

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT 2009 ACADEMIC PLAN

I. Introduction

English Departments have existed for approximately one hundred years, having evolved from the Rhetoric and Philology Departments of the 19th century. With the founding of the Modern Language Association in the early 20th century, English achieved the status of an independent academic discipline, and for a time many departments defined themselves narrowly as programs of literary study--jettisoning rhetoric, communication, speech, and composition. Toward the middle of the century, English Departments focused on the evaluation of literary texts, assuming that their primary aim was to help students learn to identify meanings in, and appreciate the value of, belletristic work. More recently, the narrow preoccupation with canonical literature ("high culture") has shifted to an increased concern for the significance of language in the making of culture in general. In addition, as social pressure has mounted to prepare students as writers and readers, able to contribute responsibly to public discourse, English Departments have returned to the traditional responsibilities of rhetorical education, specifically the obligation to prepare literate citizens, equally knowledgeable about literary heritage, the highest achievement of language, and about the purposes and strategies of writing, reading, and critical reasoning as essential practices of modern life.

UNC Charlotte's English faculty members have kept abreast of the recent work in literary, rhetorical, linguistic, and cultural theory, preferring not to emphasize one area of the discipline to the exclusion of others. Historically, the Department has maintained a strong conceptual as well as practical commitment to literary study, English composition, technical writing, English as a second language, and the preparation of teachers. At present, the Department includes the following fields or sub-disciplines: creative writing, language studies and linguistics, literary theory, literature, and rhetoric and writing.

STRENGTHS

The Department is committed to excellence in teaching and continues to make teaching its top priority even as it enhances its reputation for scholarly productivity and institutional service. Six faculty have won NationsBank (Bank of America) recognition for their teaching and one holds the title of Bonnie E. Cone Distinguished Professor of Teaching. In 1996 the entire Department was honored for its success in the classroom. Several faculty have made significant scholarly contributions in the area of pedagogy as well.

The Department's national reputation is particularly strong in literacy studies, pedagogy, and children's literature. In the development of future programs, the Department will build on these strengths. Literacy studies encompass linguistics, rhetoric and composition, technical writing, and creative writing. Although these areas differ in important ways, all share a common goal: helping students learn how to use written language, in various genres and through various technologies, to create meaning and communicate to particular readers in given contexts. Hence, pedagogy is also an important dimension of literacy work. The rhetoric/composition

faculty enjoys a national reputation and is competitive with faculty in the best doctoral/research institutions in the country.

For many years children's literature was taught in Education colleges, where it was often exclusively a methods course. Little attention was given to the literary qualities of these texts and literary theory was not a large part of the instruction. UNC Charlotte was one of the first universities in which an English Department offered students the opportunity to study children's literature as literature. During the last fifteen years, this Department has fashioned a team of children's literature specialists that rivals that of any department in the country.

II. Process of Developing the 2009 Plan

In the winter of 2002, the Chair met with the Department's Advisory Committee to discuss principles governing the development of the 2009 Plan. A consensus was reached that the new Plan would reiterate the central themes of the 2007 Plan, reflect the Department's progress toward the assessment goals and objectives that were set out there, and identify a series of "stretch goals" for the foreseeable future. The Committee met periodically to discuss the Plan and invited input from faculty. The revised Plan was presented to the entire faculty for discussion on March 13 and approved forthwith.

III. Assumptions

The goals and actions presented in the Departmental plan derive from assumptions outlined by the Provost (Environment for the Academic Planning Process) and seek to achieve institutional goals contained in the **Campus Academic Plan**. Assumptions that are particularly relevant to the Department's planning are the following:

1. *UNCC will maintain its focus on excellence in undergraduate education while also working toward Doctoral/Research—Extensive status (#1,#4,#7).*
2. *State resources will continue to decline while demands to serve students, assess performance, and demonstrate productivity will continue to increase (#2,#3,#8).*
3. *New academic programming will take place in a competitive planning environment and will emphasize pragmatic responses to the needs of the Charlotte metropolitan region (#1,#6,#10,#11).*
4. *Funded research will become an increasingly more critical component of the campus's mission as a doctoral/research university; it will be interdisciplinary and applied in character, with an orientation toward economic development in the region (#12, #, #).*
5. *The population of the region continues to diversify while political support for historic responses to that diversity, including 'affirmative action,' continues to decline, so that the campus will be challenged to identify new strategies to enhance diversity and insure the success of underrepresented groups within the*

- student body and the faculty (#1, #9)*
6. *Electronic technologies will increasingly affect teaching and learning (#14).*

IV. Mission/Vision

The English Department's Mission Statement, revised and approved in April, 1995, is as follows:

The Department of English regards as its mission the cultivation of excellence in its three complementary disciplines of writing, linguistics, and literature. The department fulfills its mission through a wide variety of multicultural, gender-inclusive programs and individual or group initiatives in English studies delivered both on and off the University campus.

Based on this concept of complementarity, the department is an interactive, mutually supportive community of professionals who study and teach the areas of English Studies whether in the classroom, in their scholarly or creative writing and presentations, or in their service to the University and to the larger metropolitan region. In addition to providing a sound education for majors and graduate students, English faculty serve the needs of UNC Charlotte students by offering (1) a campus-wide English composition program; (2) a large number of writing-intensive courses; (3) courses dedicated to General Education; (4) interdisciplinary courses and programs; and (5) academic minors for students majoring in other disciplines. Beyond the campus, English faculty continue to develop partnerships with business and industry and with local and regional school systems, providing (1) consulting services, (2) in-service support of teachers; (3) interns; (4) faculty presentations; (6) joint research and public projects.

V. Stretch Goals and Objectives.

Goal 1. The Department will seek ways to manage enrollment, both in its own programs and in the General Education writing requirement, as the University progresses to a target population of 25,000 students. (University Goal 1)

Discussion The Rhetoric and Writing Committee has been discussing alternative strategies for accommodating increased student demand for English 1101, 1102, and 1103, recognizing that institutional plans to expand enrollment in coming years will have a dramatic impact on the Department's capacity to offer responsive instruction in support of the University's writing requirement. Alternatives, some still active and others discarded, have included:

(1) Increase the number of English 1103 sections in order to accelerate qualified students through a three-credit rather than six-credit requirement. (The advantage is reduced demand for a second writing course, but one limitation will be the competence of incoming students. If new enrollments imply a weakening of SAT scores and other early benchmarks of college performance, this option will become problematic.)

(2) Include additional sections of 1101 and 1102 in the summer offering so that currently available instructional resources can be stretched to manage increased student load. (The advantage is fuller use of the current cadre of faculty, but the disadvantage is an increase in the pace of instruction during the shorter summer sessions. Only students with acceptable competence as writers can take advantage of a summer option.)

(3) Tie some 1000-level composition classes to work in disciplines outside English in order to take advantage of non-English, typically part-time faculty who are nonetheless experienced writing teachers in their own fields. (The advantage is a further stretching of available resources, where they exist, but the disadvantage can be a relaxation of quality control unless part-time faculty from other disciplines who intend to teach in the program are obliged to share in the extensive preparation and evaluation that English faculty currently undergo.)

(4) Encourage students to complete the writing requirement at other institutions offering comparable courses. (The advantage is a reduction of demand on our sections but the disadvantage is a loss of quality control.)

(5) Increase the number of lecturers proportionate to the increase in student load. (The advantage of more reliable coverage is offset by potentially dramatic increases in cost.)

(6) Shift more of the burden of writing instruction to full-time, tenure-track faculty. (For all the philosophical attractiveness of making senior faculty responsible for entry-level instruction, two facts stand out: we would lose important flexibility in staffing other programs in the Department and we would only modestly affect coverage in a writing program that offers over 100 sections every semester.)

The Department has also been examining ways of managing enrollment increases in its undergraduate programs and its service offerings outside the major. During fall, 1999, for the first time, three courses at the 2000-level were designed to accommodate enrollments of between 80 and 120 students, one in children's literature in response to broad demand for classes in that area, along with one in fantasy literature and one on Shakespeare in the movies, both offered for L credit. Together the three classes generated more than 900 student credit hours. In the spring semester, 2000, another large enrollment film course drew more than one hundred students, also for general education credit. Since then, additional courses have been added. The Department is now reviewing the available research literature on teaching large classes and discussing effective ways to introduce active learning so as to maintain the level of quality that we expect from any English course.

Objective 1 Create a two-year window for completing the English 1102 requirement in order to take advantage of a normal first-year student attrition rate of 15 to 20% that appears to be unrelated to academic programming. Estimated savings: 400 seats (16 sections) of 1102 at current enrollment levels. The Department recognizes that not all students and not all programs will prefer to postpone English 1102 to the second year. For that reason, we will introduce the change gradually over the next two to three years and remain responsive to programs that cannot accommodate the adjustment.

Actions

1. In AY 2002-3 the Writing and Rhetoric Committee will conduct research into national norms of student attrition, as well as UNCC historical norms, in order to be certain that the causes are unrelated to curricular planning in general or the completion of a two-semester writing requirement in particular.
2. During the same period, the Committee, working with the Director of Writing, will modestly reduce the number of sections of 1102 available during spring, 2003 (est: 6 sections) and plan to increase by the same number the sections of 1102 available in fall, 2003 and spring, 2004.
3. The Department will continue to move as many students as possible toward a two-year completion schedule by controlling the availability of sections during each of the next two academic years (through spring, 2006). However, no student whose major requires the completion of the writing requirement during the first year will be denied admission.

Objective 2 Continue to expand the number of sections of English 1103, and therefore the number of students whose incoming competence makes them eligible for a single semester of introductory writing.

Actions

1. The Writing and Rhetoric Committee will monitor each year the success of students completing English 1103, in particular the failure rate in the course and the achievement of 1103 students in their overall programs of study.
2. If data remain positive regarding the value of our current indicators for successful placement into English 1103 (including class standing, SAT scores, AP results, and other measures) the Director of Writing will seek, as student population increases, to maintain the same proportion of 1103 seats that exists at current enrollment levels.
3. The Writing and Rhetoric Committee will experiment with the adjustment of current indicators and with additional measures, year by year, in order to maximize 1103 placement as population grows to 25,000.

Objective 3 Continue to assess the advantages of other options listed above, in particular #3 and #5, and implement those that appear most feasible.

Actions

1. The Department annual report will document steps taken and success achieved each year in addressing enrollment increases. The measure of overall success in meeting enrollment demands will be a curve of cost increase that is shallower than the curve in population change.

Objective 4 Introduce additional general or survey courses into the English major and other offerings in order to maximize enrollment and create more interchangeability among faculty.

Actions

1. The Department will conduct yearly reviews of the success of its undergraduate curricula with a view toward determining where conjunctions of student interest, student need, and faculty expertise make possible the scheduling of large enrollment courses.
2. In developing the curriculum, the Undergraduate Committee will prefer new courses that can be taught by several faculty over new courses tailored to specific faculty.

Objective 5 Create salary inducements to encourage tenure-line faculty to teach an additional course or to increase enrollment in courses.

Actions

1. During spring of 2002, the Advisory Committee will evaluate the feasibility of salary increments tied to total enrollment and make a recommendation to the Department.
2. Assuming a favorable decision, the Salary Review Committee, during spring, 2003, will develop a protocol for evaluating individual cases for increment based on overall course enrollment and make appropriate recommendations to the Chair. Beginning in spring, 2003, and thereafter, individual salaries may be affected by a willingness to teach increased numbers of students.

Goal 2. The Department will continue to cooperate with the College of Education in pursuing a doctorate in curriculum and instruction. (University Goals 1,2,3, and 7; Development Theme D)

Discussion The English Department remains committed to the education of teachers and to issues of literacy. Members of this department have considerable experience in public school teaching, and significant publications dealing with pedagogy, language, and literacy. The

College of Education has expressed interest in working with English, among other disciplines in Arts and Sciences, in developing a joint degree that would reach a broad audience in the Charlotte region, including school teachers and administrators along with students interested in two- or four-year college teaching. The English Department is very pleased to be included in the proposal and is eager to support efforts to develop a C&I degree. The Department also stands ready to pursue the many opportunities for sponsored funding that federal and state agencies are making available in the areas of literacy, pedagogy, and curriculum.

Objective 1 The English Department will work with the College of Education to meet the protocols and deadlines in the University planning cycle that will lead to implementation of the degree.

Goal 3. The Department will pursue two new undergraduate minors, one in writing, the other in children's literature and literacy (University Goals 1, 3, and 7; Development Themes A, D)

Discussion (1) Currently, there is no minor at UNC Charlotte for students who want to focus on non-professional writing. The proposed minor would enable students to practice creative, personal, expository, and persuasive writing. It would also encourage students to analyze the writing process itself and their own individual writing processes. (2) A minor in children's literature and literacy would extend the Department's collaboration with the College of Education and would support education students as well as English ed majors interested in the development of reading ability through classroom use of children's and young adult literary texts.

Objective 1 Reach Departmental consensus about the advisability of either or both of these proposed undergraduate minors by spring of 2003.

Actions

1. During AY 2002-3, the Planning and Assessment Committee, Undergraduate Committee, and Writing and Rhetoric Committee will renew a long-standing conversation about the merits and feasibility of a writing minor, and inaugurate a similar discussion about a children's lit/literacy minor, making recommendations to the Chair by the end of the academic year.

Objective 2 Implement one or both of these minors by fall, 2004.

Actions

1. During fall of 2003, the Undergraduate Committee will develop the requirements for

one or both of these minors and submit them to the Department for approval.

2. Before spring of 2004, the Department will submit successful proposals to governance for implementation in fall, 2004.

Goal 4. The Department will seek to establish a Research or Public Service Center for Applied Linguistics and Community Literacy in order to expand its public outreach as well as its efforts to attract external funding. (University Goals 1,2,3, and 4; Development Themes B, C, D, and F)

Discussion This Center offers the possibility of tying together several strands of Departmental research, including ESL, literacy studies, curriculum design/review, the teaching of reading and writing, inservice work in schools, technical and professional writing, children's literature, and creative writing, in order to develop broad-based proposals for community service and stimulate external funding. As a corollary to this research and outreach, the Center would also seek to sponsor a usability testing service to attract contracts from business and industry for evaluating instructions related to software products under development. Since the College of Education has plans to pursue a Center in reading and developmental education, the Department will explore the possibility of joining COE in a combined venture.

Objective 1 Reach Departmental consensus about the feasibility of a Linguistics/Literacy Center by spring of 2003.

Actions

1. During fall, 2002, advocates of the Center will explore University and Central Administration guidelines regarding the development of centers, write a proposal outlining the scope of CALCL activities, identify the appropriate designation of the Center (as research or public service), elaborate plans for the pursuit of sponsored funding, and submit the proposal to the Planning and Assessment Committee. At the same time, the Chair will meet with representatives from COE to determine their interest in a joint Center.
3. During AY 2002-3, the Planning and Assessment Committee will evaluate the merits and feasibility of the Center, making a recommendation to the Chair by the end of the academic year.

Objective 2 Seek authorization to plan the Center.

Actions

1. By the conclusion of AY 2002-3, the Department will forward a request for authorization to the appropriate University offices.

Objective 3 Meet yearly benchmarks for a progressive increase in external sponsored funding under auspices of the Center.

Actions

1. During AY 2003-4, the Center will identify specific yearly goals for increased grant activity relevant to the operations of the Center, identifying benchmarks both in total dollars requested and in the success of proposals through the review levels of federal and state agencies.
2. Beginning in AY 2003-4, the Center will promote grant-writing and inaugurate funded research activities enabled by the success of its proposals.

Goal 5. The Department will seek authorization to plan a new degree program leading to the MFA in creative writing (University Goals 1, 6 and 7; Development Themes A and B)

Discussion There is no program on this campus that satisfies increasing student and community interest in the writing of fiction, poetry, screenplays, literature for children, and dramatic literature for publication or performance. Queens College has just inaugurated such a program, and similar programs exist on other UNC campuses in the region. The Charlotte area has a population more than large enough to provide the demand necessary to support an MFA. By seeking to meet that demand, the University strengthens its presence in and support of the community. A strong first indicator both of the demand and the potential for enhanced local involvement is the recent successful negotiation between the English Department and the Public Library of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County to sponsor jointly a writer of children's literature who would provide creative writing courses on campus as well as literary programs for the Library.

Objective 1 Reach Departmental consensus about the feasibility of an MFA by spring of 2003.

Actions

1. During AY 2002-3, the Planning and Assessment Committee will explore University and Central Administration guidelines regarding the process of requesting permission to plan a program, gather data justifying the new program, and submit documentation to the Chair.

Objective 2 Seek authorization to plan the Center.

Actions

1. By the conclusion of AY 2003-4, the Department will forward a request for authorization to the appropriate University offices.

VI. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

The English Department presently has in place, and continues to develop, procedures for evaluating (1) the analytic writing and interpretive reading abilities of English majors; (2) the oral competence and computer literacy of majors; (3) the preparation of English education majors to teach in the secondary schools; and (3) the professional competence of Master's students.

EVALUATING THE WRITING AND READING ABILITIES OF ENGLISH MAJORS

Objective 1 Students will demonstrate competence in writing appropriate to the standards and requirements of public and professional written communication.

Actions

Assessment Procedure Senior English majors submit examples of their writing which are holistically evaluated by members of the English faculty by reference to broadly accepted criteria of successful writing, including focus, organization, audience awareness, technical control, and other features.

Administration of Assessment Procedure The Department's Committee on Assessment and Planning oversees faculty evaluation of a random sample of the writing and compares it to the baseline first established in two analyses conducted in 1996-7 and 1997-8. The baseline was established by obtaining a paper from every senior English major, 57 papers in the first year and 68 in the second. Faculty then met to discuss the writing, frame reliable criteria by which to judge it, and develop inter-rater reliability. The results in each year were as follows:

	Acceptable	Unacceptable
1996/97	49 85.9%	8 14.1%
1997/98	60	8

88%

12%

Faculty then analyzed the 16 essays that had been judged unacceptable in both of the previous assessments, with the aim of determining what problems in writing these papers revealed. The committee compared their analyses and arrived at a list of problems. They found the following commonalities among English students having difficulty with their writing:

1. Focus/organization/audience
2. Reading/interpreting/using sources
3. Sentence sophistication/effective use of voice
4. Mechanics/correctness

Use of Assessment Findings The baseline assessment report has been shared with faculty to make them aware of the particular limitations that some of our students have shown in their work. Subsequent evaluations of writing samples are the responsibility of the Assessment and Planning Committee and the results are presented to the Department as a guide to evaluating courses, the effectiveness of instruction, and the need for curricular change. The next scheduled evaluation is spring, 2000, results of which will be presented in the Department Annual Report. Evaluation will occur according to a two-year cycle henceforward.

Objective 2 Students will demonstrate competence in analytic and interpretive reading at a level necessary for the comprehension of public and professional written communication.

Actions

Assessment Procedure Senior English majors submit recent writing assignments that have required them to respond analytically and/or interpretively to course readings. The work is evaluated by members of the English faculty according to broadly accepted criteria of successful reading, including the ability to paraphrase, identify speaker and intended audience, identify thematic emphases, recognize organizational pattern, draw reasonable inferences, appraise general significance, analyze rhetorical and stylistic effects, and relate a text to historical, generic, or other contexts.

Administration of Assessment Procedure The Department's Committee on Assessment and Planning oversees faculty evaluation of a random sample of student responses and compares it to the baseline first established in the analysis conducted in spring, 2000. The 2000 baseline was established in a series of steps: first, faculty themselves met to read sample texts and discuss the competences necessary for adequate understanding; then the Assessment and Planning Committee correlated faculty responses and derived reasonable criteria for acceptable performance; student responses to an assigned text were then gathered and evaluated according to the criteria. Faculty then analyzed the responses that had been judged unacceptable in order to determine what reading problems they revealed.

Use of Assessment Findings The baseline assessment report has been shared with faculty to make them aware of the particular limitations that some of our students show in their work. Subsequent evaluations of reading competence are the responsibility of the Assessment and Planning Committee and the results are presented to the Department as a guide to evaluating courses, the effectiveness of instruction, and the need for curricular change. The next scheduled evaluation is spring, 2002, results of which will be presented in the Department Annual Report. Evaluation will occur according to a two-year cycle henceforward.

EVALUATING THE ORAL COMPETENCE AND COMPUTER LITERACY OF ENGLISH MAJORS

Objective 1 Students in the English major will demonstrate competence in oral presentation and an ability to express themselves effectively in public discourse.

Actions

Assessment Procedure All English majors must successfully complete Communication 1101, Introductory Speech, or an equivalent, which includes instruction and assignments related to the theory and practice of public speaking and specific opportunities to construct and deliver speeches. In addition, oral presentation is part of many English courses.

Administration of Assessment Procedure Students are evaluated on their oral performance by course instructors according to evaluative criteria established in the Department of Communication Studies.

Use of Assessment Findings Students may not complete the English major until they have demonstrated competence in public speaking. If oral competence is deficient according to the findings of faculty in English courses, appropriate curricular discussions between English and Communication Studies will take place.

Objective 2 Students in the English major will demonstrate competence in the use of computing technology as it relates to the demands of communication, in particular wordprocessing, electronic mail, and internet research.

Actions

Assessment Procedure All students in English 3100, a required core course, will demonstrate, through the completion of class assignments, computer expertise appropriate for an undergraduate English major. Each student's faculty advisor will certify that competence has been achieved and record that judgment on a checksheet in the student's Departmental record.

Administration of Assessment Procedure Course assignments in English 3100 will insure that all students in the major receive opportunities to practice wordprocessing, communicating by

electronic mail, and WEB-based research.

Use of Assessment Findings Where deficiencies exist in student computing performance, instructors in English 3100 will take appropriate steps to eliminate them.

EVALUATING ENGLISH EDUCATION MAJORS

Objective 1 Students will possess the knowledge and skills required by the State of North Carolina to teach in the public secondary schools by surpassing the minimum scores required on the ETS PRAXIS examinations.

Actions

Assessment Procedures All students seeking secondary licensure report on scheduled testing dates to area centers where the PRAXIS examinations are administered according to procedures identified by the Educational Testing Service. North Carolina mandates three exams under the heading, □English Language, Literature, and Composition.□ The first is “Content Knowledge”; the second is “Essay Writing;” and the third is “Pedagogy.”

Administration of Assessment Procedures The protocols governing PRAXIS exams are established by ETS, and the exams are proctored by local officials outside the University.

Use of Assessment Findings Student performance on PRAXIS exams is now integrated

EVALUATING MASTER□S STUDENTS

Objective 1 Students will have knowledge of the content of their chosen fields--literature, rhetoric or language study--appropriate to the professional expectations of an MA degree. This will include some sense of the histories, key figures, canonical texts, paradigms, and major issues or conflicts in these fields.

Actions

Assessment Procedures All students in the English M.A. program demonstrate their knowledge of 10 □core texts□ on a sub-discipline (literature, rhetoric/composition, linguistics) reading list in Part 1 of the M.A. Written Examination (taken near the end of their M.A. studies). Students respond to common questions developed by a committee consisting of five members of the English Graduate faculty appointed by the Chair of the Department.

Administration of Assessment Procedures The 5-person committee that constructs the M.A. exam judges anonymously (as passing or failing) each student□s performance on the M.A. Written Examination. A passing performance on this examination is required for graduation

from the program.

Use of Assessment Findings At the end of each three-year period, the Coordinator of the English Graduate Program leads the graduate faculty in an evaluation of the performance of students on the M.A. Written Examination (over the course of the previous three-year period). The Coordinator (with the assistance of the Graduate Committee) writes a report detailing the findings of this assessment. The Graduate Committee then makes recommendations for appropriate curricular changes in the content of courses, the core reading lists, or the kinds of questions being asked of students.

VII. PLANNING ELEMENTS

A. Trend of Increased Enrollments

See Stretch Goal 1.

B. Distance Education

While the Department is pleased to respond to specific requests for distance-learning courses, and to offer individual classes as faculty interest dictates, we have no plans to develop on-line programs of study.

C. Outreach and Engagement

See Stretch Goals 2 and 4. Our faculty continue to provide extensive service to the public schools of the region, and several faculty with expertise in technical writing are beginning to expand their professional efforts on behalf of business and industry, including, most recently, consulting contracts with TIAA/CREF.

D. General Education

The Department retains responsibility for the University writing requirement (“Fundamental Skills of Inquiry”) and also looks forward to contributing faculty and courses to the new General Education rubrics pertaining to “Themes of Liberal Education.”

E. Research and Creative Activity

The Department’s principal strengths (literacy studies and children’s literature) are identified in Section I; these areas of strength continue to provide focus for research activity and programmatic initiatives. In addition, the new Stretch Goals 4 and 5 seek to expand research and creative efforts through a literacy center, on one hand, and a new

MFA program, on the other.

F. Internationalization

Several English faculty are cooperating with the College of Education to sponsor credit-bearing courses, under auspices of UNCC International Institutes, for teachers and school administrators that include two weeks of study in one of three possible sites: Mexico, Hungary, and Taiwan. Our Stratford Shakespeare program, which has operated effectively for several years, also contributes to students' opportunities for international experience. Over the past three years, the Department has supported the research activities of a literature scholar from Syria (on a Fulbright fellowship), a linguist from Germany (on faculty exchange), a TESOL specialist from the People's Republic of China, and a text linguist from Taiwan. We continue to be involved, as well, in the faculty and student exchange with Ludwigsburg.

G. Information Technology

Individual faculty rely, as they prefer, on email, chatrooms, on-line course materials, web-based student research, power point, video projectors, and other resources in the conduct of their courses. There is no systematic department-wide commitment to delivering instruction through electronic means, but there is growing acknowledgement of the value of electronic technologies and no lack of sophistication in their use. A number of our courses would profit from expanded access to computer classrooms (the Department has two available to it at the moment, but could readily fill writing and other courses to capacity in additional rooms), and from widely available video projection systems as well. The Department would also support student ownership of notebooks and wireless Internet access.

