

Final Report
External Review of the English: Literature, Writing and Culture Program
California State University Channel Islands
October 2008

INTRODUCTION

On October 22 and 23, 2008, Professors Richard Hansen (CSU Fresno) and John Purdy (Western Washington University) visited California State University Channel Islands to conduct an external review of its English: Literature, Writing and Culture Program (hereafter “English Program”). During the course of the two days, they met with the provost, the dean, the program’s chair, faculty in the program, staff (including the Director of the Writing Center), and students. Prior to the visit, they were furnished with a variety of materials related to the program, including its self-study, as well as several assessment reports.

Founded in 2001, CSUCI has a current enrollment of nearly 5,000 students and it continues to experience steady enrollment growth. At this stage of its development, it exhibits an inclusive nature in which the conventional divides between administration and faculty are not apparent, and this has fostered a sense of collaboration that is truly remarkable.

Its defining character is found in its current and emerging interdisciplinary curricula offered through its programs (here, synonymous with the conventional “department”). This core value of collaboration across disciplines is in keeping with national trends that integrate learning outcomes from multiple perspectives, and that prepare students for a productive life in a complex global environment. This close interaction has resulted also in an institution-wide culture of “buy-in,” meaning a sense of shared commitment to and possession of the university’s mission (as articulated in its governing documents) and this is apparent in the English Program’s mission as well. This has generated a great deal of energy, which has resulted in innovative curricula and initiatives. The values are articulated in the university’s mission statement, as articulated on its website:

CSUCI graduates will possess an education of sufficient breadth and depth to appreciate and interpret the natural, social and aesthetic worlds and to address the highly complex issues facing societies. Graduates will be able to:

- Identify and describe the modern world and issues facing societies from multiple perspectives including those within and across disciplines, cultures and nations (when appropriate).
- Analyze issues, and develop and convey to others solutions to problems using the methodologies, tools and techniques of an academic discipline.

CSUCI Graduates are expected to be:

- informed about past, present, and future issues affecting human society and natural world, and the inter-relatedness of society and the natural world;
- empowered with the disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge necessary to evaluate problems, the ability to translate knowledge into judgment and action, and excellent communication skills for conveying their interpretations and opinions to a diverse audience;
- creative in developing imaginative self-expression and independent thinking, with joy and passion for learning; and
- dedicated to maintaining the principles of intellectual honesty, democracy, and social justice, and to participating in human society and the natural world as socially responsible individual citizens.

The English Program's curriculum is designed to meet these goals. Moreover, student learning outcomes and various assessment implements and procedures are all cued to these institutional goals. In short, the program contributes at all levels to the mission of the university and provides valuable service for other programs to achieve them as well.

While the review team cannot speak to the effectiveness of the university in achieving these qualities in general, it can provide some observations and evidence that suggest that they are the driving force behind the English Program's faculty members' efforts at all levels of their experience, from teaching and curriculum development to their scholarship and community involvement.

The following report is meant to address the program's stated "areas of concern" as provided in section ten (X) of its self-study, and it is structured to examine the major areas of faculty involvement in achieving the university's mission goals. However, these areas quite clearly overlap. Individual recommendations will be made in the appropriate sections below. Other, overarching recommendations will be presented collectively at the end of this document.

ENGLISH FACULTY/ PROGRAM AND INSTITUTIONAL WORK

In the cohesiveness of the program's culture and faculty collegiality, we find the English Program exemplary. The spirit of work and scholarly, educational, professional, and scholastic commitment exhibited by this group are exceptional in the reviewers' experience as university faculty and program assessors. We believe that individual professor's intellectual rigor and scholarly generosity result in maintaining a program culture that supports invention and reflection on a scale that exceeds most department norms. During our visit, members of the English Program were constantly referring to one another's work, praising it, questioning it and telling stories about how their own work was in some way influenced by the work of someone else in the unit.

This constant stream of collaborative, yet critical, interaction creates a sense of trust and honesty in the program that is essential, we believe, for a true interdisciplinary approach to education to succeed. Clearly, members of English are in constant professional contact, but this contact has not forced them apart, rather it has allowed them to work earnestly and openly with one another, not always agreeing on issues, but

listening to one another and collaborating with one another with an eye always turned to the needs of students at CSU Channel Islands.

Faculty members are highly engaged: they are “student-centered,” which means they work closely with students in courses and in advising/mentoring throughout their degree programs. These programs all culminate with a portfolio review process that provides for elaborate, personal assessment of students’ development, and entry into the “capstone” project that allows students to apply the theories and methodologies they have learned. This type of review constitutes the “best practice” of assessment in programs where writing is such a major component of pedagogy. In this case, the faculty members use it to develop courses that extend the curriculum and revise others in response to the assessments. This continuous assessment and responsiveness are noteworthy. They are also labor-intensive.

Faculty members play a crucial role in the governance of the program, and also the university. They serve on numerous committees as well as direct centers that have a role in the interdisciplinary life of the institution. For instance, Dr. Julia Balén is Director of Center for Multicultural Engagement and Dr. Brad Monsma of the Center for Integrative Studies. Add to these duties the ways faculty voluntarily add to the culture of the institution with theatre programs, or inventive projects for students to learn through “hands-on” experience such as the class on Anacapa Island and the overall work load of faculty can be viewed as an increasingly significant issue.

If CSU Channel Islands is to maintain the same level of inventiveness and aggressively progressive curriculum development, the fundamental elements of the current culture must be protected. To us this means that Administration keeps close watch on the distribution of university and program work so that no one individual becomes overburdened with a range of responsibilities that will diminish the productive and professional development generated by members of this department. In a program of this size, each person represents an integral perspective in academic and pedagogical conversations because each person brings information from the various disciplinary genres in English Studies. The work English faculty perform in these discussions about student needs is an example of the kind of relationships that should be taking place on a larger scale across the university.

OTHER EVIDENCE WITH SOME SUGGESTIONS:

- The work of English faculty is integrated into the general work of different disciplines and departments at the university as evidenced in both interdisciplinary and team-taught courses. English faculty members are aggressively seeking contact with faculty from other disciplines in order to encourage inventiveness and progress. We encourage the administration to support curriculum-sharing exchanges with other programs, shared credits in other programs, and team teaching with other disciplines.
- English faculty members demonstrate a strong commitment to students and institutional needs, often subordinating their own intellectual agendas for such service. One example is how tenure track faculty share travel funds with part-time faculty so that part-time faculty can attend conferences, present papers, research, and scholarship. The English faculty is very committed to the continued integration of all teachers working in the English Program, so another example is

that teaching often involves extending beyond one's areas of expertise and committing significant time and effort to collaborate about content and teaching methods. This is an expected service to institutional/mission needs. The proposed MA will again create these opportunities/pressures. We suggest that faculty and administration keep an open line of communication on the benefits and constraints this kind of intellectual, personal, and professional selflessness can bring.

- English faculty members pool money out of their own pockets to provide awards and recognition for students in programs under the purview of English. This gesture is offered as a celebration, but we think it also has important recruitment and validation effects for students in English.
- We are impressed with the amount of scholarship and creative work generated by English faculty, especially in view of the fact that each person in the department is also developing and running some kind of program. The breadth of scholarship is impressive and, more specifically, we believe that the university may want to take advantage of the programmatic opportunities that attend the annual performing arts festival initiated by Bob Mayberry as a means of developing the Performing Arts program on campus.
- We are impressed with how many of the English faculty is doing important/essential university and CSU institutional work in addition to their regular teaching and research work. However, department members who run programs outside the English Program are asked to provide a level of management and scholarship that can run at cross purposes. We would like to see faculty heading up programs and centers used primarily as sources for scholarship, curriculum invention and development, as well as spokespersons for the academic benefits of their individual program agendas. Providing strategic, enhanced administrative support in the form of administrative assistants may help diminish the “managerial” or “program chair” responsibilities of the program and center leaders.
- We liked the Learning Outcomes Assessment Program headed up by Mary Adler. This work is representative of the way English faculty is in constant contact for collaboration, consultation, and assessment, and this work is unique in the sense that there is follow-up to assessment; faculty are thinking about the implications of their findings in relation to student progress and the university mission. Furthermore, this conversation seems to be part of the fabric of the department's relationship. Continued self evaluation within the context of the larger department mission, goals, and objectives is simply understood as professional behavior. The English program's assessment led to specific changes in individual classes and to the initiation of discussions about sequence and breadth of the curriculum. The time taken to organize, perform, and analyze such a project is considerable, and, given the multiple tasks many professors perform on campus, it is commendable that professors are finding the time and energy to continue self-assessment. Too often English departments are left to “protect” their own disciplinary needs, resulting in the kind of fragmented and boundary-restricted curriculum/pedagogy that prohibits collaborative and generative academic exploration in our field. If English Studies is to provide the kind of critical consciousness that fosters

national and international citizenship, then professors need to perform the kind of border-crossing thinking that is exhibited in the English Program at CSU Channel Islands. English Studies, and more specifically literary studies, is in decline across the nation, with the literature major shrinking. If professors are to revive literary studies as a socially, culturally and politically engaged subject area, professors must be encouraged to discuss the significance of their field, at the least, within their own department. This kind of behavior should be supported as an essential function of a program, and professors who contribute to this work should receive support for maintaining the kind of analytical and collaborative decision-making performed by English faculty at CSUCI.

PROGRAM CURRICULUM

We are impressed with the breadth of courses offered and the way they give concrete expression to the university mission statement. The great diversity of texts offered and focal points of inquiry are truly noteworthy. Furthermore, we think the scaffolding around each option provides focus and direction while at the same time allowing room for students to accommodate cross-disciplinary interests by taking courses in different disciplines within English Studies. The flexibility of the English major is consistent with the English Program's interest in providing students opportunities for a "wide range of career choices" as well as developing a deeply contextualized understanding of a wide range of literacy practices and their attending cultural significance.

Thus we read the program's course offerings as a demonstration of the faculty's commitment to the mission of the university as it contributes to the success of students in academic and public communities. Consequently, through the development of curriculum, the program is able to participate in wider campus matters—such as curriculum articulation, assessment methods, self-assessment methods—as a vehicle for programmatic and professional development. Many of the program members are leaders on campus for work that defines the culture and tone of the university and the courses offered in English are representative of the faculty's interdisciplinary and collaborative interests.

EVIDENCE:

- Students like the intimacy of classes, with easy access to faculty, and resources: One student reported, "It is like getting a first class education at a small, private college at the cost of a public education."
- The core of the English degree is comprised of an abundance of literary courses that establish a canon of study against which many offerings may enter into conversation. We like the focus on a canon of texts, but we also like the way that "other" courses possess the potential for cross-talk, the kind of interdisciplinary, or multi-discursive perspectives that the university values in its education.

Some Concerns:

A close reading of syllabi for the English Program reveals some potential weaknesses in the application or authenticity of interdisciplinary thinking. Some of the syllabi do not make much mention of interdisciplinarity in their outcome statements, or provide much access to interdisciplinary information in course readings. Thus there seems to be some inconsistency in the representation and application of interdisciplinary thinking as it provides a theoretical and conceptual framework for English courses. It might be a good idea for the department to review syllabi, share ideas about how interdisciplinarity finds expression in courses, and develop outcome statements that represent—for students and teachers—the role interdisciplinarity plays in class. These could then be articulated in each syllabus for the program.

Furthermore, given the English Program's focus on active learning and learning in social, cultural, and historical contexts, it seems that many syllabi focus on teaching literature as a body of information, as a series of readings that are not necessarily in conversation with one another or with disciplinary discourses outside English Studies. While this may not be the intent and the in-class exchanges may help provide connections, the syllabi show many assignments that call for analysis of literary texts that seem to emphasize a formalist approach to identifying literary traits or studying authors and historical contexts, and this is perfectly acceptable. However, we hope that this also includes engaging students in situations where they are asked to make decisions about the information they have gathered as it takes part in a larger academic or civic conversation. Faculty might benefit from reading Arthur Applebee's *Curriculum as Conversation: Transforming Traditions of Teaching and Learning*. Given the program's commitment to interdisciplinary and collaborative approaches to teaching, and given the intellectual orientation to learning as problem-solving or decision-making, faculty may find discussions of this text useful when reviewing course syllabi for alignment with the University's mission statement. In fact, it would be good if the Administration provided this text for wide dissemination on campus.

Finally, Mary Adler's Learning Outcomes Assessment project noted that students were not fully engaged in interdisciplinary work in their classes, nor did students fully recognize the significance of interdisciplinarity in their education. English faculty said in our interviews, "We are on it!" And we would like to underscore that sentiment. If students are to understand interdisciplinarity as a conceptual, ideological, and theoretical framework for study, they need to be taught about interdisciplinarity earlier in their progress toward graduation. Learning about it is best accomplished when it is seen as a response to earlier constructions of disciplinarity, knowledge, education, learning, and discursive identity. If students are to appreciate the significance of an interdisciplinary approach, they need historical and theoretical instruction.

We suggest for consideration an introductory course as early as the sophomore year. Perhaps the class would establish a broad context for understanding theory as scholarly behavior inextricably tied to practice. Additionally, we think this class should introduce students to the basic agendas of theoretical movements as they influence educational, social, and cultural practices, not just literary practices. Within this context, we feel that a conversation about interdisciplinarity can begin, and students educated in the basic assumptions and vocabulary of interdisciplinarity may be able to apply the

concept to conversations about subject matter in individual classes. Perhaps this could be conceived as a GER course that would cut across the various programs on campus, and could perhaps operate as a second-year course with an intense focus on written articulation of core concepts and applications.

COMPOSITION PROGRAM

We appreciate the way the comp program is working. The program's promotion of collaboration and "team" work organize individual and group behavior by providing a thick context for understanding the relationship between students and content, methods and outcomes, pedagogical practices and program performance. As a result of this collaborative spirit, we believe the relationship among composition faculty members establishes a literacy culture that permeates the classroom, providing a tangible context for collaborative, cultural, rhetorical, and individual relations between students and the academic conversations they are entering.

We believe that the rhetorical and pedagogical power of Directed Self Placement has initiated a hallmark change in the way writing instruction, assessment, placement, and pedagogy may be perceived throughout the CSU. The work Bob Mayberry has done researching the concept and then delivering a system that supports guided self-assessment is being referenced and imitated on at least two other CSU campuses. This program is "unique" and successful. Dr. Mayberry's report convincingly reveals not just student satisfaction with placements, but successful matriculation through University curriculum.

We do not want to overstate this, but the fact that so many students are satisfied with their placement and the teaching they have received in their classes is unique in almost all university First Year Writing programs. One of the most important benefits of DSP is the fact that all students in your program feel like they belong here. That may sound a bit soft in the context of traditional university education rhetoric, but research shows that students who feel like they belong here are better motivated and, consequently, graduate at a higher rate. The elimination of a remedial track, as well as the devaluation of the EPT as a placement mechanism, and the subsequent valuation of students' sense of their literacy competency, minimizes the effects of a deficit rhetoric when it comes to sending messages to students about who they are, how they should learn, and why they are here. This program, with its emphasis on direct instruction, collaboration, peer evaluation, self-assessment, cultural and rhetorical composition theory, and community represents the future of writing studies in the university. CSU Channel Islands administration and faculty should be very proud of what they have built here, and, every chance you get, you should promote this program as a democratic and rigorous approach to academic literacy.

EVIDENCE:

- All comp faculty meet twice a week to exchange ideas, get a pulse for the classroom, the curriculum, individual iterations of work. This collaborative spirit is fostering a strong community of invested tenure track and part time faculty, an uncommon relationship in the CSU.
- We like the way that the comp program provides oversight and focus through a common syllabus, but allows for flexibility and teacher inventiveness through

writing assignments and reading selection. This allows for a wider range of courses to take advantage of the interdisciplinary focus of the campus.

- We find that the service learning classes in FYW are well articulated and function well within the spirit of interdisciplinarity and service learning outlined in the University mission statement.
- Assessment in FYW is well articulated, transparent, public, and well documented. The process has become part of the pedagogy rather than a separate, autonomous, and uncontextualized act of arbitrary information gathering. The portfolio assessment allows teachers and students to perform formative assessment, making use of the information and experiences of the classroom as contexts for understanding learning in First Year Writing. Those assessments become the site of conversations between students and teachers—in a collaborative moment of generalizing about learning—that provide information for personal and programmatic review. In this sense, portfolio is used effectively to provide a space for students to make contextualized decisions about their literacy competence as they function within the framework of the universities' mission goals. That link is made explicit through portfolio assessment. This seems to be a very efficient assessment program.

THE MASTERS PROGRAM

We have reviewed a variety of supporting documents about the Masters Program, which has been approved at the campus level. The implementation of it has been postponed, and we are fully sympathetic with the decision to defer for the time being, given the budgetary constraints all higher education is facing. However, the real question is this: will the costs of implementation provide benefits that offset? We would argue, yes, particularly at this moment in the university's evolution.

A graduate degree program inherently moves the level of discourse and rigor of academic achievement (for faculty and students alike) to a higher level. It also reflects well on the university and, in this case, the English Program. This helps in the recruitment of students, of course, but also faculty. As the latter comment suggests, faculty are drawn to departments and programs that have a graduate program; it also suggests that those faculty members in programs that create graduate programs often feel the benefits. In other words, it validates one's ability to conduct research and teach in ways not always apparent at an undergraduate institution.

Moreover, the infusion of students dedicated to advanced degrees can have a profound ripple effect throughout an institution. In our discussions with program faculty, it became apparent that graduate students would change the culture of the community in very positive ways: as mentors/role models for undergraduates and as ambassadors for the program across campus. In brief, CSUCI would evolve with the implementation, be better situated for future growth, and provide an avenue of potential for students who would never have thought of themselves as possessing the abilities to succeed in academics.

RELATED RESOURCES

WRITING CENTER

We found the Writing Center to be a comfortable space, well planned, and easily accessible to students and faculty. We particularly liked the way the Writing Center is student-centered, run by an expert and staffed by students trained in writing pedagogy and methods. We also found the center's support for in-class writing instruction commendable, though we would like to see time and support for tutors to learn more about teaching strategies for invention, revision, editing, planning, and reading so they would be able to run mini-lessons in the class. We think the university could make more efficient use of tutors in class if the Writing Center Director had more support for training tutors in specific methods/strategies for reading and writing in the academy. Training tutors to present literacy strategies in the classroom seems like a very efficient use of Writing Center resources and expertise. Too often writing centers become curricular islands that students travel to only for a quick "fix" of some literacy problem. It seems like the Writing Center could play a more central role in the education of students and faculty about literacy practices, and this would have multiple layers of benefits across campus.

We also question the fact that the university has grown over 50% since its inception, but there has never been a budget increase for the Writing Center. This may be partially a result of the current administrative alignment of the Writing Center with Advising Services and thus the way the Director of the Writing Center accesses University support. Currently, the Director must work through the Advising Center to get approval for programs, expenditures, and changes. The Advising Center's focus is more institutional than pedagogical, and frequently questions asked by the Director are not recognized for their significance. It would be much more effective and efficient if the Writing Center Director were to report directly to the Provost. This relationship would also send an important message to the university community about the importance of writing to the achievement of its goals. Furthermore, linking the Writing Center to the Provost's office would make the Writing Center a university space, as opposed to an English space, encouraging the notion that the use of writing is a university-wide responsibility/opportunity.

We also like the drop-in quality of the Writing Center. Each time we visited it, students were working closely with tutors.

We appreciate the pedagogical approach of the Writing Center as it puts the work of rethinking a paper on the student, with the tutor functioning as a kind of guide to the thinking, revision, rewriting process.

EVIDENCE:

- We commend the Writing Center for constantly polling students on the benefits of work at the Writing Center, and revising structure or work in response to student needs.
- We commend the university for hiring a writing expert to run the Writing Center.
- We like the way the Writing Center is working to support FYW by providing information for students about the portfolio process.

- We like the integration between the Writing Center and FYW pedagogies: well articulated and maintained by the Comp Director and Writing Center Director's professional and collegial relationship.

FACILITIES

Given the nature of the physical constraints of remodeling older buildings, we recognize that the campus is a "work in progress." However, we also concur with the program's self-evaluation. Classrooms are small and crowded. This complicates many things, including the ability to team-teach across disciplines. One such course we visited had a great deal of difficulty simply reorganizing students into small groups for close discussion, and when a large fan was turned on to help air flow, the discussion suffered.

While we have no recommendations for this issue, we do encourage innovative thinking about classroom allocations, and this may lead to our earlier recommendation for enhanced efforts to encourage cross-disciplinary team teaching. This may help maintain the very productive student-faculty ratio while making efficient use of the larger classrooms.

Hopefully, as the campus evolves, priority will be given to classrooms.

CONCLUSIONS, CONCERNS AND FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

The English: Literature, Writing and Culture Program has much to recommend it, from its highly dedicated and active faculty, to its forward-looking curriculum and culture of self-reflection, collaboration, and innovation. However, the program operates in a unique environment: a "new" university that is growing rapidly and will continue to grow dramatically over the next ten years. This actuality generates great energy and potential, but also problems that are not those faced by "established" universities. Add to this the truly inspired direction of the university with its focus on new structures for how universities operate and its interdisciplinary nature, and the potential is multiplied, along with the need to put into place—to institutionalize—frameworks, policies and procedures that can be built upon productively as it grows.

As we formulated our recommendations for the English Program in the specific areas above, we also recognized the need to comment upon some elements of the environment in which the program operates.

- We wonder if all faculty members across the campus have a fully shared understanding of interdisciplinarity. There seems to be evidence that the concept and the value of interdisciplinarity is unevenly received across campus; however, it seems fully realized by members of the English Program. There doesn't seem to be ongoing space or provision for these kinds of issues to be worked out at a university level. There seems to be a need for a recurring conversation among faculty that both supports and explains interdisciplinarity. This contributes to an on-going drain upon human resources, as faculty members reiterate this benefit in

a venue after venues. This does not seem to be an efficient use of resources, since the university's mission statement should be the foundation of all programs.

- This problem seems also to be related to an uncertainty about the role of the various centers on campus, whether they are to promote more professional development in their orientation, or work to provide pedagogical and curricular support, or whether they are more institutional in their function, with directors working to outline university standards, meet legal and institutional guidelines, or simply manage the day-to-day bureaucracy of the center. It seems that the expertise of each director gets lost in the management demands of the centers.
- There is a need to continue enhance and support team teaching on campus. Too much is left to individuals to form classes through informal and unsupported meetings. This ad hoc approach diminishes motivation and innovation. Faculty need to be given time to work on inventing and developing new classes. This kind of collaboration speaks to the core of the university's mission, and diminishing attention to this aspect of University culture could lead to the disintegration of important interdisciplinary discussions.
- We found a general lack of oversight and investment in writing instruction on campus due to the absence of a central location for writing across the curriculum. Many professors are anxious about including writing in their courses simply because they remain untrained in the basics of writing pedagogy. A series of workshops could be good, but it is the reviewers' opinion that the University already has a team teaching ethos in place and could easily take advantage of that expectation to join experienced and less experienced faculty in classes with the primary purpose of exchanging ideas, methods, and assumptions about the use of writing as a tool for learning, not just a means of reflecting information or demonstrating comprehension.
- We recommend that you implement the English Masters Degree Program, which may work to good effect upon some of the concerns we have expressed.
- We found that the Program Chair is doing an amazing job of managing two departments, English and Theatre/Performing Arts. But we think this should be the work of two people. As the English Program grows, this position will require further support. Given the unique qualities of the program—its interconnectedness throughout the university, its evolving nature, its impending Masters Program, its highly active faculty—the chair needs more help and this means more staff. This includes additional support for the current support coordinator, but also a means of accommodating the myriad duties associated with scheduling, faculty mentoring, community outreach, and curricular development. Given the fact that the team heard several times about the frustration involved with resource limitations, which often means highly engaged faculty expend time and energy on innovative projects that ultimately either lose momentum or are not supported financially and thus do not reach implementation or else are implemented but not sustained, the development of an associate chair position might be advisable. This person could provide support within the program by working with the chair to fulfill the usual functions of program management, but also to enable faculty to develop new courses and initiatives and perhaps to seek funding.

This takes us back to the strengths of the English Program: its faculty and the culture it has generated. These are the strengths that mark CSUCI overall. To put it bluntly, the university's "brand" is crucial. Our review considered what it is that makes the university exceptional, and the report describes that for the English Program but also the campus. This is what will bring students into the program and to campus, but given the projected diminishment in numbers of potential students in higher education over the next ten years, the question becomes: why CSUCI and not elsewhere? The innovative nature of the curriculum is the answer, and an exerted outreach to students from underrepresented communities will both help the university to continue to grow; both of these initiatives are at the heart of the English Program's mission and its faculty values.

In conclusion, some strategic investments in the English Program at this point in time will have a tremendous impact upon the university's ability to achieve its mission and grow. Some of this investment may be in direct funds to support faculty research and curricular development—through course releases and/or grants—and some of it may be a renewed investment in dedicated space and staffing. It may mean a reconfiguration of the use of the "centers" as sites for collective inspiration and/or enhanced capabilities for team-teaching and collaborative development of curricula. The potential certainly exists, and we saw it in abundance in the English Program. With a new Provost, who has embarked upon an open forum about the budget and allocation priorities, this is an even more exciting moment of potential.

We hope this report offers some insights that will help the English Program and institution to evolve in productive ways.