

**Texas A&M University-Kingsville**  
**Undergraduate Program Review Committee**  
**Ad-Hoc Committee Report on “the Department of English”**  
**2009**

**Report Completeness:**

- In Part I.03 (Page 4): A copy of the previous Program Review Subcommittee recommendations is **not provided**. Therefore, it is not possible to properly evaluate the program reactions against these recommendations.
- In Part II.04 (Page 6): Simply writing “ ... , and other measures” does not explain the ‘other’ measures.
- In Part III.01 (Page 7): Appendix B and Appendix C are **not provided**.
- In Part III.03 (Page 9): Information about how courses are modified/deleted/added is **not provided**.
- In Part IV.01 (Page 10): Appendix D for course syllabi is **not provided**.
- In Part V (Page 11): The importance of advising is emphasized but information about advising process efficiency is **not provided**.
- In Part VI.03 (Page 13): A number of course-level student learner outcome data is **not provided**.
- In Part VI.04 (Page 14): A lot of data for the general education courses student outcome assessments is **not provided**.
- Part VII.01 (Page 16): A copy of the Credentials evaluation summary is **not provided**.
- In Part VII.05 (Page 18): A detailed description of the program faculty scholarly activity table can explain the depth of the scholarly activities.

**Strengths:**

- Responsive to ongoing curriculum changes such as developing new courses for general education and offering special topics courses.
- A number of effective teaching methods such as one-on-one and maximum interaction, small classes and discussion groups, technology-assisted instruction, etc., have been utilized.
- Annual faculty review helps to address ongoing issues promptly.

- A number of internal development grants have been received. However, the scope and evaluation of the grants could have been detailed.

### **Weaknesses:**

- The program enrollment trend appears to be downward in Kingsville campus. However, the SC-San Antonio English program enrollment numbers are improving due to aggressive marketing efforts.
- Although there are a number of committees in the program to review and plan, no methodological assessment tools are offered with regard to the efficiency of these committees.
- There are no established program-level student learner outcomes. These outcomes are still being examined by the program faculty. Furthermore, it seems that standard procedures to implement the course-level student learner outcomes, full participation and consistency among the faculty are missing.
- The report does not mention about current and future accreditation plans.
- Insufficient travel and professional development funds for the faculty may significantly reduce the range of scholarly activities.

### **Recommendations for Improvement:**

- An external consultant can be utilized to implement the program-level and course-level student learning outcomes. Furthermore, the measurement tool for the program-level student learner outcome “Majors will practice basic research skills in the library and on the internet” should be modified to properly reflect the student progress.
- Although there are some recruitment activities, its scope can be extended to local institutions in more pro-active ways and a reasonably funded recruitment committee can be established to enhance/develop/coordinate the program recruitment activities with the rest of the university (Note: the program freshman/sophomore committee is assumed to be only advising these students).
- Internally-funded course development efforts can be extended to external local/national funding agencies.
- University administration should be approached and person(s) with much desired background should be hired for tenure-track position(s).
- The program may establish some criteria to hire/to train teaching assistants to ensure the instruction effectiveness.

### **Recommendations Regarding Continuation of the Program:**

- Unconditional Continuation