IV.	Understanding Students and Other Stakeholders Needs	27
V.	Valuing People	30
VI.	Program Planning for Continuous Improvement	32

## **English as a Second Language Program**

### **I. ~~Program Mission and Alignment~~**

<b>II. Student Learning Outcome Assessment (Helping Students Learn)</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>III. Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>IV. Understanding Students and Other Stakeholders Needs</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>V. Valuing People</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>VI. Program Planning for Continuous Improvement</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>VII. Program Recommendations (for all Programs in the Department)</b>	<b>39</b>

## **Appendices**

<b>Appendix A. Curriculum (available in a separate file)</b>	
<b>Appendix B. APR Data Sets (available in a separate file)</b>	
<b>Appendix C. Technology in the Classroom</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Appendix D. Department Revenue Not Included in S&amp;E Budget</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Appendix E. Capital Equipment Request for Continuous Improvement</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Appendix F. Formal Program Articulations with Other Institutions</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Appendix G. Department Strategic Plan</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Appendix H. Mentoring Plan</b>	<b>48</b>

# Departmental Summary

## I. Executive Summary

The Writing and Library Science Department is a vibrant academic unit at the University of Wisconsin-Superior.

### Strengths:

This Department has three programs to be proud of:

**The Writing Program:** In the past several years, as a part of a supportive department, the Writing Program has been able to see its Writing Minor increase greatly in numbers of minors, develop and see to approval a Writing Major, develop and use—at both the core and the Major-Minor levels—learning outcomes informed by scholarship in the field, provide more and better professional development for all instructors in its purview, do theoretically and scholarly informed assessment using good data, develop exciting co-curricular programs, and so much more. It does all this while also delivering an excellent first-year writing program that serves students from every corner of the University. The Writing Program is filled with faculty and instructional staff who are responsible institutional citizens in terms of budget, relationships with stakeholders, assessment, participation in HIPs, service to University and Department, and so on. Productive scholars and creative writers fill its ranks.

**The Library Science Program:** This Program is devoted to serving the students who seek a minor, certification, or a graduate degree in Library Science. Its faculty also help the general student population achieve information literacy and have found wonderfully significant ways to collaborate with the First-Year Writing Program to this end. Faculty from the Library Science Program have been campus leaders who have provided much service to the University. The Program's faculty are now intent upon seeing their current students through to graduation in the best way possible as the minors and graduate degree it offers “sunset” in 2017.

**The English as a Second Language (ESL) Program:** This Program provides key assistance to students for whom English is a second language, helping them achieve the academic language skills they need to be successful at UW-Superior. The instructors in this Program are devoted to this cause. They have collaborated effectively with the Writing Program in ensuring a good transition for students from ESL Writing into the First-Year Writing course sequence. They hold the main strength of the ESL Program to be the satisfaction and success of the ESL students during their subsequent semesters at UW-Superior.

The Department as a whole is a very supportive group. Members work together well to ensure the Department reaches its goals and serves the students of the University of Wisconsin-Superior in the best ways possible.

## Opportunities (Areas in Need of Attention)

In the Writing Program, members are concerned about how much the Program will be able to grow in the future if more resources do not become available. The Program would also like to offer the Writing Minor online, to give Distance Learning students more options but has decided that the current workload for members of the Program as well as incompatible DL policies regarding such matters as overload pay (which the Program wishes to avoid) have made that unfeasible at this time. The Program would like to find a way to deliver the Minor online in the future.

In Library Science, with the Program sunsetting, the concern lies in how best to see students through to graduation, particularly with faculty resignations and retirements coming and the possibility of their not being replaced with new faculty. Thus the question of how to continue to staff courses as long as will be needed looms large.

In ESL, the Program would like to analyze statistically how students from the ESL Writing course do in subsequent courses compared to how international students who did not take ESL do in these courses, and the Program would like to develop a special topics course to meet the needs of those students who need a specific type of support not covered by the four ESL courses generally offered.

An additional area of concern for all in the Department is that faculty and staff are experiencing personal financial hardship due to the rising cost of living, reformulated insurance and retirement contributions, and salary stagnation. If not substantively addressed soon, these problems could impact faculty stability in this Department as they have already affected it in other, less cohesive units.

## **II. Department Mission and Alignment**

### **A. Department Mission**

#### **1. Provide the current version of your Department's mission.**

“The Department of Writing and Library Science supports the University of Wisconsin-Superior's liberal arts mission by promoting literacy across disciplines. In doing so, the Department refines skills in reading, writing, listening, speaking, viewing, and thinking (both critical and creative) for both native and non-native speakers of English. Moreover, the Department develops in its students, skills in accessing, processing, creating, evaluating, and sharing print and non-print media including today's technologies.”

#### **2. When was this current mission statements adopted or revised?**

Upon becoming a Department in 2009, a mission statement similar to the above was adopted. At that time, the Reading (aka Language Arts) Program was part of the Department, and the ESL Program was not yet part of the Department. With the departure of the Reading Program in

2010, and the arrival of the ESL Program in 2011, the Department revised the mission statement into the version seen above. The revised statement was adopted in 2011.

**3. What process was used in the adoption and/or revision of the mission statement for the department?**

The adoption and revision of the mission statement were the products of extensive discussion during Department meetings.

**B. Alignment of Department Mission to the Institutional Mission**

**1. Address the means by which the Department ensures that its mission, expectations, and objectives align with the University’s liberal arts mission and high impact practices, as well as its Liberal Education Learning Goals.**

In adopting and revising the mission statement, Department members looked at the University’s mission statement and overall learning goals. The Department quickly noted major connections between certain goals of the University and key attributes of the programs of which the Department is comprised. The University’s mission statement speaks of the fostering of “intellectual growth and career preparation.” It also speaks of the emphasis upon “individual attention” and “respect of diverse cultures and multiple voices.” The programs in this Department embody these ideas. In the Writing Program, to write is to make meaning and to learn more deeply about whatever subject one is studying—thus intellectual growth is advanced. In addition learning to write effectively is a key part of becoming prepared for almost any career in any field. Writing courses at UW-Superior have as their trademark an emphasis upon individual attention and respect for the multiple voices of the many diverse students who populate them.

In the Library Science Program, students grow intellectually as they learn to use resources and to teach others to use the resources of a library collection, and they learn valuable career skills in this area as well. Library Science courses also emphasize individual attention and respect for multiple voices. Further, the faculty in this Program help not only the students who take its courses but also every student at the University as they offer and deliver information literacy lessons to the student population as a whole (whether in the embedded information literacy within first-year writing courses, or library sessions for students from other courses, or information offered to students on an individual basis as they use the library).

Finally, in the ESL Program, second-language learners are prepared to read, write, listen, and speak academic English so that they can take full advantage of the intellectual and career preparation opportunities available to them at UW-Superior. The individual attention they receive in the ESL courses is a key to the success of these courses in meeting the needs of this internationally diverse group of students.

In short, each of these programs provides much that is important for a liberal arts education.

Three of the Liberal Arts Learning Goals read as follows:

- The ability to express oneself in multiple forms
- The ability to analyze and reflect upon multiple perspectives to arrive at a perspective of one's own
- The ability to engage in evidence-based problem solving

All of these require literacy across the disciplines. How can one express oneself, analyze, reflect on multiple perspectives, and use evidence without being steeped in writing, in information literacy, and, if one is a second-language learner, in the learning of academic English? What the programs of this Department teaches is indeed essential to students as they gain such capacities.

### **C. Response to the Recommendations Made in the Previous Review**

N/A (This is the Writing and Library Science Department's first Program Review.)

## **III. Department Planning for Continuous Improvement**

Planning continuous improvement examines planning and assessment processes and how strategies and action plans are helping achieve Departmental mission.

### **1. What is the Department's vision of what it will be like in the next 5-10 years?**

The Writing Program has a unified vision of itself as a solid and robust major/minor program with a strong culture of published student writing as the results of this endeavor. Objectively, this can be assessed with the number of majors and minors totaling well above the minimum levels needed to stay afloat, as well as the number and types of publications of students in the Program. With the growth of the Minor and momentum of the new Major, Program members are confident that can happen.

This vision depends on untenured faculty gaining tenure within the next two to three years. (Right now, untenured faculty are the majority in the Department and in the Writing Program specifically.)

Closely related to this need is the need to retain and possibly increase the number of fulltime instructors in First-Year Writing. As is well known, the Writing Program balances the Major/Minor with 40+ sections of WRIT 101 and 102 per year, taught by the faculty and instructional academic staff. The instructional academic staff engage fully in Program decisions, assessment, and high-impact practices such as First Year Seminar and Academic Service-Learning. With the demand of these first-year courses, the importance of fulltime work and benefits for the dedicated instructors must not be overlooked.

Indeed, the Program foresees the First-Year Writing sequence becoming even more solid and attune to the needs of students from across the University than ever (provided this staffing

challenge is met). Already the Program has seen gains in these respects due to having attained in the past few years three fulltime instructional academic staff who have renewable appointments; having more instructors whom the Program can expect to teach in the Program semester after semester (perhaps on regular 50% appointments, if fulltime positions are not feasible) would be highly beneficial.

Finally, alongside the solid curricula of the Major/Minor, First-Year Writing, and general-education offerings, there is the culture of the Program. The co-curricular events and activities the Program offers to all students who wish to pursue more opportunities to write are currently underfunded. The Program has cost-shared for some programming with partners on campus such as CETL, Career Services, First Nations Studies, Writing Across the Curriculum, and URSCA. Yet, every year there is a scramble to engage students outside the classroom due to a lack of funding in relatively small amounts. An influx of only \$4,000 per year to the Writing Program makes all the difference.

For the Library Science Program, come 2017, the Library Science Liberal Arts Minor, Education Minor, and Graduate Degree/Certification will be no more. Nonetheless, the Department hopes to continue serving as the academic home for the faculty (and instructional staff) from this field because of the fruitfulness of the collaborations and connections between them and the members of the Writing Program.

The ESL Program is another solid part of the Department. Department members have been pleased to have become the academic home for this set of courses, so important to those second-language learners who enter the University with a need for additional work on their academic English skills. The Department foresees a continuation of this relationship and, more specifically, a continued partnership of the ESL Program and the Writing Program in making sure the bridge between ESL Writing and First-Year Writing is smooth and appropriate.

These three programs, in short, work well together, and the Department looks forward to continuing the partnerships that have been forged.

## **2. Discuss the Department's plan for funding projects to meet objectives.**

The Department's plan to fund projects is to continue to do a good job, recruit students to the Writing Major and Minor, and increase the demand for Writing classes. Using the Program Prioritization model, this should mean funding to suit the demand. The Department will continue to seek funding partners for co-curricular activities, and faculty will continue to individually seek out grant money for their conference presentations.

- 3. What are the Department’s projected needs for space, acquisitions, and capital equipment for the next five years? Provide any estimated cost and rationale for this projection. What method of evaluation led to this statement of needs? What planning processes are in place to secure the internal and external resources necessary to meet these needs?**

<b>Statement of Need</b>	<b>Cost (if any)</b>	<b>Rationale and Method of Evaluation</b>	<b>Planning Processes To Secure Resources</b>
Larger Resource Room for the Writing Program	No cost (unless remodeling is needed)	The Writing Program has over 40 minors and has just started a major. Yet it has a tiny resource room (the smallest such room in Swenson Hall)—too small for more than four people at a time comfortably.	The Department will explore with administration the possibility of a trade or of remodeling space in some way to provide for a roomier resource room for the Writing Program.
Use of Language Lab or Computer Classroom One Hour Per Week for ESL Program (Speaking Course)	No cost	Use of computers once a week for the ESL Speaking class would enable the instructor to give personalized, individualized instruction to the students.	The Department will talk to the administration and other appropriate entities about this possibility.

- 4. What are the Department’s needs for support resources for the next five years? Provide any estimated cost and rationale and benchmark for this projection. What method of evaluation led to this statement of needs? What planning processes are in place to secure the internal and external resources necessary to meet these needs?**

<b>Statement of Need</b>	<b>Cost (if any)</b>	<b>Rationale, Benchmark, and Method of Evaluation</b>	<b>Planning Processes To Secure Resources</b>
Scholarships for Writing Majors	\$2000-3000 per year	There are no scholarships for Writing majors (since it is very new). This is a shortcoming for recruiting students to the Major and should thus be corrected.	The Department plans to consult with the Foundation on how best to approach this issue.

5. What are the Department projected needs for instructional information technology for the next five years? Provide any estimated cost and rationale and benchmark for this projection. What method of evaluation led to this statement of needs? What planning processes are in place to secure the internal and external resources necessary to meet these needs?

Statement of Need	Cost (if any)	Rationale, Benchmark, and Method of Evaluation	Planning Processes To Secure Resources
Replacement computers for the two computerized writing “labs” (SWEN 1042 and 1042). There are 44 computers in all.	\$35,000 (\$800 per computer, according to Dell)	Computers simply need to be replaced every few years. At the end of FY15, these computers will be three years old. They are used extensively in delivering the First-Year Writing curriculum.	The Department plans to consult with IT and the administration as appropriate to explore the possibilities.
E-Portfolio Platform	\$750/year	The Writing Major capstone course concerns development of portfolios, so the appropriate software is needed to enable students to do electronic portfolios optimally.	The Department would like to seek a regular allocation for this purpose and will consult with IT and the administration on the possibilities.

# Writing Program

## II. Student Learning Outcome Assessment (Helping Students Learn)

### **1. What are the Program-specific student learning outcomes? When did your Program determine these outcomes? Who was involved in setting these outcomes?**

There are two sets of Learning Outcomes in the Writing Program: one for the Major/Minor and one for First-Year Writing. See Attachment 1 for both sets.

Major/Minor outcomes were adopted in 2012-13 upon beginning research and planning for the Writing Major, which was approved by the Board of Regents in October 2013 and began in Fall 2014. This was a collaborative effort on the part of members of the Writing Program.

First-Year Writing outcomes have been in place since 1999. They have been revised over time to suit the changing needs of students, changes in technology, and emerging literacy theories. The current iteration was adopted in 2012-13. The outcomes were discussed and drafted collaboratively by the Program members. They are informed by outcomes suggested by the Council of Writing Program Administrators, the national professional body for first-year writing at the college level.

### **3. What sources of evidence for the Liberal Education Learning Goals (i.e., campus-wide common student learning outcomes) does your Program collect and analyze regularly? Describe the methods of collection and analysis.**

Since there was no Writing Major prior to Fall 2014, no assessment of Liberal Education Learning Goals has been completed. As of the writing of this report, the University is revising its university-wide learning goals. The Program plans to align Major/Minor outcomes with the new university-wide learning goals once those goals are finalized and approved.

### **6. How has your Program communicated the current state of student learning outcomes and Program improvement priorities to students, faculty, staff, administrators, and other appropriate stakeholders?**

Major/Minor: the outcomes and assessment plans for the Major/Minor were made public to many bodies before their approval in October 2013. The levels of approval included the Department, Provost, Faculty Governance, other UW campus representatives, and the Board of Regents. The outcomes are also now published in the 2014-16 catalog for students.

First-Year Writing: Ongoing assessment has occurred since Spring 2012. Raw data and reports have been made available to the Department in Spring 2012, Spring 2013, and Spring 2014. Annual meetings occur between the Dean of Faculty, the Provost, and the Writing Coordinator to discuss any problems or trends. The Program also works closely with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to compare the Program's assessment results with University data to triangulate findings. The First-Year Writing Program is also the subject of two scholarly publications in regard to its implementation and improvement in students' information literacy:

White-Farnham J. and Caffrey Gardner, C. "Crowdsourcing the curriculum: Information literacy instruction in first-year writing." *Reference Services Review* 42, 2 (2014): 277-292.

Caffrey Gardner, C. and White-Farnham, J. "'She has a vocabulary I just don't have': differing disciplinary discourses in a first-year writing and information literacy collaboration." *Collaborative Librarianship* 5, 4 (2013): 235-242.

**9. How has your Program determined and communicated to prospective and current students what preparation is necessary to succeed in the Program's curricula, courses, and learning?**

The Writing Program affords students the chance to understand its expectations through official channels, such as the catalog, which includes prerequisite information and accurate course descriptions for each course. This is true across the boards, for everything from the Program's development course and first-year writing courses to its Major and Minor.

For the new Major and for the Minor, the Program has also focused on its marketing opportunities in the past year, working with the Admissions office in Summer 2014 to create a fact sheet for the Program that includes the new Major (but also encompasses the Program's other offerings). (Go to [http://www.uwsuper.edu/acaddept/wls/facts/writing\\_fact\\_1\\_1368078](http://www.uwsuper.edu/acaddept/wls/facts/writing_fact_1_1368078) to view the fact sheet.) The fact sheet describes all the Program offerings and the faculty's expectations for students to expand their writing experiences and abilities. The Program website is another place where what is available in the Writing Program (both curricular and co-curricular) is described.

The Writing Program's goal when it comes to communication in regard to the Major and Minor is to reach students who wish to become writers. The message is aimed at those who are confident, as well as those who have less writing experience and want to expand their skillsets.

**10. How does your Program advise students? What advisement plan does your Program have? How does your Program assure the timely and effective advisement of students?**

Currently, the Program is undergoing a transition in advisement: having had no majors, faculty and fulltime instructional staff in the Program formerly advised undeclared students only. But, Program faculty are beginning to work with Writing majors. In either case, advisement is counted as teaching in the Department's retention and promotion standards. While each advisor has his/her own advising routines and practices, every advisor in the Program works with students individually, follows University deadlines for advisement and enrollment, and helps students chart a path that balances their University requirements with their interests. For undeclared students, this can include prompting students to work with Career Services to explore various majors or introducing them to colleagues in programs they are leaning towards. For Writing majors, this will include discussing options after college, such as job searching, applying to graduate school, or promoting opportunities for writers in the community.

### **III. Other Distinctive Objectives**

#### **2. How does your Program determine your other distinctive objectives? Who is involved in setting these objectives?**

Recognizing the importance of other distinctive objectives to complement student learning and fulfill its mission, the Writing Program is dedicated to ensuring an ongoing program of scholarship and creative activity among its faculty; enriching the campus and broader community with creative cultural activities; and infusing its curricular and co-curricular activities with high-impact practices such as service learning and undergraduate research, scholarly, and creative activity.

The Writing Program determines other distinctive objectives by committee and, in some cases, subcommittee. Ideas brought forth by individual faculty and teaching staff are discussed in the appropriate subcommittee, typically, and shared with the larger group for input or reporting. For example, a small subcommittee discussed, planned, and launched the UW-Superior Visiting Writer Series, with input and support from the Department as a whole. Similarly, a small subcommittee envisioned, planned, and implemented the bi-annual Careers in Writing Night.

As a whole, the Writing Program shares a vision of the scholarship, creative and cultural activity, service learning and other high-impact practices, and outreach that will complement student learning and fulfill the mission of the Writing Program. Within that shared vision are the flexibility and freedom of individual faculty/teaching staff to bring new ideas to the table and collaborate within the Program and with other entities on campus.

#### **3. How are these objectives assessed and reviewed? Who is involved and how is their feedback incorporated in readjusting the objectives or the processes that support them?**

Other distinctive objectives that complement student learning are assessed and reviewed in a variety of ways. Service learning, for example, is assessed in concert with the ASL coordinator. Scholarship and creative activity of faculty are reviewed and assessed during annual retention and performance reviews. Additional activities such as the UW-Superior Visiting Writers Series, Careers in Writing Night, and the *Nemadji Review* undergo ongoing assessment and review based on student engagement and feedback.

#### **4. What are the results in accomplishing these objectives? Looking at your results for Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives, comment on the positive results as well as those in need of improvement.**

The Writing Program has seen tremendous growth in student enrollment in its Writing Minor and is seeing student interest in its new Writing Major; in the first semester the Writing Major has been offered, students are already declaring Writing as their major. Much of this growth and excitement about the Writing Major and Minor is the result of energy and resources going toward streamlining and strengthening the curriculum and enhancing the student experience with these other distinctive objectives.

As the Writing Program continues to offer students opportunities to meet visiting writers, participate in the *Nemadji Review*, explore writing careers through Careers in Writing Night, etc., it will work toward increasing student attendance and participation in such opportunities.

**6. How does your Program communicate the current results and improvement priorities to students, faculty, staff, administrators, and stakeholders?**

The Writing Program utilizes a variety of means to communicate its results and improvement priorities, including its annual report, the recent program prioritization report, fact sheets and other materials used by admissions, the UW-Superior catalog, the Writing Program website, news releases, and additional, targeted means of communication. In addition, the Program has communicated results to University colleagues via Enhancement Day sessions, such as one held concerning a Writing Mentors pilot in WRIT 099. (See below for more details about this project.) Also, some SOTL research done by members of the Program have concerned the results and improvement priorities of the Program.

**IV. Understanding Students and Other Stakeholders Needs**

Students

**2. How does your Program identify the changing needs of student groups? What is the process for analyzing and selecting a course of action regarding these needs? Provide some examples of actions taken since the last review.**

Writing Program staff and faculty maintain awareness of changing student needs through ongoing, personalized discussion with students from general-education and major/minor writing courses, professional contacts within a range of writing-related fields, and regular examination of enrollment data and trends. The Program regularly obtains and analyzes data from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

The Writing Program is highly responsive to student needs and interests, as is evidenced by the development of the new Writing Major, offered for the first time in Fall 2014. The ranks of Writing minors grew from a single minor in 2008, to 6 minors in 2009, to 26 minors in 2011, to 44 minors in 2013. Program faculty and staff observed an upward trend in Fall 2012 and decided that a Writing Major could be a popular and useful addition to the UW-Superior program array. Increasing numbers in the Minor, along with eight predicted Writing majors graduating in 2014-15, are indicative of student demand for opportunities to pursue writing as a serious course of study at UW-Superior and of student satisfaction with the Program's multifaceted curriculum and student-centered approach.

The primary goal while planning Writing Major requirements, and streamlining and revising Writing Minor requirements, was to create a scaffolded, educationally sound, student-friendly course sequence. In order to facilitate student learning, multiple 200-level genre-specific courses were eliminated and replaced with WRIT 250, Introduction to Creative Writing, which is now a prerequisite for an array of 300-level genre-specific courses.

In addition, the Writing Program is responding to student demand for professional preparation with a new capstone senior seminar (WRIT 490), in which each student prepares a high-quality online writing portfolio while researching career and graduate school options, and by exploring the feasibility of adding internships—important to the Program because internships entail experiential learning. In addition, a Writing Program community advisory board is under development. It will help faculty and staff prepare students for changes and developments in writing-related career fields.

**3. What process does your Program have for students to report complaints? How does your Program analyze students' feedback both in a formative and summative manner and select a course of action? How does your Program communicate those actions to students?**

Given this relatively new program and even newer major, Writing Program faculty and academic staff are highly receptive to student feedback, which more frequently takes the form of constructive comments and suggestions than complaints. When they arise, student issues are taken seriously. In the rare case that a student has a complaint that cannot be resolved directly with the instructor, he or she advises the student to follow the University chain of command per UW-Superior policy by consulting with the Writing and Library Science Department Chair and, if the student deems necessary, with the Provost. Student complaints regarding curriculum or other Program-level issues would be discussed with the Chair and by the Program as a whole if necessary.

An unofficial Major/Minor listserv allows the Program's faculty and instructional staff to communicate any alterations to the curriculum and/or course offerings to all declared students in a timely, efficient manner that allows for student response and questions. Instructors communicate adjustments and changes to individual classes as needed in both General Education and Major/Minor writing courses.

**4. What measures of student satisfaction does your Program collect and analyze regularly?**

Student evaluations are done every semester in every section of every course offered by this Program. A few years ago, the Program developed a new evaluation tool that Program members feel elicits student comments more effectively concerning key areas such as use of active-learning pedagogies and use of educational technology than did the previous tool. Another innovation is that the tool was put into the Learn@UW-Superior course pages so that students can complete evaluations online. Completion rates are kept high by having students complete the evaluations in class (meeting for the day in computerized classrooms for those classes that do not normally meet in such rooms). The online completion method makes statistical analysis much more convenient.

The Program is also intent upon making sure its online sections are equivalent to its in-person sections of the same courses. (WRIT 101, 102, and 209 are offered online regularly, via the Distance Learning Program.) To that end in terms of student evaluations, the Program (with the Distance Learning Center's blessing) has students in online sections complete the same evaluation form as their campus counterparts (rather than using the DL evaluation form). Completion rates are kept high by incentivizing, thus giving the instructor better information.

Altogether, then, the Program has good information from students to use in determining their reactions to its delivery of the curriculum.

In addition, the Writing Program is currently in its second year of collaborating with the Writing across the Curriculum Program in having Writing Mentors for each WRIT 099 section. As part of this effort, students in these classes fill out and submit pre-course surveys and post-course surveys concerning their prior experiences with writing support (typically, for this population of students, at the high-school level) and the support they receive in this course, respectively. Additionally, the post-course survey asks students about their satisfaction with the work of the Mentor. This information has been subjected to analysis by the WAC Coordinator. (Meanwhile, the Writing Program has teamed with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to examine data on retention of students who have taken these courses, looking at the difference before and after such interventions as the mentoring, as well as other pedagogical changes, were established.) Finally, in courses in which Academic Service Learning projects occur, students complete ASL evaluation forms at the conclusion of the courses.

In all cases, instructors in the Program receive and review the evaluations, using information from them in considering course revisions.

### **5. What are the results for student satisfaction with your Program?**

Students are showing a high level of satisfaction with this Program. They are minoring in Writing in increasing numbers, and a number of them jumped at the new opportunity to major in Writing. Student evaluations are, as a rule, positive.

Analysis of the Writing Mentors surveys shows an increase in positive attitudes about academic writing on the part of students at the end of WRIT 099 relative to their attitudes at the start of the course. In addition, the post-course surveys reveal that most students found the mentoring useful or extremely useful and that most found their Mentors helpful. Retention has also increased.

#### Other Key Stakeholders

### **6. How does your Program identify the changing needs of other stakeholder groups? What is the process for analyzing and selecting a course of action regarding these needs? Provide some examples of actions taken since the last review.**

Writing, as an independent program with a stand-alone minor, has been in existence just since 2009, and the Program was granted entitlement for a major only last year, and will have no officially declared majors until Fall 2014. In addition, the majority of the fulltime faculty and staff were not serving in their current positions (many of whom were not even affiliated with UW-Superior) until 2011 or later, so nearly all Program processes, including analyzing stakeholder needs, have been undergoing significant change. Nevertheless, in this short time it has become clear that making data-driven decisions and striving to understand the educational needs of its constituencies are hallmark traits of this new program.

When the Program began considering a bid for entitlement, the first step in its deliberations was to gather data regarding current student interest in a Writing Major. Out of regard for institutional sensitivity, the Program decided not to poll currently enrolled UW-Superior students, but instead worked with The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the UW-Superior Alumni Association to develop a survey to allow the Program to predict the potential demand for such a major. This survey was delivered, via email, to every UW-Superior alumnus, regardless of major, who had graduated within the past ten years, and for whom contact information was obtainable. The results of the survey indicated that there was even more potential interest than the Program had anticipated: 40% of the 89 respondents indicated that they would have been either “highly likely” or “possibly” interested in completing a B.A. in Writing when they were students at UW-Superior. Though the survey was simple, it proved to be a powerful factor in the decision-making process. The Program would like to work with IE to create additional instruments that could gather data of potential interest to all programs, from a wider sample, in a coordinated fashion that would not exhaust the resource (the resource, in this case, being the attention of UW-Superior alumni).

The proposed Advisory Board for the Writing Major will also prove a good way to attain such information.

### **7. What measures of stakeholder satisfaction does your Program collect and analyze regularly?**

Though faculty and instructional staff would like to have the opportunity to work with IE to create an institutional, non-redundant data-gathering instrument to measure the needs of UW-Superior stakeholders (from potential students to current students to alumni to those served by alumni), IT has not yet proposed a process for doing so; an institutional will consummate with the Program’s own is necessary for that development to begin. In addition, the aforementioned Advisory Board is still under development.

Nevertheless, the Program has established and maintains close relationships, both formal and informal, with alumni, employers, and professional writers in the region. Through the Program’s many substantial ASL partnerships (over twenty in the past two years), through collaborations with Career Services, and through initiatives such as Careers in Writing Night, during which the Program invites professional writers and employers from the region to meet and converse with students, the Program has developed a good sense of the employment landscape students will encounter upon graduation. In the future, unless an appropriate University-level survey is developed, the Program plans to engage in systematic, quantifiable, Program-level surveys of Writing alumni, particularly when Writing majors start graduating.

### **8. What are the results for stakeholder satisfaction with your Program?**

At this point in the Program’s development, the main result of its outreach efforts so far has been to establish channels of communication and a spirit of mutual good-will and respect between the Program and many of its community stakeholders. For example, such community partners as CASDA, the City Council, the Development Center, and the Duluth Playhouse are among those with which strong, ongoing relationships exist.

The Program looks forward to tracking the employment status of Writing majors, post-graduation. It is hoped that the relationships being cultivated now will result in greater internship and employment opportunities for them. As mentioned earlier, the Program plans to compile data on its own majors and minors after graduation, to gauge their satisfaction when they have had time to reflect on their education and how it is serving their personal goals.

**9. With regard to the needs of your Program's key stakeholder groups, how are the targets for improvement set?**

Aside from the satisfaction that students express in course evaluations and informal feedback, the Program is currently most interested in making sure that they are able to achieve realistic post-graduation goals such as sustained, gainful employment in writing-related fields or admission to graduate programs. The Program's targets for improvement are therefore set in relation to students' success rates in these areas. Again, the need to continue gathering data from alumni and regional employers is paramount to establishing and realizing these improvement targets.

**10. What specific improvement priorities is your Program targeting and how will these be addressed?**

Though still at a very early stage in its stakeholder assessment plan, the Program has already realized that Writing majors should be encouraged, or perhaps even required, to avail themselves of vocationally oriented courses such as WRIT 209: Business and Professional Writing. Though service obligations to First-Year Writing and to other curricularly dependent departments make upper-division course scheduling a challenge, the demand for more technical writing training can likely be met... if the combined number of majors and minors does not rise higher than its current level. (This scheduling challenge is, in fact, the main reason WRIT 209 is not now a required course for the Major; to make it a requirement would most likely require additional FTE.)

**V. Valuing People**

**1. What key faculty/staff orientation, enhancement and mentoring initiatives are currently being undertaken or planned for the next one to three years?**

Each new faculty and fulltime instructional academic staff in the Program is given a course release to participate in CETL's NFO Program in his or her first semester. In addition, the Program encourages participation of adjunct instructors in adjunct orientation sessions.

The Program encourages participation of any and all of its faculty and instructional staff in CETL workshops throughout the year, especially during Welcome Weeks.

The Program has regularly scheduled brown bag sessions (once monthly) for Program instructors that have taken the form of peer presentations on specific research and pedagogies, a reading group on specific disciplinary issues, and a time/space to seek advice from colleagues.

Another key activity in this area is the class observations that are required on a regular basis for probationary faculty and for fulltime instructional staff, but especially for the first semester; the first observation is conducted by the First-Year Writing Coordinator, but faculty and staff have the option to observe for each other after the first observation.

## **2. What support is provided to faculty for the professional development, retention, tenure, and promotion process?**

In addition to the opportunities mentioned above in #1, faculty are provided with feedback, if they wish it, on construction of their retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure portfolios. They are also provided with as much funding as possible, given budget constraints, to attend conferences and give scholarly or creative presentations. In addition, their accomplishments in scholarship are celebrated: for instance, in May 2013, a Department-sponsored reading was held in honor of the publication of a book chapter by Deborah Schlacks in a Cambridge University Press book.

## **3. What support is provided to staff for their professional development and retention?**

Academic teaching staff are encouraged to travel to present scholarship at and/or attend both regional and national professional conferences. Financial support/travel reimbursement is offered to make these trips possible, such as the upcoming (April 2015) Association of Writers and Writing Programs Conference in Minneapolis, which several academic staff (as well as several faculty) plan to attend.

Personnel rules, made available through the Department's Learn@UW-Superior page, have been updated to better represent State laws and University policies, as well as value individual contributions to the Program and Department. These changes help both faculty and academic staff.

## **4. ~~Using data from the APR Data Sets, discuss faculty and staff (full and part-time) load. Explain any significant deviations from expected University standard load. Explain any load reassignments and the process used to determine them.~~**

Aside from reassignments (explained below), the only deviations were the five-course instead of the normal four-course teaching loads of three fulltime instructional academic staff during 2008-11. This load was changed by the administration to a four-course-per-semester load (with advisement duties) thereafter. (That is, these staff members did not advise when they had a five-course load, but once the teaching loads were reduced, advisement became part of their duties.)

The following load reassignments apply to the Writing Program:

- .25 Department Chair reassignment: Since Spring 2014, the Department Chair has been a faculty member from the Writing Program. (Before that, the Chair was a faculty member from Library Science.)
- .25 First-Year Writing Coordinator reassignment
- .50 Writing across the Curriculum Coordinator reassignment (which, prior to Fall 2013, was a .75 reassignment)

- .25 Assistant Writing Center Director reassignment
- .25 Credit for Prior Learning Coordinator reassignment (during 2013-14)

The Department Chair reassignment (at .25) is standard practice at UW-Superior, with the Chair having been elected by Department peers. The First-Year Writing Coordinator position is a standard one in Writing Programs nationally because of the complexities of scheduling, assessment, and staffing of first-year writing courses and the impact this course sequence has on student retention and success. The faculty who fills this position has it as part of her job description and contract and has specific professional expertise in this area. The other three positions on the list are in University-wide programs external to the Writing and Library Science Department. Who would fill these positions and the amount of reassigned time allotted to them were the decisions of administration (i.e., Academic Affairs), not of the Writing and Library Science Department.

**5.Using data from the APR Data Sets, discuss the average size of undergraduate and graduate classes. Explain any class that on average enrolls less than 10 students (undergraduate) or 8 students (graduate).**

In keeping with their heavy writing emphasis, WRIT courses are capped as follows:

WRIT 099: 18\*

WRIT 101, 102, and 209: 22\*

WRIT 200-level and above (workshop-style writing classes): 15\*

WRIT 303, 307: 25

\*Note that the National Council of Teachers of English recommends a cap of 15 for developmental courses (such as WRIT 099) and of 20 for first-year writing courses (such as 101 and 102). Meanwhile, the Association of Writers and Writing Programs defines the "optimum workshop class size" as 12 students.

As a rule, sections of WRIT 099, 101, and 102 exceed the 10-student minimum by a considerable margin. The occasional deviation is explained by the effort to provide these courses to all students across the University who need them when they need them; there can thus be a "spill-over," where one last section of the semester is smaller than the norm. This is particularly the case for Spring 099, where there are typically too many students for just one section yet not enough sections for two fully enrolled sections.

The following other deviations, along with the reasons for them as well as (when applicable) the action that has taken in regard to them, should be noted:

- WRIT 102, offered in-person in Summers 2011, 2012, and 2013, had low enrollments. Meanwhile, online sections of this course offered in these summers enrolled adequately. Thus the Program has decided not to offer this course in-person in the summer. In the summer, only online sections will be offered.
- WRIT 101 and 102, offered online via Distance Learning, in certain terms has had enrollments of fewer than 10 (WRIT 101, "E" sections in Fall 08, 09, 10, and 11; and in Spring 14 AND WRIT 102, "E" sections in Fall 09, 10, 11, and 13). Distance Learning

capped these particular sections low because they were taught as overloads. These sections were offered due to the same “spill-over phenomenon” mentioned above. It should be noted that most of these instances are from a few years ago. This is because the Writing Program is not typically adding new such sections “on demand” any more and is instead integrating scheduled DL sections into its regular course offerings.

In courses 200 level and above, the following deviations should be noted:

- WRIT 209 typically exceeds the enrollment minimum. The exceptions are some of the DL sections (labeled “E” or “S”) in Fall 10, 11, and Spring 11, 12, 13, and Summer 13. There is actually no continued unexplainable pattern of low enrollment here, as shown below:
  - In Summer 2013, the first section opened filled, resulting in the need for another section being offered, which was rather small. The instructor was thus paid by the student; since it was a summer section, the instructor was not doing this work over and above a fulltime contracted position.
  - In Fall 2010 and Spring 2011, these sections were taught by a Writing professor who had left UW-Superior employment for another job the previous spring. Since the Department had not yet replaced her and needed someone to cover these courses, she took them on in order to ensure that DL students would have continued access to this course during that year. She was paid by the student.
  - The low-enrolling Spring 2012 section was a section taught in Scotland as part of the Wisconsin-in-Scotland Program.
- WRIT 208 (Journaling for Study –Away Students) and WRIT 265 (Writing Center Internship) are one-credit courses taught by a Writing professor who is also the WAC Coordinator. They are taught as part of her WAC coordinator work. Similarly, WRIT 298, Credit for Prior Learning, was taught in Spring 2014 by a Writing professor who was also serving as Credit for Prior Learning Coordinator. She taught it as part of that work.
- WRIT 307 typically exceeds the enrollment minimum. The exceptions are DL sections (labeled “E”) in Fall 10, 11, and 13, and in Spring 12. An emeritus faculty member employed and paid by the Distance Learning Center taught this course in Fall 2010, Fall 2011, and Spring 2012--which explains the acceptance of the lower enrollment.
- WRIT 470 had low enrollment several times: in Summer 2010 (two different sections), Summer 2011, and Fall 2012. The summer sections were Continuing Education offerings; the instructors were paid by the student by Continuing Education. The Fall 2012 section was a new offering: a fiction workshop that has since been given its own title and number and now attains more than the minimum acceptable enrollment.
- WRIT 695 had low enrollment the two times it was offered during the period under review: Spring 2013 and Summer 2013. In both cases, this was because it was offered on-load as an independent study. The summer section was offered via Continuing Education.
- Other *seeming* patterns of low enrollment:

- WRIT 325: This course is crosslisted with WST (Women's and Gender Studies). (As of Fall 2014, the prefix is GST as the program is now called Gender Studies.) In Spring 2011, it had a total enrollment of 11, and in Spring 2013, of 15. The data set does not show the WST enrollments.
- WRIT 255: This course is also a WST (henceforth, GST) crosslisting. In Fall 2009, it had a total enrollment of 13, and in Fall 2013, of 7. As with 325, the data set does not show the WST enrollments. As the number of minors in the Gender Studies Program has been growing, and the course will find a new audience among Writing majors, the Program expects course enrollments to grow in this course in the future.

## **6.Using data from the APR Data Sets, discuss student credit hour production among and across faculty/staff.**

The data in the APR data sets concerning student credit hour production among and across faculty/staff reveal differences whose explanations fall into the following categories for various categories of employees:

- Fulltime faculty
  - Reassigned time (Deborah Schlacks, Yvonne Rutford, and Jamie White-Farnham's credit-hour production is affected by the fact that they have reassigned time. See the information on reassigned time elsewhere in this report.
  - New Faculty Orientation: In Fall 2009, Yvonne Rutford's teaching load was reduced by 25% due to her participation in NFO. In Fall 2011, the same was true for Jamie White-Farnham, Jayson Iwen, and Julie Gard.
- Fulltime instructional academic staff
  - Adjustment in course load: From 2008-11, fulltime academic staff (Allen Shepard, Elizabeth Grbavcich, and John McCormick) had five-course loads. As of Fall 2011, they had four-course loads.
  - New Faculty Orientation: Despite its name, New Faculty Orientation is also for new fulltime instructional academic staff. Thus, when these instructors took on their fulltime positions, they had 25% reassigned time in their first semester to participate in NFO.
  - Change from part-time to fulltime: The data set listings sometimes reflect the shift of an instructor from part-time to fulltime status. This is the case for Allen Shepard, Heather McGrew, and John McCormick.
- The variability of semester-to-semester workloads of part-time instructors, such as Susie Isaksen and Deborah Faul, among others: In some terms, the Program has needed these instructors to teach just one course each; in others, up to three. The need for their services simply varies. (Note also that Roger Forseth, Emeritus Professor of English, had until recently a job with the Distance Learning Center that included the teaching of one WRIT course, WRIT 307 [English Grammar].)
- Comings and goings: Anthony Bukoski and Barton Sutter retired during this period, and

Maureen Salzer resigned to take another position. (For some reason, the data set includes her for only one year of this period. That is not correct: she was fulltime faculty at UW-Superior from 2000-2010 and generated credit hours during every semester of that period [apart from a year on leave, which was well before the period under review here], as well as for a while afterwards as she taught part-time online for the Program in the year following her departure.) In addition, several new faculty and instructional staff (as indicated above) arrived during this period.

**7.If faculty and staff credit loads are higher than the University standard, what processes are used to insure that Program quality does not deteriorate and academic standards are upheld?**

The credit loads are not normally higher than the University standard, except that three instructional academic staff had unacceptable course loads of five per term for a few years. The Department advocated for a change in this situation, and the administration made a change to a load of four per term for these instructors. (As of this course-load change, these three instructors gained advisement responsibilities as part of their contractual obligations.)

**8. How does the work environment contribute to civil and open communication and promotion of cooperation, innovation, and skill sharing?**

All members of the Program are encouraged to share expertise and innovations at regular brownbag Program meetings throughout the semester. All members are also welcome and encouraged to submit items for Program meeting agendas, time is set aside for announcements at these meetings, and members participate in various subcommittees for the purpose of decision making on issues of classes, books, pedagogies, etc.

This valuing of all voices is also reflected in the Department meetings where Writing faculty, fulltime instructional staff, and part-time instructional staff have faculty status for voting on matters unrelated to retention, tenure, promotion, annual review of faculty, and post-tenure review.

In addition, the Program helped create and uses a Department Learn@UW-Superior course shell to share resources, engage in discussions, and store handbooks and other important documents.

In 2013, the entire Department completed the Strengths Quest assessment to better the ability to communicate across diverse areas of strengths and differences.

**9.Using data from the APR Data Sets, discuss how diversity among faculty and staff is advanced and supported.**

The data sets reveal that the Program employs both men and women and that the ethnicity of all faculty and instructional academic staff in the Program is White.

The Program takes care to follow a search and screen procedure that encourages

underrepresented groups to apply for positions.

The Program also uses a mentoring plan meant to ensure that faculty and instructional staff, including those in underrepresented groups, feel welcomed and included.

**10. What assessment and planning processes are used to determine what faculty resources the Program will need?**

This is an informal process, although in the past two years (2012-13, 2013-14), a more routinized method has been developed for budgeting faculty development requests. In the budgeting process, the Chair asks for individuals to submit their travel support requests for the year. However, faculty routinely find other funding sources such as CETL or faculty development grants or else grants from conferences themselves. Apart from individual requests, faculty collaboratively decide how best to fund projects, submitting such requests at the start of the year as well so they can, if the budget is sufficient, be built into it. For example, the Writing Program offers two annual co-curricular events, the Visiting Writer series and Careers in Writing Night. The Department has been open to supporting these events. Other funding sources have been used to offset these costs (i.e., collaboration with First Nations Studies in one instance, and a CETL grant in another). Some special requests are made to purchase books and new computers; such requests are decided at the Chair's discretion depending on whether sufficient Department funds are available.

**11. What is the process for analyzing and selecting a course of action for improving current processes and systems for valuing people? Provide some examples of actions taken since the last review.**

Program members typically bring up issues at Program or Department meetings and take action either by consensus or by vote. In some cases, subcommittees are formed. For instance, a subcommittee examined personnel rules, which were then vetted by the Department.

In addition, Program members bring concerns individually to the Department Chair from time to time. However, this avenue of raising concerns is very informal. To better handle concerns that people might not find appropriate to first—or perhaps ever—discuss at a meeting, the Program may need to develop an official process whereby members can safely raise concerns.

## **VI. Program Planning for Continuous Improvement**

**1. Summarize the main findings for the Program associated with successful completion of the APR process. Describe this in terms of current program strengths and opportunities (i.e., areas in need of attention) for future planning.**

Strengths:

The Writing Program has shown great growth in a variety of ways during the period under review. The Writing Program did not exist as such until 2009; before that, it was subsumed

under the English banner. The Writing Minor had existed for slightly longer (having begun in 2007), and the First-Year Writing Program (then called the Freshman English Program) had existed from time immemorial, as had a very few other writing offerings. But the First-Year Writing Program and Writing Minor came their own when the Program split from English and joined with Library Science (and, for a while, with Reading) to form a Department, later to be joined by the ESL Program into today's Writing and Library Science Department. With the replacement of retired and departed faculty and instructional staff and the conversion of one academic staff line into a faculty line in the 2009-11 time frame resulting in a cadre of fresh, new faculty, and with the stabilization a bit more recently of other staffing via the hiring of three fulltime instructional academic staff on renewable contracts, the Program has been able to achieve great things: develop and see to approval a Writing Major, develop and use learning outcomes informed by scholarship in the field, provide more and better professional development for all instructors in its purview, do theoretically and scholarly informed assessment using good data, develop exciting co-curricular programs, and so much more.

In addition, the Writing Program faculty and instructional staff take great pride in being responsible institutional citizens in terms of budget, relationships with stakeholders, assessment, participation in HIPs, service to University and Department, and so on.

Finally, taken together, this Program is highly productive in the area of scholarship and creative activity. The yearly output and quality of publications and presentations are notable.

#### Opportunities (Areas in Need of Attention)

The Program and its members are now close to achieving a state of maximum efficiency. Such efficiency is good, but it allows little time or energy for any kind of additional growth, so if enrollment does rise much above the current combined major/minor population, the Program could be strained.

An additional point of concern is that faculty and staff are experiencing personal financial hardship due to the rising cost of living, reformulated insurance and retirement contributions, and salary stagnation. If not substantively addressed soon, they could impact faculty stability in this Program as they have already affected it in other, less cohesive programs.

The Program would also like to offer the Writing Minor online, to give Distance Learning students more options but has decided that the current workload for members of the Program as well as incompatible DL policies regarding such matters as overload pay (which the Program wishes to avoid) have made that unfeasible at this time. The Program would like to find a way to deliver the Minor online in the future.

#### Closing

In short, the Writing Program is a commendable program on the move, particularly as it begins the Writing Major. Program offerings touch all UW-Superior students in key ways as they learn to communicate as college-educated individuals. Program members look forward to opportunities for further enhancement for the benefit of UW-Superior students.

## **Writing Program Attachment 1: Learning Goals**

### **WRIT 101 and 102 Learning Outcomes:**

By the end of the College Writing sequence students will

After WRIT 101:

-demonstrate understanding of rhetorical situation and elements of published essays, nonfiction, and fiction by way of active and critical reading

-demonstrate writing as a complex individual and collaborative process that is an important means of learning, of making meaning, and of communicating meaning to readers through such steps as: invention, drafting, seeking and giving feedback, revision, editing, proofreading, and publication/delivery.

-write essays that show attention to audience, purpose, genre, diction, tone, organization, and other aspects of the rhetorical context

-incorporate one or more texts into their own writing, practicing well-known citation strategies

-demonstrate competency in Standard Edited English

After WRIT 102:

-demonstrate understanding of elements of argument, including organizational models, rhetorical appeals, and uses of evidence in texts

-engage in the research process by searching, finding, evaluating, and synthesizing a variety of sources, publications, and media appropriate to the rhetorical situation

-write clear, well-organized arguments that draw on evidence for support of claims

-cite sources according to convention with practice in MLA and/or APA styles

### **Writing Major/Minor Learning Outcomes:**

#### **Rhetorical Knowledge**

Know foundational theories of language, rhetoric, and writing

Understand the contextual nature of writing

Identify and respond appropriately to a variety of exigencies

Write for various purposes and audience in a variety of genres

Articulate their choices in arrangement, format, and structure in a variety of genres

### **Writing Process**

Recognize that writing is a process requiring time and revision across drafts

Engage in all stages of the writing process from invention to delivery

Collaborate with others during the writing process to both seek and provide feedback for revision

Develop personalized strategies for generating ideas, drafting, revising, editing, and proofreading

### **Writerly Identity**

Express an understanding of themselves in cultural context in their writing (*cultural* assumes a broad range of experience and contexts, including but not limited to the personal, local, regional, national, ethnic, global)

Reflect on their growth as a writer, integrating insights from one project into another

Articulate their own stance/voice/persona/style as a writer by way of examining strengths and weaknesses

Produce a polished, representative portfolio of their writing for an audience that encapsulates their writerly identities

### **Reading & Research**

Demonstrate critical reading of form and content that informs their writing

Use reading and writing for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating new understandings

Integrate their own ideas with the ideas of others, appropriately “joining the conversation” of a given topic

Understand and apply the conventions of citation and documentation

### **Knowledge of Conventions**

Understand the rhetorical implications of the use and manipulation of conventions of Standard Edited Written English

Build on their knowledge of conventions through experimentation and practice

Articulate their choices in tone, diction, and the use or manipulation of conventions

Seek out models of conventions in reference books and other resources

Identify patterns of error and self-correct using personalized strategies

# Library Science Program

## II. Student Learning Outcome Assessment (Helping Students Learn)

- 1. What are the Program-specific student learning outcomes? When did your Program determine these outcomes? Who was involved in setting these outcomes?**

The Program's Student Learning Outcomes were revised and adopted in 2011. The Library Science faculty developed the learning goals in part to meet DPI guidelines for the School Library Media Specialist degree and to address needs of students in the Library Science Liberal Arts Minor.

Library Science Program Student Learning Outcomes:

1. Locate, analyze, synthesize, and ethically communicate information and knowledge in a variety of formats.
2. Demonstrate knowledge of and ability to select print and electronic information and effective information retrieval.
3. Demonstrate the ability to apply standards relevant to specific information service activities.
4. Demonstrate ability to use technology and teach others to use technology in the learning process.
5. Be able to serve as a leader and advocate for change through learning, using effective communication and collaboration.

**3. What sources of evidence for the Liberal Education Learning Goals (i.e., campus-wide common student learning outcomes) does your Program collect and analyze regularly? Describe the methods of collection and analysis.**

The Program does not have any formal process in place to regularly collect and analyze data on the campus Liberal Education Learning Goals as the Program does not have a major, and major programs have been the conduit for such collection and analysis. The Program's own learning goals do support the campus-wide goals that emphasize a liberal education experience. The Program collects and analyzes data from student evaluation of courses and informal feedback from students in assessing how it is meeting campus-wide goals.

- 6. How has your Program communicated the current state of student learning outcomes and Program improvement priorities to students, faculty, staff, administrators, and other appropriate stakeholders?**

The Program communicates through course syllabi, meetings of Program faculty, informal discussions with students, and the annual program review process.

- 9. How has your Program determined and communicated to prospective and current students what preparation is necessary to succeed in the Program's curricula,**

## **courses, and learning?**

The preparation and coursework for the Library Science Education and Liberal Arts Minors and the graduate-level preparation are clearly set out in the undergraduate and graduate catalogs. The Program has also maintained a website with the requirements for the undergraduate Minors and Graduate Certification and a schedule of courses for three to five years out. In addition, the Program's participation in the University of Wisconsin System School Library Education Consortium (UWSSLEC) has allowed it to link to the Consortium's website, where students have access to the course and practicum information they need to pursue the School Library Media Specialist degree.

### **10. How does your Program advise students? What advisement plan does your Program have? How does your Program assure the timely and effective advisement of students?**

The Coordinator of the Library Science Program has main responsibility for advisement in the Program. (It should be noted that since this is a minor program, each student has an official advisor in his or her major; the Coordinator's advisement of those minoring in Library Science is of a more informal nature.) Advisement is conducted in person, by email, and by phone. Different modes of advisement are necessary since the Program serves both campus and distance-learning students. At this time there are 20 students finishing up both the Liberal Arts Minor and the Education Minor and the Graduate Certification Program for School Library Media Specialists.

## **III. Other Distinctive Objectives**

### **2. How does your Program determine your other distinctive objectives? Who is involved in setting these objectives?**

The faculty in the Program determine the distinctive objectives. The Program must also meet Wisconsin DPI requirements for certification and licensure for the School Library Media Specialists. These objectives have included service learning requirements in Library Science courses, capstone projects, electronic portfolio, and student teaching or practicum completion.

### **3. How are these objectives assessed and reviewed? Who is involved and how is their feedback incorporated in readjusting the objectives or the processes that support them?**

The Coordinator of the Library Science Program and an onsite supervisor are responsible for assessing and evaluating the student teaching experience for the students in the Education Minor. Where service learning is incorporated into a course, the faculty responsible for teaching that course will assess and review the objective. Reflection on the service learning experience is incorporated into the yearly faculty review process, and feedback is provided by other faculty in the Program. Capstone projects would be assessed and reviewed in a similar way as the service learning project.

- 4. What are the results in accomplishing these objectives? Looking at your results for Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives, comment on the positive results as well as those in need of improvement.**

Students must complete and pass a student teaching experience in order to be eligible for the School Library Media Licensure. The Program has a very high rate of successful completion for those students completing the Education Minor. The student teaching experience includes a reflection paper and rubric of experiences successfully completed. The student also creates an electronic portfolio with artifacts that show his or her competency in meeting the DPI Content Standards for the School Library Media Specialist degree. Students completing a capstone will also produce an electronic portfolio with artifacts and reflection on the various aspects of their capstone. The student teaching experience should be augmented with additional field experiences for those students pursuing the Library Media Licensure and those students seeking employment in a special or public library. Service learning and/or field experiences need to become more of a regular objective in the Library Science courses.

**6. How does your Program communicate the current results and improvement priorities to students, faculty, staff, administrators, and stakeholders?**

The Program communicates current results and improvement priorities through Program faculty meetings, course syllabi, student advising, and annual program review. The UWSSLEC faculty hold two semi-annual meetings to discuss program objectives and results, review syllabi, and propose course revisions and curriculum redesign. The UW-Superior Library Science Program has faculty representation at these meetings. UWSSLEC invites representatives from the DPI to these meetings to discuss any changes and future directions for the School Library Media Specialist Licensure in Wisconsin.

## **IV. Understanding Students and Other Stakeholders Needs**

### Students

- 2. How does your Program identify the changing needs of student groups? What is the process for analyzing and selecting a course of action regarding these needs? Provide some examples of actions taken since the last review.**

The Program has used an external advisory council of area library media specialists as a sounding board for curriculum and Program changes. The faculty have met with the Superior School District school librarians in the past years to help identify the needs of students in the Library Science Education Minor. The UWSSLEC faculty also solicit feedback from school librarians employed in schools in Wisconsin.

Since the last review, the Library Science Program has developed a complete online minor offered through the Distance Learning Center. This meets the needs of students

who cannot come to campus to take courses. This has been a successful method for practicing teachers who wish to complete the school library media specialist as an add-on licensure. It is the only online Library Science Minor at a UW-System school.

- 3. What process does your Program have for students to report complaints? How does your Program analyze students' feedback both in a formative and summative manner and select a course of action? How does your Program communicate those actions to students?**

The Program follows the University process for handling student complaints while encouraging students to discuss concerns with their instructor. Assignments may be modified and /or revised based on student evaluation of instruction.

- 4. What measures of student satisfaction does your Program collect and analyze regularly?**

The Program collects and analyzes student evaluations of the courses. The UWSSLEC has conducted a survey of student satisfaction with students who have completed the degree.

- 5. What are the results for student satisfaction with your Program?**

Student evaluations of our courses have generally been positive. Students in the school library tract have successfully completed their student teaching experience.

#### Other Key Stakeholders

- 6. How does your Program identify the changing needs of other stakeholder groups? What is the process for analyzing and selecting a course of action regarding these needs? Provide some examples of actions taken since the last review.**

The Library Science Program's involvement with the UWSSLEC has enabled identification of changing needs and preparation of school librarians. New national standards have been developed for school librarians from ALA/AASL (American Library Association/American Association of School Librarians). The Wisconsin DPI has convened a working group to revise the School Librarian job description. Also with the job description review and AASL standards for school librarians, there exists a need for revision of DPI Content Standards for the School Librarian. Since the last review, competencies for the Collection Development course have been merged into the two literature courses and the Information Resources and Services course. This has reduced the number of credits needed to complete the Minor. In the academic year 2011-2012, Library Science mapped its learning outcomes to the course offerings. Using that information, courses were streamlined and credit hours increased for LIBS 309: Information Literacy Leadership.

**7. What measures of stakeholder satisfaction does your Program collect and analyze regularly?**

The Program does not have a regular program established for collection and analysis of data.

**8. What are the results for stakeholder satisfaction with your Program?**

Information on results would be anecdotal since the Program does not have a formal program for collection of data. Students who have graduated from the Program and the UWSSLEC Program hold a substantial number of the school library positions in the region. Many students who completed the Library Science Liberal Arts Minor have continued their schooling, successfully completing the Master's Degree in Library/Information Science.

**9. With regard to the needs of your Program's key stakeholder groups, how are the targets for improvement set?**

Targets for improvement are set through DPI Standards and state and national standards for libraries and information providers. The Program stays current regarding changing needs.

**10. What specific improvement priorities is your Program targeting and how will these be addressed?**

Since the Program has been suspended, at this point the faculty in the Program will be working on improving advising for current students, to ensure these students will be able to successfully complete the Minor, Certificate, or Degree before August 2017. Had the Program not been suspended, other priorities would have included a redesign of curriculum to meet changing information needs of students and stakeholder groups, including more field experience or service learning in the courses. Assessment of the Program also continues to be a priority in order to meet DPI continuous improvement requirements as long as the Program is operational. Changes in staffing have made it difficult to continue with the process of assessing the Program's Learning Outcome #1, which reads: "locate, analyze, synthesize, and ethically communicate information and knowledge in a variety of formats."

The Program will continue to use the advisory group of area librarians to improve student learning with relevant course content.

## V. Valuing People

- 1. What key faculty/staff orientation, enhancement and mentoring initiative are currently being undertaken or planned for the next one to three years?**

The Library has a mentoring plan in place for new employees. New faculty also participate in the New Faculty Orientation via CETL.

- 2. What support is provided to faculty for the professional development, retention, tenure, and promotion process?**

The Department's Personnel Rules address support for professional development, retention, tenure, and promotion. Funding is provided for faculty for professional development and other professional opportunities.

- 3. What support is provided to staff for their professional development and retention?**

The Department provides funds for staff for professional development.

- 4. ~~Using data from the APR Data Sets, discuss faculty and staff (full and part-time) load. Explain any significant deviations from expected University standard load. Explain any load reassignments and the process used to determine them.~~**

Library Science faculty serve a dual role: they are instructors in the Library Science Program, and they hold professional positions in the Hill Library or Distance Learning Center. All Library Science faculty are permanent, regular, fulltime faculty.

The Library Science Program offers most of its courses on a two-year rotating cycle, with some courses such as Children's Literature and Young Adult Literature being offered annually. Faculty credit hour production is in the average range for the campus.

- 5. Using data from the APR Data Sets, discuss the average size of undergraduate and graduate classes. Explain any class that on average enrolls less than 10 students (undergraduate) or 8 students (graduate).**

Library Science Program enrollment over the past 10 years has been very stable. The number of declared minors has been a fairly constant 12 to 15 students. Class sizes range from under 10 students to around 15. The literature courses have seen a decrease in student numbers due to changes in requirements for Teacher Education students (who also had taken them). The graduate students enrolled in this program at UW-Superior are mostly completing the certification only for the School Library Media Specialist Licensure (rather than in order to complete a master's degree). The enrollment at the graduate level has decreased due to changes in Wisconsin law concerning teacher advancement.

**6. Using data from the APR Data Sets, discuss student credit hour production among and across faculty/staff.**

While enrollment in the Program has remained stable over the past ten years, it has not increased significantly. The Library Science Minor is one of the few online minors offered through the Distance Learning Center, and this may account for the stability in enrollment. The Program does not, of course, anticipate an increase in the number of students in the Minor since the Program is sunsetting. If it were not ending, the enrollment would likely stay about the same, due partly to low economic outlook in the region for its graduates. With a .10 percent teaching load, the faculty credit hour production is still around average.

**7. If faculty and staff credit loads are higher than the University standard, what processes are used to insure that Program quality does not deteriorate and academic standards are upheld?**

Faculty in the Program do not exceed credit load.

**8. How does the work environment contribute to civil and open communication and promotion of cooperation, innovation, and skill sharing?**

The work environment within the Program is very collegial, with civil and open communication and promotion of cooperation, innovation, and skill sharing.

**9. Using data from the APR Data Sets, discuss how diversity among faculty and staff is advanced and supported.**

The Library Science Program includes faculty who encompass gender and ethnic diversity. Courses taught also address issues of diversity, such as in the library administration and the children's and young adult literature courses.

**10. What assessment and planning processes are used to determine what faculty resources the Program will need?**

See the Writing Program section.

**11. What is the process for analyzing and selecting a course of action for improving current processes and systems for valuing people? Provide some examples of actions taken since the last review.**

Open discussions at the Department and Program levels take place. In recent years, the Department's Personnel Rules have been revised, addressing both faculty and academic staff.

## **VI. Program Planning for Continuous Improvement**

- 1. Summarize the main findings for the Program associated with successful completion of the APR process. Describe this in terms of current program strengths and opportunities (i.e., areas in need of attention) for future planning.**

The APR process has enabled the Library Science Program to look at both strengths and areas in need of improvement. The Program continues to offer well-designed courses to meet DPI requirements and prepare students in a liberal arts setting.

It should also be noted that this Program offers the only online Library Science Minor in the System. That is something to be proud of, something that has fulfilled an otherwise unaddressed need in the System. It is also one of the few online minors available to UW-Superior Distance Learning students.

The Program does need to address assessment and set up a process while it still remains in operation. The suspension of the Program makes dealing with future planning somewhat problematic. While the Program still needs to address all DPI requirements for those students in the Library Science Education Minor, it may be difficult to implement major curriculum revisions within the three-year time period remaining for the Program, especially in light of anticipated vacancies in faculty positions.

# English as a Second Language Program

The English as a Second Language (ESL) Program consists of a set of four courses (10 credits total) that are offered each semester to incoming international students who place into them. These courses serve as a support or bridge program to help these international students improve their English to the level needed for success at college. UW-Superior accepts only those international students who demonstrate a required level of English proficiency, but those students with international test scores at the low end of the acceptable range are given a placement test when they arrive and are placed into ESL courses if their placement test scores indicate the need for improvement in some or all of the skill areas.

There is no major, minor, or certificate associated with the ESL Program.

## II. Student Learning Outcome Assessment (Helping Students Learn)

### 1. What are the Program-specific student learning outcomes? When did your Program determine these outcomes? Who was involved in setting these outcomes?

The following goals and outcomes were revised in March of 2013 by the ESL instructors.

#### General Goals (all ESL courses)

1. Raise ESL students' mastery of English to the level needed to succeed in college-level courses taught in English.
2. Familiarize students with the academic culture of American universities.

#### Learning Outcomes for Individual Courses

##### Reading:

Students will be able to:

- recognize and use a greater range of bridging and academic vocabulary
- use a variety of appropriate reading strategies to comprehend different types of academic material
- understand the importance of critically reading and analyzing academic texts

##### Writing:

Students will be able to:

- produce a variety of formal and informal academic texts
- use a process approach to writing with special emphasis on the revision process
- transition successfully into the First Year Writing program

##### Listening:

Students will be able to:

- understand academic lectures and discussions
- take accurate and useful notes on lectures and presentations

Speaking:

Students will be able to:

- take part in and contribute to classroom discussions
- prepare and effectively deliver short formal and informal presentations
- improve their delivery of spoken English to a level comprehensible to native speakers

**3. What sources of evidence for the Liberal Education Learning Goals (i.e., campus-wide common student learning outcomes) does your Program collect and analyze regularly? Describe the methods of collection and analysis.**

The ESL Program is a one-semester, language skills development program. It does not track the Liberal Education Learning Goals.

**6. How has your Program communicated the current state of student learning outcomes and Program improvement priorities to students, faculty, staff, administrators, and other appropriate stakeholders?**

ESL instructors communicate with the Chair and other members of the WLS Department during Department meetings. The ESL Coordinator also has one-on-one conversations with faculty, staff, advisors, and administrators as questions arise.

For students, outcomes are included on course syllabi, and instructors discuss course and Program expectations with students.

**9. How has your Program determined and communicated to prospective and current students what preparation is necessary to succeed in the Program's curricula, courses, and learning?**

Both the minimum TESOL (or equivalent) test scores for acceptance to UW-Superior and information about the ESL placement test and the ESL courses are listed on the International Programs webpages and in information sent to prospective and matriculated students.

**10. How does your Program advise students? What advisement plan does your Program have? How does your Program assure the timely and effective advisement of students?**

The ESL instructors are part-time academic instructional staff and therefore may not serve as advisors. However, international students do have academic advisors in their majors as well as an advisor in the Office of International Programs.

### **III. Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives**

Not applicable to ESL, which is a one-semester, language skills program. However the international ESL students and the ESL teachers do participate in community, creative, and cultural activities with the Office of International Programs.

### **IV. Understanding Students and Other Stakeholders' Needs**

#### Students

- 2. How does your Program identify the changing needs of student groups? What is the process for analyzing and selecting a course of action regarding these needs? Provide some examples of actions taken since the last review.**

This is the first Program Review for the ESL Program. Since the student pool is limited to international students, the Program uses the placement test scores of each incoming class to guide choices about course content to the degree that this is flexible. Instructors work hard to align class curricula with the academic and institutional needs of the students.

- 3. What process does your Program have for students to report complaints? How does your Program analyze students' feedback both in a formative and summative manner and select a course of action? How does your Program communicate those actions to students?**

Students come to instructors during office hours or after class with problems and concerns. Issues may be discussed with the ESL Coordinator and/or the international student advisor if appropriate. Student complaints may also be directed to the WLS Department or to the OIP, if the student does not wish to speak directly with an ESL teacher.

Students are asked to complete course evaluations each semester. Complaints and comments are read and discussed by the ESL instructors, and changes are made to courses as deemed appropriate.

- 4. What measures of student satisfaction does your Program collect and analyze regularly?**

Again, course evaluations are collected each semester. Instructors also hear anecdotal evidence such as comments from students that they are recommending a friend or sibling to come here because of the support the Program gives students.

- 5. What are the results for student satisfaction with your Program?**

Generally positive. On Likert-scale questions, most responses are 4 or 5 out of 5. Comments are mostly positive. Negative comments generally offer specific suggestions for improvement, which are carefully considered for implementation in future classes.

## Other Key Stakeholders

- 6. How does your Program identify the changing needs of other stakeholder groups? What is the process for analyzing and selecting a course of action regarding these needs? Provide some examples of actions taken since the last review.**

The ESL Coordinator regularly consults with the First-Year Writing Coordinator and other first-year writing instructors about standards for incoming students and the success of ESL students in FYW classes.

The Program would like to have the opportunity to run some data sets to determine ESL student and non-ESL international student performance in more than just the writing courses; in fact, to follow them through their UW-Superior programs.

- 7. What measures of stakeholder satisfaction does your Program collect and analyze regularly?**

See #6 above.

- 8. What are the results for stakeholder satisfaction with your Program?**

Students who complete the ESL courses do very well in their First-Year Writing courses.

- 9. With regard to the needs of your Program's key stakeholder groups, how are the targets for improvement set?**

The Program will be able to set targets if it can get data as discussed in #6.

- 10. What specific improvement priorities is your Program targeting and how will these be addressed?**

The ESL Program is one semester of English language skills development. The main stakeholders are the students themselves and their professors in later classes. The ESL Coordinator does check student GPAs for subsequent semesters. Although there are a few students who fail, the students' GPAs are generally quite satisfactory.

## **V. Valuing People**

- 1. What key faculty/staff orientation, enhancement and mentoring initiative are currently being undertaken or planned for the next one to three years?**

Instructors in this Program will continue to be invited to take part in the Writing Program brown bags. See the Writing Program report for more information on these opportunities.

**2. What support is provided to faculty for the professional development, retention, tenure, and promotion process?**

N/A

**3. What support is provided to staff for their professional development and retention?**

Both ESL instructors are part-time academic instructional staff. They are encouraged to take advantage of on-campus faculty development opportunities. WLS is also able to provide some travel support to the ESL instructors for conference attendance and/or presentations.

**4. Explain any significant deviations from expected University standard load. Explain any load reassignments and the process used to determine them.**

See #5 below.

**5. Using data from the APR Data Sets, discuss the average size of undergraduate and graduate classes. Explain any class that on average enrolls less than 10 students (undergraduate) or 8 students (graduate).**

For ESL courses, the numbers are dictated by the number of new international students who have matriculated and who also need ESL courses. Even if there are very few students, the courses must be offered in order to meet their needs. They must also be offered due to visa and admission requirements.

For significant increases in international student numbers, which the Program already has the staff to support, funds would have to be allotted for recruiting purposes. Since the instructors are paid directly from ESL student tuition (through Continuing Ed), staff pay and benefits for greater numbers of students would not be a drain on university resources.

**6. Using data from the APR Data Sets, discuss student credit hour production among and across faculty/staff.**

The data show some changes in credit-hour production in some cases from year to year for the following reasons:

The gap in 2006 was because the Japanese college UW-Superior had been working with for many years, Kobe Yamate Jogakuin, was facing difficulties and chose to drop its English Major and thus its association with UW-Superior. Kobe Yamate had been sending a group of students every year for twenty years at least, and they had formed the core of the SESLI Program. SESLI under Bob Kosuth proposed several ways to maintain the Program without the Kobe Yamate students, but the administration chose to discontinue the Program.

In 2006, there were three or four international students who needed support, and someone was hired to meet with the students a couple of hours a week to help them with their coursework. International Programs then argued strongly that an ESL program was necessary -

both to support students who were already here and to help that program recruit students who might not be able to meet the university's TOEFL requirement. In 2007, two courses were offered, and as International Programs was able to recruit more students, it became both necessary and feasible to offer the four courses that now exist.

- 7. If faculty and staff credit loads are higher than the University standard, what processes are used to insure that Program quality does not deteriorate and academic standards are upheld?**

N/A

- 8. How does the work environment contribute to civil and open communication and promotion of cooperation, innovation, and skill sharing?**

The ESL instructors and students work within a mindful multi-cultural work space that focuses very strongly on civility, open communication, and cooperation.

- 9. Using data from the APR Data Sets, discuss how diversity among faculty and staff is advanced and supported.**

The diversity of the instructors lies in their teaching experiences: they have worked overseas in very different areas, with very different populations.

- 10. What assessment and planning processes are used to determine what faculty resources the Program will need?**

The Program works within the WLS Department and with Continuing Education, according to their respective processes of determination. Please see the Writing Program report response to this item to learn more about the process used; it applies to ESL as well.

- 11. What is the process for analyzing and selecting a course of action for improving current processes and systems for valuing people? Provide some examples of actions taken since the last review.**

Again, this is the first review for the ESL Program. It would be working with the processes already in place in the Program's two affiliated departments: WLS and Continuing Education.

## **VI. Planning for Continuous Improvement**

- 1. Summarize the main findings for the Program associated with successful completion of the APR process. Describe this in terms of current program strengths and opportunities (i.e., areas in need of attention) for future planning.**

The main strength of the ESL Program is the satisfaction and success of the ESL students during their subsequent semesters. There are two areas that need attention.

The Program currently tracks how students from ESL Writing do in First-Year Writing, but there is no obvious corollary for other courses. The Program would like to run a statistical analysis of students' grades during their second semester, subsequent to taking ESL, and compare it to the grades of international students who do not take ESL. The Program would also like to extend this to follow them through their entire sequence of courses at UW-Superior.

Occasionally there is a student who has the need for some specific type of ESL support that is not met by the four standard classes offered by the Program. The Program would like to propose an ESL independent study or special topics course that could be used to address particular concerns not met by its main curriculum.

## **VII. Program Recommendations**

## Appendices A and B: See separate computer files.

### Appendix C. Technology in the Classroom

#### Writing and ESL Responses:

Note:

5 fulltime faculty

3 fulltime instructional academic staff

4 part-time instructional academic staff

Technology	Number of Faculty Who Regularly Use	Number of Faculty Who Would Use If Available
Overhead	11*	
VCR/DVD	7	
Slide Projector	2*	
Integrate tech. equipment (digital cameras, laptops, handheld computers, etc.)	9	
Computer lab	12	
Multimedia presentations by faculty	10	
Multimedia presentations by students	10	
Internet use in classroom presentations	12	
Online syllabi	12	
Internet assignments	11	
Chat rooms for student interaction	3	
Online bulletin boards/discussion boards	10	
Online quizzes or exams	10	
Online lecture notes or handouts	12	
Faculty has web page	3	
Resource links provided to students	12	
Wireless network	12	
D2L	12	
Electronic Reserves	8	
Other (identify)	4	3
	Identify: outside web platforms for assignments, such as blog, website, and wiki platforms; free online hosting platforms for blogs, webpages, wikis, and surveys; software other than Word such as Publisher or video editing software	chalkboard, SmartBoard, webinars

\*These two respondents added in the Comments section that they interpreted this “slide projector” as the “overhead” that the teacher station uses to display what is on the computer or document camera. This would bring the “overhead” total to 11.

**Library Science Responses:**

Note: 4 fulltime faculty

<b>Technology</b>	<b>Number of Faculty Who Regularly Use</b>	<b>Number of Faculty Who Would Use If Available</b>
Overhead	1	1
VCR/DVD	1	
Slide Projector	1	
Integrate tech. equipment (digital cameras, laptops, handheld computers, etc.)	2	
Computer lab	2	
Multimedia presentations by faculty	4	
Multimedia presentations by students	4	
Internet use in classroom presentations	4	
Online syllabi	4	
Internet assignments	4	
Chat rooms for student interaction		
Online bulletin boards/discussion boards	4	
Online quizzes or exams		
Online lecture notes or handouts	4	
Faculty has web page	1	
Resource links provided to students	4	
Wireless network	4	
D2L	4	
Electronic Reserves	4	
Other (identify)	1 doc camera	

**Appendix D. Academic Department Revenue Not Included in S&E Budget\***

<b>Source</b>	<b>FY08</b>	<b>FY09</b>	<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>	<b>FY12</b>	<b>FY13</b>	<b>FY14</b>
Remedial English	\$39,734	\$36,782	\$15,244	\$43,087	\$5,000	\$53,000	\$79,050
Distance Learning 136	\$668	\$2,575	\$0	\$4,375	\$1,000	\$1,500	\$1,000
Foundation	0	0	0	\$100	\$650	0	0

\*This includes revenue from such sources as 136 funds (for course/lab fees, distance learning support, remedial tuition), foundation accounts, and grants.

## Appendix E. Capital Equipment\* Request for Continuous Improvement

Requested Capital Equipment	Cost	Rationale
See the Department summary. No single purchase would cost \$5000. However, the purchase of replacement computers for the computerized classrooms would cost more than that altogether.		

\* This refers to anything costing more than \$5,000 that has a useful life of more than one year.

## Appendix F. Formal Program Articulations with Other Institutions

What type of Agreement	Other Institution	Date of Most Recent Signing	Evaluative Comment	Name of UW-S Contact
None				

## **Appendix G. Department Strategic Plan**

### **Writing Program**

#### **First-Year Writing**

In recent years, the Writing Program has successfully streamlined its Gen Ed offerings to fit with fluctuating enrollment, established an annual assessment routine, and secured permanent teaching staff for developmental writing courses. In order to continually improve this already-strong program, the Writing Program seeks to:

- Stabilize teaching resources for the fluctuating enrollment of First-Year Writing courses by seeking 50% instructor positions. Such positions would entail a 40% teaching (2 sections) and 10% service load. In accordance with WLS's recent implementation of a review process, establishing these positions would further enhance the continuity of course delivery to students.

- Undertake its first collaboration with WAC in Fall 2013 through Writing Mentors. Trained peer mentors will work with instructors to provide feedback and support of students in WRIT 099, tailored to each section's needs. This program will be assessed through feedback from instructors, students, and mentors, as well as any change in DFW rates for WRIT 099.

- Apply for "Certification of Excellence" through the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA), the national consulting body for first-year writing programs. This application will follow up on a 2002 consultancy-evaluation conducted at UW-Superior by the CWPA; many of the recommendations have been implemented in the past decade, and FirstYear Writing at UW-Superior is among those programs across the country to deliver theoretically informed, pedagogically sound writing curricula to students. The application packet will be prepared in 2014-15.

#### **Writing Major/Minor**

Once established, work to make the Writing Major a hallmark program of the University through plans that align closely with the Liberal Arts mission and the high impact practices espoused by the University, including:

- Senior Year Experience: Pilot Capstone course for majors in Spring 2014. Projected plans include professional development and creation of a public portfolio for students to use on the job market.

- Academic-Service Learning: The Writing Major, as part of an Enhanced ASL Grant department, will incorporate community-based opportunities to Writing majors. Some long-term projects include: conducting writing circles with are high school students and reaching out to aging people to record local histories. These projects will be a natural expansion of the extensive ASL work in First-Year Writing and WRIT 209: Business and Professional Writing.

-URSCA: Facilitate students publishing of original creative work and scholarship through such venues as student conferences (such as Posters in the Rotunda), professional journals and conferences, as well as local readings and events.

Internships: Establish a reliable internship network for students majoring and minoring in Writing, in concert with Career Services, a close partner for the Writing Program.

Publicity and Recruitment:

- Create promotional literature (e.g. brochures) for the Program
- Become a member of AWP (Association of Writing Programs) to connect student with resources and opportunities in the marketplace
- Utilize AWP resources to promote the Writing BA nationally and internationally, including attending AWP Conference Bookfair (in Minneapolis in 2015) for promoting the Writing Major, displaying faculty and staff publications, Program brochures, the *Nemadji Review*, etc.
- Connected to ASL planning, Writing minors/majors can extend writing circle plans to high school students outside of Superior by offering such programming at, for instance, the Duluth Public Library as a means of recruitment for the University

### **Community Outreach**

The Writing Program is currently planning some local collaborations to extend the reach of the Writing Program to area colleagues:

- A Spring 2014 regional teaching-writing conference is tentatively planned which will include instructors from UMD, CSS, LSC, WITC, and FDL.
- Following up on a past meeting, Writing Program instructors plan to invite Superior High School teachers to discuss issues of curriculum, preparedness, and transfer.

### **Curricular/Co-Curricular Collaborations**

The Writing Program offers several exciting opportunities for students to develop and professionalize as writers outside of the classroom. While the Program has established excellent working relationship with other campus units, funding is needed to continue to offer these opportunities to students:

-Visiting Writers Series: The Program will continue to work with the University Advancement Office to secure an external sponsor for the series. Meanwhile, Program members persuade both local and national authors to come to UW-Superior to speak to and workshop with students at a discount rate. The Program will also continue to collaborate with other University units, such as Women's and Gender Studies; the Program plans to reach out in 2013-14 to First Nations Studies.

-Careers in Writing Night: Reliable funding is also necessary for this event, which brings professional writers from many fields (technical writing, grant writing, creative writing, marketing and PR, blogging, academic writing) to connect with students through round-table conversations. The Program continues to partner with Career Services in this regard, as well as seek CETL and Continuing Ed funding. Plans for expansion of the event

include making the event available to DL students/those off-campus through video, ITV, or live streaming, as well as extending the opportunity to speak with professionals to students across the bridge through a potential collaboration with UMD.

-Writing Interest Group (WIG): The Writing Program is partnering with the First Year Experience office to offer a WIG in Fall 2013, a 12-week weekly writing circle open to all students and led by writing instructors in an extracurricular, relaxed atmosphere. Working with FYE, the Program will maintain records on the number and names of students who participate to plan for another round of WIGs in Spring 2014 and in the future.

-*Nemadji Review*: The Writing Program seeks to support this student organization by providing some infrastructure that would allow a smoother turnover in the student editorial team, including dedicating some of the Writing Program student assist time to office support for the editorial team and by purchasing software licensing, such as InDesign, to be installed on the computers in the Writing Resource Room for access by the students working on the *Nemadji Review*.

### **Credit for Prior Learning (CPL)**

The Writing Program, in collaboration with the Veteran and Nontraditional Student Center, is the current home for Credit for Prior Learning, which entails advising students of their CPL options at UWS and providing the course WRIT 298: Prior Learning Portfolio. The Program seeks to offer training to as many instructors who are interested in teaching this one-credit, online course through CAEL (Center for Adult and Experiential Learning) conferences and workshops, which occur annually around the country.

### **Space Planning/UW-Superior's master plan**

The Writing Program has recognized opportunities to make the best use possible of the spaces afforded it in Swenson Hall:

-Safety: Following active shooter drills in Spring 2013, the Writing Program seeks to enhance the safety of its two classrooms, Swenson 1042 and 1043. A proposal sent to appropriate officials details the needs for instructors' and students' safety.

-Resource Room: The Writing Resource Room (Swenson 3071) is small and underused; however, the use of it could be enhanced by moving the center of activity of the unit, including student assists and department associate, to the room as a hub of communication and repository for materials and resources for students and instructors.

-In concert with other departments' strategic space plans, the Writing Program is interested in a larger space to accommodate student assists and meetings of student groups, the WIG, future URSCA projects, etc. Should there be a chance to change rooms or swap with another unit, the Program is flexible.

### **Library Science Program**

1. The Library Science faculty will work to ensure that current Library Science students can complete their Minors, Certifications, and Degrees smoothly before the Program sunsets in 2017.
2. They will also work with Teacher Education to ensure that Education Minors are prepared for the assessment measures they must undergo.

3. They will also work to solve the staffing issues that are on the horizon due to expected staffing changes in the Program.

4. The Program will work to remain an active part of the WLS Department, continuing, for instance, the partnering on projects involving informative literacy and the like that have been done previously.

## **English as a Second Language Program**

### Office space – ESL Coordinator

It is enormously helpful for the ESL coordinator to be housed in the Office of International Programs. The week before classes start and the week after classes start, the ESL coordinator, the international student advisor, and the other OIP staff are able to answer many questions and solve many problems because they are all in the same office and can repeatedly check in with each other. Throughout the semester, the ESL coordinator and international student advisor consult about issues and problems that individual students are having. Many of these conversations would not take place if they did not see each other daily. The Program plans to maintain this location.

### Office space – ESL Instructor

At this time, the second ESL instructor also teaches writing and has office space in Swenson with the other writing instructors. This is also beneficial, as ESL and Writing are part of the same department, and having an office there allows her to stay connected to others in the Writing Program. The Program plans to maintain this location.

### Language Lab – for ESL Speaking class

The ESL Speaking class plans to request permission to schedule one hour per week of class time in a language classroom or other computer classroom. This would allow individualized instruction for each student in his or her problem area. There are computer classrooms available, but for this class, meeting for one hour in the computer room and one hour in a classroom with tables and chairs would be better than to only meet in the computer room.

### Curriculum

In 2011, after joining the Department of Writing and Library Science, ESL received approval to change its courses from remedial courses to 100-level courses that count towards the credits needed for graduation. Currently, only four courses are offered. The Program will explore the possibility of adding a couple of one-credit ESL courses to expand the options available to international students.

## Appendix H. Department Mentoring Plan

### WRITING SPECIALIST MENTORING PLAN:

The Department looks upon carrying out the following plan as the responsibility of the Department as a whole, with senior faculty taking a lead in implementing it.

As soon as the candidate has accepted the offer, the Department will begin preparing for his or her arrival by communicating by e-mail to establish a friendly rapport and will send information regarding department operations and life in the Twin Ports. Should the new assistant professor come for an advance visit to locate housing, the Department will help with this task and will have a get-together with him or her during the visit.

During opening week meeting and the initial weeks of the fall semester, the Department will make a point of introducing the new assistant professor to students and other faculty, actively working to help him or her make connections within and outside of the Department.

The Department will develop a first-year schedule for the new assistant professor that is equitable to that of others in the Program as to number of preps and levels of classes and is reasonable as to times of classes.

The new assistant professor will receive a course release for the fall semester to participate in the required New Faculty Orientation conducted by the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning.

In addition, the Department will emphasize to the new assistant professor that he or she is not *required* to serve on committees during the first year. At the same time, however, the Department will encourage him or her to participate in department and university work and life to the level the new assistant professor wishes. The new assistant professor will also be encouraged during the first year to prepare to begin advisement duties during the second year. (The new assistant professor will not begin advisement duties until the second year.)

The new assistant professor will be encouraged, soon after arrival, to select a mentor from within the department as well as a mentor from outside the department. The Chair and other members of the Department can help the new assistant professor with this selection.

The new assistant professor will be encouraged to seek out the campus's resources for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and other scholarship opportunities. He or she will have equal access to departmental travel funds.

The Department will provide the new assistant professor with the Department's personnel rules and other pertinent information about the retention and tenure process, voting rights, the open meeting law, and the like, and will encourage him or her to participate in governance to the level he or she wishes.

The faculty peers in the Department will assist the new assistant professor as he or she works to

meet tenure requirements in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

The entire Department will seek to provide a welcoming, collegial environment and will attend to the particular needs of the new assistant professor, including the non-academic needs.

## **Jim Dan Hill Library Mentoring Plan**

### **University Mission:**

*The University of Wisconsin-Superior fosters intellectual growth and career preparation within a liberal arts tradition that emphasizes individual attention and embodies respect for diverse cultures and multiple voices.*

### **Values:**

- Intellectual Development
- Student Focus
- Integrity
- Continual Improvement
- Collegiality
- Respect for Diversity
- Civic Engagement

### **Introduction:**

There is a mentoring plan for faculty within the Writing and Library Science Department. However, those hired as either faculty or staff within the university Library need additional mentoring to introduce them to their unique positions within the university. *Faculty* librarians shall additionally participate in the *New Faculty Orientation Program*, which includes basic information about promotion and tenure; information technology; educational technology; and governance and service.

*“Mentoring should be viewed as an important supplement to on-the-job training. It provides new librarians with a nurturing, ongoing relationship ....”* (Kaufmann, S. “Mentoring for librarians.”)

The goal of Library mentoring is to provide directed support for professional development of incoming library staff and faculty. The mentoring program is created for the purpose of improving the quality of professional engagement and leadership skills of incoming librarians in order to increase job satisfaction and socialize new librarians into the university community. In addition, the mentoring program will encourage successful retention and promotion of library faculty through mentoring into the scholarly community.

The mentee must be accountable for performance of his/her primary assignment. In addition, new faculty must take ultimate responsibility for their own professional development, research, and service activities, and the quality of his or her annual faculty performance evaluation and promotion progress.

**Objectives:**

During the first 3 months of employment, all in-coming library faculty and staff shall be given an overview of the University System, the UW-Superior campus, and the role of the library in supporting the campus mission. The new faculty or staff will be given an in-depth introduction to each person and functional area of the library, with emphasis on the inter-relationship of our roles and how they affect one another and our primary audience.

**Actions:** At least once per month in the first 3 months of employment, the mentor and mentee will meet to address the following needs:

**For Staff:**

- Discuss the structure of the library and how each area provides support to the mission.
- Identify and introduce staff to appropriate System peers in the specialty/area.
- Assist in enrolling them in relevant collaborative groups and coordinating committees for their area, and make sure they are aware that active participation is an accepted and important part of their job responsibilities.
- Assist the new member to develop reasonable, appropriate and achievable goals for the first year.
- Keep them apprised of the availability of professional development opportunities, including support for attendance at workshops and library conferences.
- Encourage cross-area discussions and brainstorming new ideas and services.

**For Faculty:**

- Discuss the structure of the library and how each area provides support to the mission.
- Identify and introduce library faculty to other local librarians and to appropriate System peers in the specialty/area.
- Enroll them in relevant collaborative groups and coordinating committees for their area, providing explicit discussion of expectations for active participation and leadership in such groups as part of their job responsibilities.
- Assist the new member to assess personal skills and develop reasonable, appropriate and achievable goals for the first year.
- Help them to develop institutional knowledge and connections by introducing them to faculty colleagues, staff, department chairs, etc., outside the library.
- Keep them apprised of the availability of professional development opportunities, including support for attendance and presentation at library meetings and conferences, locally, regionally and nationally.
- Encourage cross-area discussions and collaboration for new ideas and services.

***In addition***, beyond the initial 3 months, and minimally through the first year, faculty librarians should be mentored:

- In the complex role of a faculty member;
  - The specific description of how librarians may meet the requirements of teaching, scholarship and service for tenure and promotion as described in the WLS department rules;
  - And how to manage their career path.

- Mentors should encourage thoughtful discussion of career goals and balancing the 3 elements of faculty life on a small campus.
- The mentor should encourage professional collaboration within the library, across campus, and with library peers outside the institution in support of the university mission.