



University of Colorado **Boulder**

2016 Program Review

Department of English

Academic Review and Planning
Advisory Committee Report

Approved

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Keith Ware'.

02/13/2017

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs : Date

Contents	Process overview – 3
	2016 ARPAC members – 4
	Unit overview – 5
	Past reviews – 11
	Campus context – 12
	National context – 13
	Analysis – 14
	Recommendations – 26
	Required follow-up – 30

Process Overview

The review of the Department of English was conducted in accordance with the 2016 review guidelines. The Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC) conducts and writes the final reviews of all academic units on the Boulder campus. The unit prepared a self-study, which was reviewed by an internal review committee (IRC) consisting of two faculty members from outside of the Department of English. The IRC found the report accurate and complete but made several recommendations to the unit that may provide a more complete picture, “particularly of dissenting views.” These recommendations were subsequently addressed by the unit in its response to the IRC and in a revised self-study. An external review committee (ERC), consisting of two disciplinary experts from outside of the University of Colorado, visited the unit over April 14 and 15, 2016, reviewed the relevant documents, and met with faculty, students, staff, university administrators, and members of ARPAC. ERC comments and recommendations are cited at appropriate points throughout the report. This public document reflects the assessment of and recommendations for the Department of English as approved by ARPAC.

Academic Review
and Planning
Advisory
Committee
(ARPAC)

Marie Banich, Professor, Institute of Cognitive Science,
Sanjai Bhagat, Professor, Leeds School of Business
Adam Bradley, Associate Professor, Department of English
Erin Furtak, Associate Professor, School of Education
David Korevaar, Professor, College of Music
Clayton Lewis, Professor, Department of Computer Science
Jack Maness, Associate Professor, University Libraries
David Mapel, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science
Susan Nevelow Mart, Associate Professor, School of Law
Bryan Taylor, Professor, Department of Communication

Academic year 2016-2017
voting members

Non-voting members

Jeff Cox, ARPAC Chair, Vice Provost and Associate Vice
Chancellor for Faculty Affairs and Professor of English and
Humanities
Bob Boswell, Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Community
Engagement and Professor of Molecular, Cellular, and
Developmental Biology
Katherine Eggert, Quality Initiative Leader and Professor of English
Bill Kaempfer, Senior Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor
for Budget and Planning and Professor of Economics
Mary Kraus, Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor for
Undergraduate Education and Professor of Geological Sciences
Ann Schmeising, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School
and Professor of Germanic and Slavic Languages and Literatures

Staff

Andre Grothe, Office of Faculty Affairs

Unit Overview

The campus' standardized description of the Department of English, and information regarding comparable units, can be found on the Office of Data Analytics' (ODA) website (<http://www.colorado.edu/oda/institutional-research/institutional-level-data/information-department/academic-review-and-0>). ODA updates profiles annually in the fall semester. This report cites the ODA data for English posted in November 2015, reflecting the state of the department as of academic year (AY) 2014-2015. More recent data from the English self-study are cited where appropriate.

As of November 1, 2015, the department had 39 tenured and tenure-track (TTT) faculty, plus four instructors/senior instructors, and six honorarium lecturers. Three state classified staff employees and one university staff member provide support. Eleven of the TTT faculty are ranked as full professors, 19 as associate, and nine as assistant professors. An additional 65 student teaching assistants (TAs) and graduate part-time instructors (GPTIs) provide instruction. No fewer than three TTT have served one or more years during this review cycle as senior campus administrators, and several have administrative appointments in centers and other academic programs. The department ranks first of 16 arts and humanities units in percentage of faculty who are women (56 percent), and eighth of 16 units with 22 percent of its TTT faculty who identify as "minority race/ethnic status (Asian American, African American, Hispanic/Latino, Native American)."

Personnel and governance

The unit's self-study, dated April 2016, reports 44 TTT faculty (one with a 50 percent appointment), six instructors, and five staff members. Although these numbers have increased from the ODA data of 2014 in all categories, they are still fewer than the personnel reported in the last review of 2009. The self-study

reports the retirement of seven TTT and one instructor since that review was completed, further noting that “half of our TTT faculty have been hired in the last decade.”

A faculty-elected chair and three associate chairs lead the department, all for three-year appointments. Tenure and tenure-track faculty and instructors are all considered voting members. The department officers, plus five at-large elected members, comprise the executive committee, which is tasked with policy, administrative, and personnel decisions when appropriate. According to departmental “Standing Rules” (i.e., the bylaws), composition of the executive committee also requires at least one untenured member (unless no untenured member wishes to stand), one woman, and at least two total members from “protected classes (women and/or members of underrepresented ethnic minorities).” Other faculty governance committees include a salary committee and graduate and undergraduate education committees.

The self-study outlines many departmental governance procedures and structures that have been changed since the last review, in part due to ARPAC recommendations. It further outlines action items to address related matters that arose during the 2015-2016 review process.

Research, scholarship, and creative work

Standard ODA data provided to ARPAC on research productivity includes the average number of publications and/or creative works produced per TTT faculty member (as rostered on November 1, 2014), from 2008-2014. For purposes of comparison, these data are ranked with all academic units across campus and those within this cycle (in this case, arts and humanities units). With respect to the number of TTT faculty, English ranks second of 16 units in its cycle. Average research productivity per faculty member during those seven years derives from self-reported

publications in the annual Faculty Report of Professional Activity (FRPA) and includes: 0.8 refereed books and monographs per TTT (ranking ninth of 16 units); 4.0 referred articles and chapters per TTT (ranking ninth of 16 units); and 20.6 creative works per TTT (fifth of 12 units reporting creative works).

The department's self-study provides a discussion in this regard:

In the five-year period between 2003 and 2007, our faculty produced, on average, 0.91 books per TTT faculty member; 0.33 major edited projects per TTT faculty member (editions of texts, edited collections of essays, and special issues of journals), and 2.59 scholarly articles per TTT faculty member. In the five-year period from 2010 to 2014, our faculty produced, on average, 1.05 books per TTT faculty member (up from 0.91); 0.66 major edited projects per TTT faculty member (up from 0.33); and 4.04 articles and essays per TTT faculty member (up from 2.59). Since 2009, the faculty have also garnered 24 major awards and fellowships for either individual or collaborative research and creative work, where "major" constitutes a grant of more than \$10,000 or a fellowship that provides at least a semester or an entire summer for research and/or writing.

These, and many other achievements included in the self-study, are important contributions to ARPAC's deliberations.

Undergraduate education

The Department of English offers two tracks toward a Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree in English: literature and creative writing. The fall 2014 census indicated 582 majors (second of 16 units) and 75 minors (fourth of 14 units offering minors). Of these undergraduates, 61 percent are women (seventh of 16), 19 percent identify as minorities (11th of 16), and 13 percent from underrepresented minority populations (14th of 16). Mirroring national trends in the humanities, the number of majors has declined significantly in five years (a 41 percent decrease). Student credit hour (SCH) production was just under 18,000 for academic year (AY) 2014-2015 (third of 17 units). This also mirrors a national trend in five-year decreases (a 38 percent decrease). Tenure and

tenure-track faculty taught 38 percent of these SCHs, an increase of nine percent and ranking English eighth of 17 units in this measure. The exception to the trend of decline is in the Creative Writing major. The self-study reports the program has more than twice the majors at the time of the self-study report than it did in AY 2010-2011. Median time-to-degree that the Office of Data Analytics (ODA) reports is sixth of 13 units (4.00 years). The percentage of students who are women (60 percent) has held steady over five years, while the percentage identifying as “minority status” (19 percent) has increased by 49 percent, and those students from underrepresented minority populations (13 percent) has increased by 60 percent. Ranked against similar units, English is near the middle for female students and the bottom for minority students.

A recent ODA survey of undergraduate seniors showed that a slight majority of English majors anticipated gaining full-time employment after graduation (64 percent of 55 survey participants). Eighty percent gave the department maximum favorability ratings in availability of required courses (first of six units), and 75 percent gave the highest ranking for program quality (fourth of six). The quality of advising ranked somewhat lower, with 57 percent of respondents giving it highest marks. The internal review committee (IRC) conducted similar surveys of undergraduates in the spring semester of 2015 and found similar results from a greater number of students (about 100). Students tend to be satisfied or very satisfied with courses, faculty, and the quality of the program, while being a bit less satisfied with advising. Students the IRC surveyed perceived availability of courses more negatively.

The department is considering significant revisions to the undergraduate literature track (and thus, the literature component

of the creative writing track). At issue, according to the self-study, is discussion of a “Chautauqua model,” which could potentially eliminate the requirement that students receive instruction in a mandatory distribution of historical periods of literature. Courses would be redistributed into categories that would enable more topical inquiry and “acknowledge the interrelationship between theory and practice.” The faculty has not found a consensus on this proposal. In fact, the self-study characterizes the faculty as “deeply divided” on the issue of eliminating the historical period requirements.

Graduate education

The department offers three graduate degrees: a PhD in Literature, a terminal MA in Literature, and an MFA in Creative Writing. The creative writing faculty, led by the associate chair in Creative Writing, independently runs the creative writing program at the graduate level.

ODA reports 30 master’s degrees awarded in AY 2014-2015, a 25 percent increase over five years, with a median time to degree of 2.1 years (ranking English sixth of 13 units). The fall census for 2014 indicated 81 students enrolled in these programs (a three percent increase in five years, due primarily to the MFA program). The department awarded five doctoral degrees that same year, a decrease of 38 percent and a result of intentionally downsizing the program in order to better fund candidates. Median time to degree for PhD students was 7.02 years (sixth of eight comparative units), and fall 2014 data show 40 doctoral students and candidates. While this is a decline of 15 percent, it is, again, intentional, with further reductions planned (a program of 20-25 is an expressed goal for English). Diversity in the graduate student body is similar to that of the undergraduate, with 58 percent being women (a five percent decrease over five years), 17 percent identifying as minorities (a 20 percent increase), and 12 percent from

underrepresented minority populations (a five percent decrease and an exception in five-year trends).

English overhauled its doctoral program rather significantly approximately five years ago. It now admits candidates without an MA and guarantees funding for five years; as noted, the department has downsized the program and has further decreases planned. PhD students are funded at 50 percent graduate part-time instructor (GPTI) appointments for five years. A limited number of 25 percent teaching assistant (TA) positions are awarded to MA students, and English revised the MA program's curriculum in 2010 to decrease emphasis on genre and period and increase emphases on "topic" requirements. Finally, ODA data indicate the MFA in creative writing includes 26 full-time students, and the self-study states they are funded at either 25 percent or 50 percent TA positions with stipends of \$8,700 in the first year and \$13,000 in the second and third years, with partial tuition waivers. This program transitioned from an MA to an MFA shortly before the last review. According to the self-study, this resulted in a significant increase in applications.

Space English faculty are dispersed across eight buildings. Two shared spaces for graduate students exist, and, until recently, departmental staff resided in two separate Hellems offices (as of summer 2016, the offices have been merged and the remaining room has been converted into an undergraduate student lounge). Renovation plans include a faculty lounge and updating of existing locations, including instructional spaces. Past reviews frequently cite department dispersal, and the fact that never in its history has English been located in one building, as a barrier to departmental cohesion.

Past Reviews

English has undergone program review every seven years since 1983. Its last review, in 2009, identified several strengths and areas for improvement. English has addressed many of these concerns, including improving its mentoring program and the department's reputation in scholarship, revising aspects of bylaws, creating a strategic plan, and ensuring engagement in departmental leadership. Indeed, English demonstrates, in both its 2009 and 2016 self-study processes, a willingness to recognize and proactively address difficult issues.

There remains, however, significant concern regarding the department culture and its impact on decision-making, which hampers the unit's ability to leverage strengths and seize opportunities to further distinguish itself in both campus and national contexts.

Campus Context

The Department of English is a significant contributor to campus life. As teachers and scholars, the English faculty bring diverse perspectives, interdisciplinary pursuits, and vitality to faculty governance and campus administration.

Despite declining enrollments, the department ranks third in student credit hour (SCH) production for degree-granting humanities units. Its faculty have founded, direct, or otherwise actively engage in many innovative and important interdisciplinary pursuits, including the Center for the Humanities and the Arts, the Laboratory for Race and Popular Culture, the Media Archaeology Lab, and the Center for Medieval and Early Modern Studies, among others. Faculty have received many campus awards, including the Provost's Achievement Award and the College of Arts and Sciences Professor of Distinction.

Indicative of its contributions, a prioritization initiative that the University of Colorado Board of Regents directed in 2012 measured academic units' efficiency and productivity in teaching and research and found English to be ranked first in humanities disciplines and seventh of units across the entire campus. Undoubtedly, across the humanities and beyond, English is central to the university's mission.

National Context

The English faculty are a distinguished group, with 31 of the current 44 TTT having won 64 major awards in the course of their careers. These include book awards, fellowships, and stipends from entities such as the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Endowment for the Arts, the Fulbright Foundation, the Mellon Foundation, the American Philosophical Society, and the American Council of Learned Societies.

Despite these accomplishments, and as the self-study laments, the department's graduate program is currently ranked 50th (down from 46th) in *U.S. News & World Report*.¹ The study is correct in contextualizing this ranking, noting that it is 24th of 34 public institutions in the American Association of Universities and ranks above peer institutions with similar levels of state funding. The department is also correct in providing a caveat regarding this ranking's methodology (a survey of individuals, usually department chairs, taken in 2012) and that it is reasonable to expect the ranking may soon improve. The self-study also notes that the relatively new MFA program in Creative Writing was ranked 32nd in 2012 by *Poets & Writers*,² after having been unranked in 2010.

¹ See: <http://grad-schools.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-humanities-schools/english-rankings/page+3>

² See: http://www.pw.org/content/2012_mfa_rankings_the_top_fifty?cmnt_all=1.

Analysis

The Department of English has made strides since the 2009 review, but issues related to climate deeply trouble ARPAC. The department's self-study does a commendable job of outlining efforts to address all but one of the recommendations from the 2009 review and goes so far as to include action items for future departmental efforts to address remaining issues, as well as issues that arose as a part of the 2016 self-study process. ARPAC appreciates the extent to which English leadership embraces these reviews as opportunities to make improvements to its programs but believes matters related to climate are urgent and must be addressed by the entire faculty.

The ERC notes progress as well, especially a “laudable transition [. . .] to a highly productive model of research and creative activity,” further stating that “[t]hose who lead the department through that process are to be commended.” ARPAC concurs, and echoes the ERC, that these reports should be “appropriately consider[ed] [. . .] within the context of the impressive, upward driving arc of research and creative activity success that has developed in the unit.”

Nevertheless, it is clear to all, including the department itself (which described progress as “uneven”), that English continues to suffer from a long-standing substandard department climate. The result is an environment that stifles communication, collaborative goal-setting, and creative thinking. A decision-making paralysis has set in, impeding the unit's ability to seize and replicate said upward driving arc in other areas of its work, particularly its teaching and curriculum development. The climate also impedes the unit's ability to foster a sense of common purpose between literary scholarship and creative writing.

Personnel and governance

ARPAC believes a chair needs to address these issues by focusing for a sustained period on improving faculty engagement, communication, and transparency in decision making. Even more importantly, the chair needs full support from the college. If English can improve its climate significantly, enabling it to make bold, creative decisions, it could become a top-ranked program.

A new chair has recently assumed interim department leadership. ARPAC feels the approach the department is currently developing to address climate issues is a promising one but feels strongly that the interim chair's term of service is insufficient and that the college should extend it, if the chair is willing. It would be unreasonable, however, to assume any one person, or even group of people (in the form of the department's executive or faculty personnel committees, for example) could solve these complex issues: it is necessary that the entire faculty commit to, and actively engage in, changing the department culture.

The ERC mentions the possibility of summer leadership development programs offered by the Association of Departments of English, and the university offers many development opportunities. These suggestions seem worth consideration, not due to any individual's shortcomings, but rather simply due to the "enormous pressure" on the chair, as the ERC notes, and the gravity of the task at hand.

This task, as the ERC notes, includes several areas where departmental culture and decision-making are "in need of serious attention." These include the departmental role of faculty members who serve in campus administration and the potential for, as the ERC phrases it, "vertical intervention"; gender dynamics that create disempowerment; a tendency to rationalize the culture to

the extent it becomes self-fulfilling; and a need to improve open communication, transparency in decision-making, and collegiality.

In addition to numerous action items outlined in the self-study, the department has convened an advisory board comprised of faculty from outside the department with leadership experience and the director of faculty relations. In addition, the department has begun engagement with the Office of Faculty Affairs and the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance with an aim to improving unit culture. This work includes: facilitated discussion of the Academic Affairs Policy on Professional Rights and Duties of Faculty Members and Roles and Professional Responsibilities of Department Chairs document³, discussion of department bylaws with an eye toward both building awareness of them and considering possible revision, and substantive training in conflict resolution and implicit bias.

ARPAC emphasizes that it is of critical importance that all faculty actively engage in these efforts.

ARPAC commends the department, its leadership, and the college for engaging in this work. The committee asks the department, its advisory board, and the Office of Faculty Affairs to consider the following concerns as paramount:

1. **Lack of faculty engagement in the department needs to be remedied.** Whether it is low attendance at department meetings, trainings and workshops, or engagement in faculty governance committees, there is an unproductive level of engagement among the faculty in department work. ARPAC notes that the department's faculty personnel committee "addresses questions of morale, publicizes and keeps track of

³ http://www.colorado.edu/bfa/sites/default/files/attached-files/PRDJanuary16_2013.pdf

changes in the Standing Rules.” The board and the chair might consider engaging this committee in these matters. In addition, the unit’s service expectations indicate “[e]veryone is expected to show up to meetings, graduations, retreats, etc.” and the Professional Rights and Duties document (Part II.C.1.b.) states that faculty members are expected to “participate in the operation and governance of his or her academic department or division, school or college and of the University.” If these expectations are not clear enough, however, English might consider specifying them, such as requiring a certain level of attendance and participation to receive a rating of “adequate” in service.

2. **Faculty displaying un-collegial behavior need to be held accountable.** Behavior that may violate expectations outlined in the Professional Rights and Duties document section on “Academic Citizenship” is too prevalent and has gone unchecked. ARPAC notes that the Professional Rights and Duties document Policy Part IV includes detailed procedures for review of faculty conduct and provisions for sanctioning unprofessional behavior and also that the department Standing Rule IX outlines internal grievance procedures. In addition, English might wish to work with its advisory board to improve formal and informal procedures and channels by which faculty may report and resolve problematic behavior. ARPAC believes current training efforts could help faculty members constructively address many of these matters informally but that formal procedures must be invoked if un-collegial behavior persists.

3. **Unconscious bias, micro-aggression, and inequities with respect to protected classes are issues that need attention.** In addition to unprofessional behavior, there appear

to have been troubling incidents of such behavior being directed toward members of protected classes. ARPAC supports the department's training efforts to address this issue and commends the work of the department's salary committee—for example, to adjust how merit evaluations account for the results of faculty course questionnaires (FCQs). But as the self-study notes, “debates over gendered hierarchies and divisions of labor” are “especially charged.” Current facilitation efforts should assist the faculty in constructively addressing these matters, but the committee again calls attention to the fact that engaging in these facilitated efforts is expected of all faculty and that the department should consider the possibility of revising service expectations to incentivize participation in trainings and workshops. Faculty must be held accountable if they engage in aggressive or biased behavior or if they are unwilling to engage in changing department culture. Complacency in this environment is tantamount to being complicit in the behavior.

4. **Unclear voting procedures on major issues should be clarified.** The department already appears ready to address voting procedures, but ARPAC emphasizes this may be particularly important as English should shortly undertake a number of important decisions, including revising the undergraduate curriculum. Clarity on voting procedures may prevent unconstructive handling of conflict that may arise in this process.

5. **The Department of English does not appear to have complied with a 2009 ARPAC recommendation** that the unit “submit an annual report to the dean of Arts and Sciences indicating efforts taken and progress achieved in creating a more collegial and functional departmental culture.” ARPAC

feels strongly that the department should implement an annual reporting arrangement. In consultation with the chair and advisory board, the dean should set clear benchmarks for improvement and conduct annual reviews of departmental progress in improving climate.

6. ARPAC is also concerned about **the possibility of “vertical intervention,”** as the ERC phrases it, from faculty members in administrative roles outside the department. The possibility or perception of irregular and/or inappropriate intervention in departmental governance by faculty members serving in administrative positions needs attention. The college should work with the provost in developing transparent recusal protocols for academic officers.
7. **Discussions regarding the creation of a new school in the college have exacerbated tensions between literature and creative writing.** ARPAC does not have sufficient information to comment on the creation of the school, or of the department’s affiliation with it, but suggests that the discussion recognize the need for English to address its climate issues without unnecessary complications and for creative writing to have strong ties to both literature and creative practice scholars. The department’s progress on climate issues must not be impeded by externally imposed structural changes.
8. **The Department of English has the opportunity to work toward aspirational goals if the climate can be improved.** The self-study outlines action items in many areas that identify laudable goals for the unit, including but not limited to: revising the undergraduate curriculum, increasing alternative career awareness and placement among PhD and MA students in literature, and exploring several graduate

certificate programs and/or a professional master's program, including one in publishing. Indeed, the self-study evinces a unit with many progressive and proactive goals. ARPAC believes that a concerted effort toward improving unit climate may allow English to pursue the successful implementation of these action items and to make progress on building the department's reputational standing.

ARPAC concurs with the ERC that the department's efforts in improving the climate "need to be monitored and, when necessary, facilitated, not so much because of imminent peril, but because the college and campus need a stronger, more cohesively functioning English department helping [to] anchor and buttress the humanities given the broader context of the challenges we face in higher education." The committee notes, however, that while the department may not be in "imminent peril," it is at an important crossroads in its history.

ARPAC fully supports current efforts undertaken by the chair and advisory board. If the faculty engage in this process, English could become an exemplary humanities department. However, if the unit cannot demonstrate significant improvements by the time of its first response in this review process (April 2018), ARPAC will consider initiating a contingent review as outlined in ARPAC process documentation, which states in part:

Occasionally a unit might require extra attention, such as when program or management difficulties impede its progress or when demands placed on the unit far exceed available resources. A contingent review might assume the form of a task force reporting to the dean or provost on actions necessary to promote unit quality, or to recommend program reconstitution or discontinuance.

Contingent review status, or pending status, would not excuse a unit from regular program review obligations.

In addition, if the current leadership arrangement becomes unsustainable, the college should consider placing the department in receivership.

Individual English faculty members have made significant strides since the last review, but now a more collective focus on the department and its campus role are in order. Indeed, the English faculty are undoubtedly impressive and through a collective effort could lead a reinvigoration of interest in the humanities.

Research, scholarship, and creative work

As noted throughout this report, the department's research and scholarship is on the ascendency. The self-study provides crucial discipline-specific context to research productivity that provides ARPAC and others with a benchmark to assess the department's performance against its own past record and the performance of its national peers. The department is to be commended for its efforts in these respects since the last review.

Undergraduate education

ARPAC supports the department's efforts to revamp its undergraduate curriculum. Changes being considered to courses and curriculum may attract more students. Undergraduates appear to be reasonably satisfied with their education and are certainly provided opportunities to study with distinguished faculty. ARPAC shares the IRC's and ERC's concern that the department is struggling to creatively and constructively rethink its curriculum given the department's climate challenges. The unit should pay special attention from the outset to determining just how these decisions will be made and by whom. They appear to be just the sort of "major issues" that will require clear voting procedures.

As it reconsiders its curriculum, the department should explore ways to leverage the popularity of creative writing courses to the fullest extent possible. Courses such as the planned “environmental writing” class are perfect examples of the sort of content that may attract students from many disciplines.

The self-study notes that there is no formal assessment mechanism for determining the success of instruction or ultimate outcomes for English undergraduates. It does provide some useful analysis, and by all accounts these students appear to be learning while at CU Boulder and successful after graduating. ARPAC encourages the department to work with campus leadership and peer departments to further develop assessment mechanisms.

In addition, while standard ODA data show a reasonable percentage of undergraduate student credit hours (SCH) taught by TTT faculty (38 percent, eighth of 17 units in review cycle), ARPAC notes that recent college data show English TTT faculty teach about as many SCH as departments with TTT teaching complements one-third the size. Considered in light of the ERC’s finding that “shared, department-wide attention to undergraduate education seems lacking [...] and should be a focal point in drawing faculty together,” ARPAC believes the unit has an opportunity to reinvigorate the undergraduate curriculum and the faculty’s relationship to it in the coming semesters. This is an example of an area where the “upward driving arc” in research could be leveraged in teaching and where departmental cohesion could be strengthened. Ideally, the faculty can rally around a common goal of improving its undergraduate curriculum and engaging more fully in it.

Finally, ARPAC encourages English to continue to work with the college on improving academic advising.

Graduate education

The department's doctoral and MA programs in literature are strong and on the ascendency. Students are finding appropriate academic positions, in many cases at prestigious universities, and the downsizing of the PhD program is wise. ARPAC also appreciates the work being done to engage students on the possibility of alternative career tracks and encourages the department to confer with campus colleagues in the humanities and with national peers to help in this important, yet challenging, process. There is some student concern regarding clear expectations for their matriculation, and ARPAC supports the department's existing efforts in this respect. Formal assessment considerations should also be undertaken at the graduate level. The effort to create a certificate/master's program in publishing is a good one, as are those in digital humanities and environmental writing, and they are examples of how the unit could be thinking creatively about graduate education moving forward.

The department has a significant opportunity with its MFA program. The ERC is enthusiastic about the program's future and feels it has the potential of being in the "vanguard of what creative writing programs will become in the twenty-first century." Being relatively new, and perhaps left to its own devices as a small program, it has built a curriculum free of traditional formats that allows for cross-genre experimentation, diverse voices, and innovation in form. With CU Boulder's western US identity and association with environmental issues to draw from, the ERC identifies the MFA program as positioned to "vault [. . .] into the top 20" of its kind. ARPAC agrees that the MFA program is poised for further success and encourages English, the college, and the campus to make concerted efforts in supporting its growth.

Contrary to some statements in the ERC report, it does not appear to ARPAC that English has inequitably funded MFA students: the department appropriately prioritizes PhD and MFA funding over the MA program. Graduate student funding packages on the Boulder campus, perhaps particularly in arts and humanities, are inadequate. A recent 6.5 percent increase to teaching assistants' salary is an important step, as are current initiatives to manage a Consortium Fellowship for Doctoral Studies in Literature and Culture that will provide year-round funding. In addition, MFA students are eligible for appointment as GPTIs, which may improve their funding. Nevertheless, ARPAC encourages the campus to further invest in these disciplines in an effort to maintain and build strengths across all its scholarly pursuits.

The MFA program may be an area worth concerted investment. The ERC notes several major gifts in the last ten years to creative writing programs, ranging from \$1,000,000 to \$50,000,000, and that the community of creative writing in the region is such that similar gifts are worth pursuing. The department should also consider revising its hiring plan in light of the ERC report.

There is a need to foster better community among graduate students in the department, including across the literature and creative writing programs.

Space The department undoubtedly suffers from its faculty members being scattered across campus. ARPAC encourages the college and the campus to renew efforts to find ways to minimize department dispersion, especially in light of current climate challenges. English should also continue to consider ways to improve communication and community regardless of space, in

recognition of the fact that many units on campus must, necessarily, be dispersed.

Recommendations

The members of the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC) address the following recommendations to the Department of English and to the offices of the dean, provost, and chancellor. It is the committee's intention that the recommendations serve to benefit program improvement and development and to further the mission of the University of Colorado Boulder.

To the unit

1. Continue working with the Office of Faculty Affairs and the Department of English Advisory Board to make a concerted, sustained effort toward improving department climate. This includes:
 - a. Providing ongoing training with an aim to addressing unprofessional behavior and gender inequality;
 - b. Building awareness of existing rules and expectations regarding service and collegiality, as well as strengthening and drawing upon existing structures in the department;
 - c. Developing and/or implementing methods for ensuring accountability of all faculty in displaying collegial behavior;
 - d. Improving formal and informal procedures and channels by which faculty may report and resolve problematic behavior;
 - e. Working with the college to set clear benchmarks for improvement and conducting annual reviews of departmental progress in improving climate;

2. Review, build faculty awareness of, and, when necessary, revise standing rules and other departmental policies to ensure transparency and clarity;
3. Reengage tenure and tenure track faculty in undergraduate education. Work with the college to set goals for student credit hours taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty;
4. Invest in the MFA program by:
 - a. Reviewing the unit's hiring plan with this effort in mind;
 - b. Seeking additional support staff for the program;
 - c. Working with the Office of Strategic Communications to make branding and marketing of the MFA program a priority;
5. Task the chairs of the graduate committee and the creative writing committee with creating plans to foster better community among department graduate students;
6. Work with Office of Undergraduate Education and the quality initiatives leader to develop formal mechanisms for measuring student success;
7. Consider developing additional courses that speak to broader initiatives in the humanities and beyond (e.g., digital and visual humanities, environmental literature, languages and culture, and writing and textual communities). Focus on offerings that draw on the strengths of English and other campus departments, bringing faculty specialties into dialog with one another. As a part of this effort, consider courses that may increase undergraduate student diversity;

To the dean of the College
of Arts and Sciences

8. Continue to advocate for contiguous space.
9. Make clear the college's support for the chair. Consider extending the interim chair's appointment if initial efforts toward improving departmental culture are successful, set clear benchmarks for improvement, and conduct annual reviews of departmental progress in improving climate;
 - a. If this leadership arrangement becomes unsustainable, consider supporting a contingent review or putting the department in receivership;
 - b. Provide resources for external facilitation, leadership training, or other necessary costs;
 - c. Support the chair in personnel matters when necessary;
10. Ensure that structural changes within the college do not harm the Department of English;
11. Considering that the MFA program and creative writing have favorable enrollment trends, consider:
 - a. Providing funding for additional support staff and marketing;
 - b. Granting tenure or tenure track faculty positions that reflect the growing demand for creative writing courses;
12. Work with campus administration on finding contiguous space for the department.

To the dean of the Graduate School

13. Explore possibilities of significantly increasing graduate student funding for humanities and arts programs. As a part of this effort, determine programs of excellence and target resources appropriately;
14. Consider providing additional financial support to the MFA program;
15. Support the unit's efforts to develop a professional master's degree in publishing.

To the provost

16. Explore possibilities of significantly increasing graduate student funding for humanities and arts programs. As a part of this effort, determine programs of excellence and target resources appropriately;
17. To prevent even the appearance of impropriety, explore developing a formal policy for faculty members to recuse themselves from departmental governance while serving in college or campus administration;
18. Recognizing the department's foundational role in the arts and humanities, work with campus administration on finding contiguous department space.

To the chancellor

19. Explore possibilities of significantly increasing graduate student funding for humanities and arts programs. As a part of this effort, determine programs of excellence and target resources appropriately;
20. Direct the Office of Advancement to make major gifts for creative writing programs a priority for the next few years.

Required Follow-Up

The chair of the Department of English shall report annually on the first of April for a period of three years following the year of the receipt of this report (i.e., April 1st of 2018, 2019, and 2020) to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and to the provost on the implementation of these recommendations. Likewise, the dean shall report annually on the first of May to the provost on the implementation of recommendations addressed to the college. The provost, as part of the review reforms, has agreed to respond annually to all outstanding matters under her/his purview arising from this review year. All official responses will be posted online.